



South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework
Core Strategy
Development Control Policies
Site Specific Policies
Development Plan Document

Annex to ~~Draft~~ Final Sustainability Report

Detailed Policy Assessments

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK:
CORE STRATEGY
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES
SITE SPECIFIC POLICIES
DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT

ANNEX TO ~~DRAFT~~ FINAL
SUSTAINABILITY REPORT:
DRAFT POLICY ASSESSMENTS

Issue No.	Status	Date	Prepared By	Reviewed By	Approved for Issue
1	Draft	26/04/05	PK & AW	AW	
<u>1</u>	<u>Final</u>	<u>24/10/05</u>	<u>PK</u>	<u>MB</u>	<u>1/11/05</u>

~~MARCH~~ November 2005

Prepared For:

South Cambridgeshire District Council
South Cambridgeshire Hall
Cambourne Business Park
Cambs
CB3 6EA

Prepared By:

Scott Wilson Kirkpatrick & Co Ltd
Scott House
Basing View
Basingstoke
Hampshire
RG21 4JG

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
STRATEGY POLICIES	2
ST/1 – Housing provision	
ST/2 – Reusing previously developed land and building	
ST/3 – Rural Centres	
ST/4 – Minor rural centres	
ST/5 – Group villages	
ST/6 – Infill villages	
ST/7 – Phasing of housing land	
ST/8 – Plan, monitor, manage	
GREEN BELT POLICIES.....	<u>1213</u>
GB/1 – Green Belt boundaries	
GB/2 – Development in the Green Belt	
GB/3 – Location and design of development	
GB/4 – Landscaping & design measures	
GB/5 – Major developed sites	
GB/6 – Recreation in the Green Belt	
GB/7 – Improvements to landscape and biodiversity	
DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES POLICIES.....	<u>2025</u>
DP/1 – Sustainable development	
DP/2 – Design of new development	
DP/3 – Development criteria	
DP/4 – Infrastructure and new developments	
DP/5 – Cumulative development	
DP/6 – Construction methods	
DP/7 – Urban frameworks	
DP/8 – Village frameworks	
HOUSING POLICIES.....	<u>2835</u>
HG/1 – Housing density	
HG/2 – Market housing mix	
HG/3 – Affordable housing within frameworks	
HG/4 – Affordable housing funding	
HG/5 – Exceptions sites for affordable housing	
HG/6 – Extensions to dwellings in the countryside	
HG/7 – Replacement dwellings in the countryside	
HG/9 – Dwelling to support a rural enterprise	
HG/8 – Conversion of buildings in the countryside for residential use	
ECONOMY & TOURISM POLICIES.....	<u>3946</u>
ET/1 – Limitations on the occupancy of new premises	
ET/2 – Meeting housing needs from employment development	
ET/3 – Promotion of clusters	
ET/4 – Development in established employment areas in the countryside	
ET/5 – New employment development	
ET/6 – Expansion of existing firms	
ET/7 – Loss of rural employment to non-employment uses	
ET/8 – Conversion of rural buildings for employment	
ET/9 – Replacement buildings in the countryside	
ET/10 – Farm diversification	
ET/11 – Tourism facilities	
ET/12 – Tourist facilities and visitor accommodation	

SERVICES & FACILITIES POLICIES.....	<u>5363</u>
SF/1 – Protection of village services and facilities	
SF/2 – Retail hierarchy	
SF/3 – Applications for new retail development	
SF/4 – Retail development on land allocated for other uses	
SF/5 – Retailing in villages	
SF/6 – Retailing in the countryside	
SF/7 – Public art and new development	
SF/8 – Telecommunications	
SF/9 – Underground pipes, wires, fibres and cables	
SF/10 – Lord’s Bridge Radio Telescope	
SF/11 – Protection of existing recreation areas	
SF/12 – Outdoor playspace, informal open space and new developments	
SF/13 – Open space standards	
SF/14 – The River Cam	
NATURAL ENVIRONMENT POLICIES.....	<u>6880</u>
NE/1 – Energy efficiency	
NE/2 – Renewable energy	
NE/3 – Renewable energy technologies in new development	
NE/4 – Landscape character areas	
NE/5 – Countryside enhancement areas	
NE/6 – Biodiversity	
NE/7 – Sites of biodiversity importance	
NE/8 – Natural Areas	
NE/9 – Regionally important geological and geomorphological sites	
NE/10 – Groundwater	
NE/11 – Water and drainage infrastructure	
NE/12 – Foul drainage: alternative drainage systems	
NE/13 – Flood risk	
NE/14 – Sustainable drainage systems	
NE/15 – Water conservation	
NE/16 – Hazardous installations	
NE/17 – Lighting proposals	
NE/18 – Noise pollution	
NE/19 – Emissions	
NE/20 – Land contamination	
NE/21 – Protecting high quality agricultural land	
CULTURAL HERITAGE POLICIES.....	<u>94106</u>
CH/1 – Historic landscapes	
CH/2 – Archaeological sites	
CH/3 – Listed buildings	
CH/4 – Development within the curtilage or setting of a listed building	
CH/5 – Conservation areas	
CH/6 – Protected village amenity areas	
CH/7 – Important countryside frontages	
CH/8 – Advertisements	
TRAVEL POLICIES.....	<u>100116</u>
TR/1 – Planning for more sustainable travel	
TR/2 – Car and cycle parking standards	
TR/3 – Mitigating travel impact	
TR/4 – Cycling and walking provision	
TR/5 – Rail freight	
TR/6 – Eastern Rapid Transit	
TR/7 – Aviation-related development proposals	

SITE SPECIFIC POLICIES409126 |

- SP/1 – Housing allocations in rural areas – explanatory notes
- SP/1a – Impington, North of Impington Lane
- SP/1b – Sawston, Land at Portobello Road
- SP/1c – Melbourn, Dolphin Lane
- SP/1d – Waterbeach, North of Bannold Road
- SP/1e – Willingham, South of Berrycroft and East of Balland Field
- SP/1f – Willingham, West of High Street and North of Over Road
- SP/1g – Bassingbourn, North of High Street
- SP/1h – Highfields Caldecote
- SP/1i – Comberton, East of Swaynes Lane
- SP/1j – Fowlmere, East of Long Lane
- SP/1k – Girton, North of Thornton Road
- SP/1l – Guilden Morden, Off Church Lane
- SP/1m – Longstanton, North of Over Road
- SP/1n – Meldreth, North of Chiswick End
- SP/1o – Oakington, North of Coles Lane
- SP/1p – Oakington, South of Water Lane
- SP/1q – Over, North of Chapman Way
- SP/1r – Papworth Everard, East of Ermine Street South
- SP/1s – Papworth Everard, West of Ermine Street North
- SP/1t – Papworth Everard, West of Ermine Street South
- SP/1u – Steeple Morden, North of Ashwell Road
- SP/1v – Heathfield, West of Kingsway
- [SP/\(x\) – Bayer Cropscience site, Hauxton](#)
- SP/2 – Cambridge Northern Fringe West
- SP/3 – Cambridge Northern Fringe East: Chesterton Sidings
- SP/4 – Allocations for class B1 employment uses
- SP/5 – Allocations for class B1 and B2 employment uses
- SP/6 – West of St Mary’s church, Gamlingay
- SP/7 – Allocations for open space
- [SP/\(x\) – Additional allocations for open space](#)
- SP/8 – Character of village centres
- SP/9 – Linton special policy area
- SP/10 – Former Land Settlement Association estates
- SP/11 – Papworth Everard village development
- SP/12 – Duxford Imperial War Museum
- SP/13 – New road infrastructure
- SP/14 – Rapid Transit
- SP/15 – Rail infrastructure
- SP/16 – Rail freight
- SP/17 – Cambridge Airport safety zone
- SP/18 – Cambourne
- SP/19 – Cambourne approved master plan and design guide
- SP/20 – Cambourne School Lane special policy area
- SP/21 – Longstanton conservation area at St Michael’s

INTRODUCTION

This document is the Annex to the [Draft Environmental / Sustainability Report on the Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan \(AAP\) Core Strategy, Development Control Policies and Site Specific Policies DPDs](#). It contains the detailed assessments of draft policies which the Council proposes to include in the [AAPDPDs](#). It has been assessed using the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Framework defined in the Council's Scoping Report, to determine how successfully the policies – individually and collectively – achieve agreed economic, social and environmental development objectives for the District.

Each policy is assessed in terms of the nature of its impact (positive / negative / neutral / cannot be determined without further data); its relative magnitude (ie. significance); and its duration over time. The symbols used in the assessments are explained below.

Symbol	Likely effect against the SA Objective
+++	Strong and significant beneficial impact
++	Potentially significant beneficial impact
+	Policy supports this objective although it may have only a minor beneficial impact
~	Policy has no impact or effect is neutral insofar as the benefits and drawbacks appear equal and neither is considered significant
?	Uncertain or insufficient information on which to determine base the assessment at this stage
-	Policy appears to conflict with the objective and may result in adverse impacts
--	Potentially significant adverse impact
---	Strong and significant adverse impact

Brackets are used primarily to show slow change in the impact – eg. in the sequence: + / +(+) / ++. However in a small number of cases they are used as follows (++) to indicate a likely impact which must be qualified because of lack of information at present.

Each policy is assessed against the 22 objectives in the SA Framework. Each table is followed by a summary of the principal issues identified in the assessments, and a summary outlining proposed mitigation measures and likely cumulative (and other) impacts.

When reviewing this document we recommend you begin with these summaries and consult the detailed markings to obtain more information on comments or issues which may be of specific interest.

STRATEGY POLICIES

ST/1 – Housing provision

Provision will be made for 20,000 new homes in the period 1999-2016, including 4400 on the edge of Cambridge, 6000 at Northstowe, and 9600 in Rural Centres and other villages.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	+	++	+++	Some short-term loss of Green Belt land which is compensated by later re-designation. Otherwise the land taken for new housing development is almost entirely brownfield.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	(-)	(--)	(---)	Expansion will increase resource consumption, however this is inevitable if housing expansion is imperative. It is therefore essential that other policies maximise use of sustainable and energy-efficient construction and design. Impact expands over time with settlement growth.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	(-)	(--)	(---)	As above in absolute terms. Incorporation of water efficient systems is required by policy NE/15.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	(+)	(++)	Not addressed directly, but the underlying strategy is to protect existing settlements where such facilities might be concentrated. Some of development areas have heritage associations but the corresponding AAPs protect key features.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	~	~	Not addressed specifically by this part of the core strategy.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	+	++	++(+)	Policy aims for coherent expansion through infill at the edge of Cambridge and within smaller centres, though delivery of this benefit depends on detailed design, as it will at Northstowe.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	(-)	(-)	(--)	As for 1.2 and 1.3. However concentration of development in the existing locations will help to reduce growth in emissions from additional traffic (for example) provided other policies to promote sustainable forms of transport are successful.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	(-)	(--)	(---)	As for 1.2 and 1.3.
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	Not addressed directly through this part of the overall strategy.

6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	As for 5.3.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	+	+(+)	++	Implicitly addressed through additional housing provision provided it meets local needs (see below).
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	+	++	+++	Strongly positive provided housing policy and use of developer contributions (if necessary) ensures stock meets needs and the affordable housing stock grows.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	?	?	?	Policy addresses housing provision only, however it prioritises growth in existing centres (Northstowe excepted) implying new housing and employment would be fairly close by.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	+	++	+++	See below.
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	+	++	+++	Implicitly supportive if meeting housing needs underpins further growth in the sub-regional economy while also ensuring the needs of key workers and similar groups are better catered for.

Summary of assessment: In absolute terms the proposed growth in housing is unsustainable as it will increase *resource consumption, increase waste, etc.*, although the selection of sites clearly limits the *loss of undeveloped land*. However, we understand that an SA of housing growth sites was undertaken as part of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan process, and this established that the chosen locations are the most sustainable in other respects, given the imperative of expanding the housing stock. Moreover expansion of the housing stock will redress current imbalances between demand and supply, supporting expansion of the economies of the district and the wider sub-region. This policy therefore illustrates the trade-off that must be made between the absolute and relative aspects of sustainability.

Summary of mitigation proposals: Effective policies and criteria of all levels of design to minimise the impact on resource consumption are essential but are addressed elsewhere in the strategy.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: The principal secondary effect is likely to be the impact on development on this scale on resource supplies, especially water, if these are to be met from local sources. Development will concentrate additional traffic in areas that may already be subject to some intermittent congestion, but this impact needs to be balanced against the adverse effects of more dispersed development which would still add to traffic and emission levels.

ST/2 – Reusing previously developed land and buildings

Sets a target that 37% of new dwellings should be built on previously developed land in the period 1999 to 2016.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

[abridged in some cases]

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	+	~	–	The primary objective of this policy although the target is well below the ODPM's national target, reflecting local land supply conditions and targets established in the Cambs Structure Plan. Impacts on this objective (and others) are assumed to decline as the supply of brownfield land in suitable and/or appropriate sites is progressively reduced and this would necessitate expansion onto greenfield sites.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	+	+	~	Supportive in principle because it ensures land likely to be close to existing services and amenities is re-used as soon as possible.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	

2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	(+)	(+)	~	Implicitly supportive as the designations are mutually inconsistent.
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	-±	-±	-±	<u>Post consultation change makes explicit reference to the need to accommodate existing biodiversity assets into development which re-uses land, and this could include established non-native species (eg. of trees) if these have habitat value, even if they are not protected or locally characteristic.</u>
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+	+	~	
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	More likely to depend on design criteria, and is also affected by the ease with which new development can be integrated with the surrounding, established land uses. It could be argued that is more feasible for new greenfield development, although clearly this conflicts with many other objectives.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	+	+	+	An implicit objective which underlies PPS1, PPG3, PPS6 and PPG13.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	(-)	(-)	(-)	Likely to increase waste in absolute terms, but this is offset by other potential benefits.
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	(+)	(+)	~	Positive benefit if land is available close to amenities, etc., encouraging non-car access.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	+	+	+	Potential increase as brownfield development would presumably include open space whereas the derelict land would be privately owned.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	+++	++	+	A likely consequence given PPS1 prioritises use of such sites for mixed land-use developments, transport interchanges, etc.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	(+)	(+)	~	Can have a positive impact particularly if central land is allocated for affordable housing, including that for the elderly and less mobile, improving their access to central services and facilities.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	++	+(+)	+	Any redevelopment for housing enables the Council to apply policies DP/1 and HG/3 to pursue this objective.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	+	+	~	Supportive in principle as it encourages planned development of housing and employment in close proximity where possible.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	

7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy ~ ~ ~

Summary of assessment: Policy clearly supports guidance on sustainable communities and the need to take available opportunities to integrate mixed land use and maximise efficient use of the land stock. The target is almost half the national target, though this is 'saved' from the Structure Plan and is understood to reflect the very limited stock of such land in the district at present.

Summary of mitigation proposals: None.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: While the target reflects local brownfield land shortages, once combined with the house building targets imposed by government and Structure Plan targets, there is a clear and substantial absolute negative sustainability impact on demand for undeveloped land.

ST/3 – Rural Centres
 Identifies five of the districts larger settlements which already have established services and amenities and good sub-regional transport links, and which will be the focus of development in addition to Northstowe and urban infill / extension around Cambridge.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	+	+(+)	++	Taken with other policies on development outside Cambridge, this policy aims to direct and contain it within the existing larger settlements, helping to prevent creep onto the Green Belt and agricultural land.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	(+)	(+)	(++)	Implicitly supportive because services are concentrated in the more accessible centres, and this should reduce the number of trips and support promotion of sustainable forms of transport.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	(+)	(+)	(++)	Supportive if it prevents development creeping beyond existing settlements, however infilling and growth within the Centres should not lead to a loss of open space for wildlife.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	?	?	?	Focusing growth on these settlements could create local development pressure which must be addressed through design criteria and development control processes.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	?	?	?	As above.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	?	?	?	As above.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	+	+(+)	++	Centres will have range of services in a more accessible location than smaller settlements, reducing number and lengths of trips and encouraging alternative forms of transport.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	(+)	(+)	(+)	Proximity of people to amenities could encourage more walking or cycling.

5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	(-)	(-)	(-)	Development pressure within Centres could have adverse impact without development controls. It is not clear what scope there is for compensatory provision at the edge of these centres.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	+	++	++(+)	A clear priority for this policy.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	+	+	+	Implicitly benefits residents of the Centres if development improves the range of services and amenities available locally (ie. rather than those in Cambridge or other centres).
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	+	+	+	Aims for 'sustainable housing mix'.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	(+)	(+)	(+)	Beneficial if it attracts additional amenities that support the community and encourage involvement.
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	Development primarily concerned with housing. In principle it should mean
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	+	+	+	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	(+)	(+)	(+)	Potential benefit if it creates a critical mass of population to sustain services and amenities, and to attract new ones. However there is no clear evidence that building more houses will necessarily attract more amenities.

Summary of assessment: Policy is consistent with the underlying principles of PPS1, encouraging development to be focused on those centres which already have the greatest provision of services and amenities. This approach is consistent with other areas of policy, notably on sustainable transport, since it aims to create a critical mass of facilities in the most populous settlements, thereby bringing homes, work and services closer together for a sizeable proportion of the population.

As a result of representations in public consultation, Bar Hill was reclassified as a Minor Rural Centre, reflecting its limited facilities (including public transport and lack of a secondary school), loss of key services recently, access problems and vulnerability to traffic congestion on the A14. The change might be seen as beneficial to Bar Hill if it reduces pressure on land resources and helps to maintain the existing balance between demand and supply of services. However it suggests a corresponding increase in pressure on land in the remaining Rural Centres in order to contribute to housing growth targets. This might suggest the outcome is less sustainable if it leads to increased pressure for peripheral development around Rural Centres, nevertheless it also appears consistent with the Council's underlying policy of avoiding development where this will increase commuting due to lack of local facilities. The Council has advised us subsequently that changing the status of Bar Hill should not have any knock-on impacts for the other Rural Centres and that the effect on housing supply will be negligible.

Summary of mitigation proposals: None.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: The principal secondary effect is likely to be the impact on development on this scale on resource supplies, especially water, if these are to be met from local sources. Development will concentrate additional traffic in areas that may already be subject to some intermittent congestion, but this impact needs to be balanced against the adverse effects of more dispersed development which would still add to traffic and emission levels.

ST/4 – Minor rural centres

Defines the next tier in the settlement hierarchy and establishing a broad threshold for the scale of development that would be permitted in these locations. The policy states the intention to use Section 46106 agreements for infrastructure provision as appropriate.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives
[abridged in some cases]

Assessment
Short Med. Long

Comments / Proposed Mitigation

1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	Primarily addressed by ST/1.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	?	?	?	Aims to limit the scale development in smaller locations which have few amenities and where residents would therefore make additional trips. The absolute impact involves an increase in the use of other resources, and this must be taken into account when considering the scale of development across the district.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	-	-	-	Increase in demand in absolute terms as the policy implies expansion of the housing stock, although overall impact is less than that of Northstowe or Cambridge East provided the scale of development continues to be small.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+	+(+)	++	Supportive since it controls the scale of development in smaller settlements, preventing them from sprawling.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	+	+(+)	++	Potential benefits subsumed under 3.2.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	+	+	+	As for 1.2.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	-	-	-	As for 1.3.
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	(+)	(+)	(+)	Positive mark given because the policy is consistent with others relating to the settlement hierarchy, although in principle some services are less accessible because their provision is prioritised in the rural centres rather than in these settlements. However, allowing more housing growth in these centres does not guarantee there will also be improvement in amenities.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	?	?	?	Impact on the elderly and less mobile difficult to quantify though such centres are large enough to support some facilities.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	?	?	?	Ensures housing provision is spread to smaller settlements and not confined to the Rural Centres.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	

7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	Impact on accessibility of local employment by means other than the car is assumed to be negligible.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	(+)	(+)	(+)	Implicitly supports the retail hierarchy by concentrating it in the larger centres where people can benefit from multi-function single trips.

Summary of assessment: Limits the scale of new development in smaller centres which will still support a limited range of services and amenities, and which implicitly supports the broader settlement and retail hierarchies.

Summary of mitigation proposals: None.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: In terms of natural resources attention is rightly focused on the impact of the major developments at Northstowe and Cambridge East. However these developments are necessitated by national housing policy and will make significant contributions to rebalancing housing stock with needs, even though the absolute impact on energy, water and other resources is apparent. Development in smaller centres, whether through infill or windfall, will contribute to housing targets, but only on an incremental scale, and the additional consumption of resources might be less easy to justify. It will be necessary to monitor the number of developments in these smaller settlements and to consider carefully their long-term cumulative impact on demand for natural resources locally.

ST/5 – Group villages

Identifies a larger number of medium-sized villages where new residential developments of up to 8 dwellings would be permitted.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	?	?	?	Assumed to be supportive in conjunction with other policies to prevent sprawl onto the surrounding countryside.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	?	?	?	Small absolute impact on resource requirements, although the long-term cumulative effect across the district should not be overlooked.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	?	?	?	As above.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	?	?	?	Policy should not result in excessive infill in smaller settlements which we assume will have a more rural and open character (the policy text refers to potentially low densities) and where wildlife may be established already.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	?	?	?	As for 2.2.
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+	+(+)	++	Addressed in requirement to retain sustainable housing balance and not introduce inappropriately high densities.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	+	+(+)	++	As above.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	(+)	(+)	(+)	Implicitly supportive in the broader context of the settlement hierarchy.

4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	?	?	?	As for 1.2.
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	?	?	?	As for 2.2.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	?	?	?	Does not improve accessibility but limits additional development in centres where there are limited facilities which might be over-stretched by further growth.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	Any issues subsumed by comments for 6.3.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	?	?	?	Might have adverse impact if limiting scale means development might fall below thresholds at which it is economic or attractive for developers to provide affordable housing in rural areas. However the final policy text recognises the need for mixed affordability (ie. tenure arrangements)
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	Impact on accessibility of local employment by means other than the car is assumed to be negligible.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	(+)	(+)	(+)	As for policy ST/3.

Summary of assessment: Another policy consistent with broad guidance on sustainable communities and with other plan policies on the settlement / retail hierarchies. One concern is that the limited scale of development may lie below the threshold for providing affordable housing and this may limit its availability in or next to the more rural areas of the district. .

Summary of mitigation proposals: None.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: As for ST/3.

ST/6 – Infill villages

Identifies a large number of small settlements in which service / amenity provision is minimal and imposes constraints on the scale of new development (and presumably on re-development) that would be permitted.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

[abridged in some cases]

	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	(+)	(+)	(+)	Implicitly supportive as constraints apply within the village framework and sprawl is prevented by other plan policies.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	Effect assumed to be negligible due to the very small scale of development that is envisaged.

1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	As for 1.2.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	?	?	?	Policy should not result in excessive infill in smaller settlements which we assume will have a more rural and open character (the policy text refers to potentially low densities) and where wildlife may be established already.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	?	?	?	As above.
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	++	++	++	Clearly supportive with specific mention of the need to ensure development does not adversely affect settlement character.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	++	++	++	As above.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	Policy text acknowledges these centres have so few amenities that residents must find them elsewhere. However given their size the impact on emissions is assumed to be negligible, and the effect of the settlement / retail hierarchy concentrates amenities in larger locations where many can be visited with a single trip.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	As for 1.2 / 1.3.
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	?	?	?	Neutral impact individually, but over time infilling should not reduce open space within the village framework.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	As for 4.1.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	Effect assumed to be neutral as allowing more extensive growth does not guarantee new amenities would be provided.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	?	?	?	Similar concerns as for policy ST/4, although the text makes an exception which could support this objective.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	Unlikely to have an impact as the policy acknowledges these settlements have limited social facilities already.
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	As for policies ST/3 and ST/4.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	(+)	(+)	(+)	As for policies ST/3 and ST/4.

Summary of assessment: Sustainable in that it prevents excessive and potentially intrusive development that would unbalance the layout of the smallest settlements. The policy effectively means that small settlements that are already under-served by services and amenities will stay that way, but this is consistent with the settlement and retail hierarchies that the ST/ policies are aiming to achieve.

Summary of mitigation proposals: None.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.

ST7 – Phasing of housing land

Establishes role of Northstowe and other developments in delivering new housing in phases, but recognises the contribution of further development elsewhere on allocated land (and presumably through windfalls).

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	Spatial issue addressed by other policies.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	?	?	?	Setting aside absolute impacts, phasing will help to ensure adequate provision of infrastructure in line with the growth in new housing.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	?	?	?	As for 1.2.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	(+)	(+)	(+)	In principal, and for the new settlements in particular, phasing aims to roll out housing and other elements in parallel.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	(+)	(+)	(+)	<u>Post consultation change made clear the role of phasing not only in maintaining a supply of housing but also in controlling the inevitable impacts of (re)development on surrounding areas.</u>
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	(+)	(+)	(+)	<u>As for objective 4.1.</u>
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	(+)	(+)	(+)	As for 3.2.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	

6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	(+)	(+)	(+)	As for 3.2 / 6.1.
Summary of assessment: This is largely a procedural policy stating the Council's intention to manage the phased growth of housing, particularly in the large planned developments, while acknowledging its duty to maintain an adequate supply of land in other locations. Benefits are largely indirect and come from the phasing of housing with provision of other infrastructure to ensure there is a viable settlement from the outset, though clearly this applies primarily to Northstowe and Cambridge East.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

ST/8 – Plan, monitor, manage				
Establishes the Council's intention to monitor growth in new development, in particular to ensure housing targets and build on brownfield land, and identifies various forms of corrective action that may be used.				
Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	~	~	
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	

5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~
Summary of assessment: This policy is procedural, stating the Council's intention to monitor the progress of the LDF in key areas and take appropriate corrective action. It is clearly sustainable and consistent with the other areas of policy but cannot be reviewed in detail.			
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.			
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.			

GREEN BELT POLICIES

GB/1 – Green Belt boundaries

The boundaries of the Green Belt are defined on the Proposals Map.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]

	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	

3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	~	~
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~

Summary of assessment: This is a procedural policy indicating where the extent of the Green Belt will be legally defined. Defining on the Proposals Map formally incorporates it into the LDF and district planning policy. As such the option cannot be assessed. Any impacts of the Green Belt are covered by the assessment of policy GB/2.

Summary of mitigation proposals: None – see below.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: The Council is assumed to have an underlying intention of preserving the Green Belt as far as possible. Developments such as Northstowe are mitigated by compensatory redesignation of land, but overall this represents a loss of the district's 'stock' of open land. Developments such as Northstowe are predicated on decisions taken high in the planning structure, but this raises the issue of whether this should result in more stringent controls on how much Green Belt land is removed and/or replaced as a result of other developments in order to limit the loss of open land in the longer term. (In practical terms this comment implies a concern that repeated redesignation of Green Belt land may weaken its role in managing development.)

GB/2 – Development in the Green Belt – NOTE THIS POLICY HAS BEEN SUPERSEDED BY A NEW POLICY WHICH IS ASSESSED BELOW

Planning permission will only be granted within the Green Belt in very special circumstances (defined in 8 points). Inappropriate development will not be permitted and any form of development may require landscaping.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural	+++	+++	+++	Clearly one of the two main objectives of this policy.

holdings				
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	+	+	+	Supportive in principle as such sites will lie beyond urban edge.
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	+	+	+	Supports maintenance.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	+	+	+	Ensures that open countryside surrounds settlements (proximity), although accessibility depends on rights of way.
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	+	+	+	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+++	+++	+++	Within 1.1 the other principal objective of this policy.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	++	++	++	Supports 3.2.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	?	?	?	Impact of traffic growth which may occur as a result of permitting development of leisure facilities?
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	(+)	(+)	(+)	As vegetation helps to fix carbon it can be argued that the policy supports this objective indirectly.
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	?	?	?	Depends whether land is available for recreational use.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	++?	++?	++?	Supportive in principal though designation does not imply public accessibility.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	
Summary of assessment: Overall the policy is clearly prevents loss of agricultural land, maintains local character, and provides the opportunity for accessible open space within easy reach of settlements.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: Condition 2 of the policy permits appropriate development for recreational and leisure use. Should the policy or the supporting text indicate that 'appropriate' should be determined not only by maintaining the open character of the land but also that it should not result in excessive traffic since this indirectly affects the character and tranquillity of the area. This issue is partly addressed in GB/6 by encouraging non-car access, but traffic impacts are not mentioned specifically.				

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.

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

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

<u>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</u> <u>[abridged in some cases]</u>	<u>Assessment</u>			<u>Comments / Proposed Mitigation</u>
	<u>Short</u>	<u>Med.</u>	<u>Long</u>	
<u>1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings</u>	<u>(++)</u>	<u>(++)</u>	<u>(++)</u>	<u>Implicitly supportive though it is assumed other policies (eg NE/21) address this issue more directly.</u>
<u>1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy</u>	<u>≈</u>	<u>≈</u>	<u>≈</u>	
<u>1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels</u>	<u>≈</u>	<u>≈</u>	<u>≈</u>	
<u>2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species</u>	<u>±</u>	<u>±</u>	<u>±</u>	<u>Supportive in principle as such sites will lie beyond urban edge.</u>
<u>2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species</u>	<u>±</u>	<u>±</u>	<u>±</u>	<u>Supports maintenance.</u>
<u>2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places</u>	<u>++</u>	<u>++</u>	<u>++</u>	<u>Ensures that open countryside surrounds settlements (proximity), although accessibility depends on rights of way.</u>
<u>3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings</u>	<u>±</u>	<u>±</u>	<u>±</u>	
<u>3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape</u>	<u>+++</u>	<u>+++</u>	<u>+++</u>	<u>Within 1.1 the other principal objective of this policy.</u>
<u>3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well</u>	<u>++</u>	<u>++</u>	<u>++</u>	<u>Supports 3.2.</u>
<u>4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants</u>	<u>≈</u>	<u>≈</u>	<u>≈</u>	
<u>4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling</u>	<u>≈</u>	<u>≈</u>	<u>≈</u>	
<u>4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts</u>	<u>(+)</u>	<u>(+)</u>	<u>(+)</u>	<u>As vegetation helps to fix carbon it can be argued that the policy supports this objective indirectly.</u>
<u>5.1 Maintain and enhance human health</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>Depends whether land is available for recreational use.</u>
<u>5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime</u>	<u>≈</u>	<u>≈</u>	<u>≈</u>	
<u>5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space</u>	<u>++?</u>	<u>++?</u>	<u>++?</u>	<u>Supportive in principal though designation does not imply public access.</u>
<u>6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities</u>	<u>≈</u>	<u>≈</u>	<u>≈</u>	
<u>6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.</u>	<u>≈</u>	<u>≈</u>	<u>≈</u>	
<u>6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing</u>	<u>≈</u>	<u>≈</u>	<u>≈</u>	
<u>6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community</u>	<u>≈</u>	<u>≈</u>	<u>≈</u>	
<u>7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location</u>	<u>≈</u>	<u>≈</u>	<u>≈</u>	
<u>7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and</u>	<u>≈</u>	<u>≈</u>	<u>≈</u>	

infrastructure			
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	≈	≈	≈
Summary of assessment: Principal control is provided by GB/1 and use of PPG2 definition of what is acceptable development and this policy provides an additional safety net to mitigate visual and similar impacts that could result. The only issue is that this policy replaces GB/3 which addressed the design of the development itself not just its visual impact. It is assumed such controls will be imposed by other Development Control Principles.			
Summary of mitigation proposals: Condition 2 of the policy permits appropriate development for recreational and leisure use. Should the policy or the supporting text indicate that 'appropriate' should be determined not only by maintaining the open character of the land but also that it should not result in excessive traffic since this indirectly affects the character and tranquillity of the area. This issue is partly addressed in GB/6 by encouraging non-car access, but traffic impacts are not mentioned specifically.			
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.			

GB/3 – Location and design of development – THIS POLICY HAS BEEN SUPERSEDED				
Development considered appropriate must be located and designed so it has no adverse effect on the character and openness of the Green Belt.				
Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	?	?	?	Depends on locality although in principle the policy is supportive
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+++	+++	+++	The principal objective of this policy.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	++	++	++	Supports 3.2.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	?	?	?	Maintains quality of open space although does not imply public accessibility.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	

6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~
Summary of assessment: Little to comment on; clearly supportive.			
Summary of mitigation proposals: If the Council has prepared design guidelines should these be referenced in the supporting text? Equally, the text might make it clear if guidelines are to be covered in forthcoming guidance, possibly as an SPD.			
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.			

GB/3 – Mitigating the Impact of Development Adjoining the Green Belt

Requires controls similar to those specified in GB/2 to apply to any development close to the Green Belt which may have an impact on its character, openness and setting.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

[abridged in some cases]

	<u>Assessment</u>			<u>Comments / Proposed Mitigation</u>
	<u>Short</u>	<u>Med.</u>	<u>Long</u>	
<u>1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings</u>	~	~	~	
<u>1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy</u>	~	~	~	
<u>1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels</u>	~	~	~	
<u>2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species</u>	~	~	~	
<u>2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species</u>	?	?	?	<u>This policy supersedes GB/7 which made specific provision for habitat creation. While that may be an outcome of planting it would be helpful if the policy itself could make this clear. (We note that the supporting text added from GB/7 does indeed make this issue clearer.)</u>
<u>2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places</u>	~	~	~	
<u>3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings</u>	?	?	?	<u>Depends on locality although in principle the policy is supportive</u>
<u>3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape</u>	+++	+++	+++	<u>The principal objective of this policy.</u>
<u>3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well</u>	++	++	++	<u>Supports 3.2.</u>
<u>4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants</u>	~	~	~	
<u>4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling</u>	~	~	~	
<u>4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts</u>	~	~	~	

<u>5.1 Maintain and enhance human health</u>	≈	≈	≈	
<u>5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime</u>	≈	≈	≈	
<u>5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space</u>	?	?	?	<u>Maintains quality of open space although does not imply public accessibility.</u>
<u>6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities</u>	≈	≈	≈	
<u>6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.</u>	≈	≈	≈	
<u>6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing</u>	≈	≈	≈	
<u>6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community</u>	≈	≈	≈	
<u>7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location</u>	≈	≈	≈	
<u>7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure</u>	≈	≈	≈	
<u>7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy</u>	≈	≈	≈	

Summary of assessment: Clearly supportive. It is assumed appropriate design guidelines will be specified in a separate SPD in due course.

Summary of mitigation proposals: If possible make clearer the mechanism for determining proximity to the Green Belt, and where this policy would apply, is not defined. Also make the policy itself clearer in its intention to contribute to habitat creation and not just to use vegetation to mitigate visual impacts.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.

GB/4 – Landscaping & design measures – THE POLICY IS DELETED FROM THE SUBMISSION DRAFT OF THE DPD AND SUPERSEDED BY NEW VERSIONS OF GB/2 & GB/3.

Development on the edge of settlements must be carefully landscaped and designed to minimise the visual impact on the adjacent Green Belt.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	?	?	?	Depends on proximity of sites, but supportive in principle.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+++	+++	+++	The principal objective of this policy.

3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	++	++	++	Supports 3.2.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	(Addresses visual impact not availability of open space.)
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	
Summary of assessment: As with GB/3, aims to minimise the impact on the <i>landscape character</i> of the Green Belt of any peripheral development that is considered appropriate.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: As for GB/3.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

GB/5 – Major developed sites

Identifies four major sites and defines the nature of development that would be permitted within their boundaries.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	Technically, land within the sites is brownfield land. The policy is neutral provided the constraints on development do not result in an extension of the site onto adjacent land (which might be resisted by policy GB/2).
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	?	?	?	Not possible to assume without understanding the nature of redevelopment, however the current policy focuses on footprint only. See comments under mitigation below.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	?	?	?	As above.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	

2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	+	+	+	Policy provides for no net expansion of developed land within these sites (all of which have a parkland setting). Redevelopment should not result in loss of important vegetation / biodiversity features, though this should be implemented through the EIA process.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	+	+	+	Positive although benefits are confined to a small area.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+	+	+	As above.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	+	+	+	As above.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	Effect is neutral provided redevelopment does not result in a sizeable increase in employment levels or changes in industrial process that increasing vehicle trips to/from the site.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	Sites have constraints on public access.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	
Summary of assessment: A supportive policy necessitated by the presence of large campus sites with land potentially available for redevelopment, but lying within the open area of the Green Belt. The policy controls horizontal and vertical redevelopment.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: It is not clear what redevelopment is envisaged, though the sites are a mixture of medical, research and manufacturing uses. In the light of Objectives 1.2 and 1.3 it could be made clearer that land use changes that result in significant changes in resource use, especially of water, would be resisted. However such provisions might be made in the Development Briefs mentioned in the supporting text.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None as these are isolated sites.				

GB/6 – Recreation in the Green Belt

Encourages use of Green Belt land for recreation provided land use change is sympathetic and facilities are conveniently close to built-up areas and/or readily accessible by non-car modes of transport.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

[abridged in some cases]

	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	?	?	?	It is not clear whether farm diversification through the release of land in a suitable location for non-agricultural purposes would be permitted.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	?	?	?	Facilities such as country parks have near-neutral impact, however the level of provision of amenities such as showers, etc. needs to be controlled. Overall effect likely to be neutral
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	?	?	?	As above.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	Adverse impacts should be prevented by planning application process and the policy does not preclude sensitive development enabling the public to visit designated sites (see 2.3 below).
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	+	+	+	Intrinsically protects some land from possible redevelopment and maintains its openness. Development should not result in loss of important vegetational, water and other features, but the overall effect is assumed to be positive.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	+++	+++	+++	One of two principal objectives of this policy.
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	Assumed that redevelopment would not be permitted in the proximity of historic sites (eg. in grounds of halls, houses, etc.).
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	++	++	++	Aims to provide for a variation in landscape that is still sympathetic and aims to provide for land uses other than agriculture around settlement edges.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	++	++	++	Supports 3.2. Provision of convenient recreation outside the urban area should contribute to residents' satisfaction with their surroundings.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	+	+	+	Supportive if accessibility encourage less use of cars, and the indirect carbon-fixing benefits of the vegetation.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	++	++	++	Accessible recreational facilities encourage exercise.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	++	++(+)	+++	The other principal objective of this policy. Effect is assumed to build over time as facilities are added.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	+(+)	++	++(+)	Addresses requirements for better accessibility for leisure facilities, and helping to reduce dependence on private cars.

6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	?	?	?	Might contribute to rural diversification, though this depends on the nature of the redevelopment.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	(+)	(+)	(+)	Appropriate development could support sustainable tourism, but this might offset other benefits of the basic policy (eg. reduced private car use) and should not entail inappropriately extensive development.

Summary of assessment: Supports objectives of *accessible open space* and *maintaining landscape character* by ensuring there is a range of countryside 'land uses' (ie. not just agricultural land) around settlements as they expand.

Summary of mitigation proposals: The policy and its supporting text does not refer to the nature of recreational developments, which appears potentially broad in type and impact. Country parks are mentioned and, implicitly, footpaths and bridleways. However other new development such as farmland turned over to golf courses, driving ranges and other non-agricultural uses are not mentioned specifically and the nature of these developments would need to be controlled carefully where they are acceptable.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: Synergistic impact of out-of-town recreational space combined with open space provision within settlements (the assessment assumes recreational features are not included in open space targets). There is also a longer-term synergistic effect of adopting a strategy for managing recreational facilities in the Green Belt – as proposed in the supporting text – if this supports provision and variety.

GB/7 – Improvements to landscape and biodiversity – THIS POLICY HAS BEEN DELETED FROM THE SUBMISSION VERSION OF THE DPD.

The Council aims to reverse declining habitat quality in the Green Belt through additional planting and habitat creation.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	+	+	+	Implicitly supportive, although the condition of designated sites is primarily the responsibility of other agencies.
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	+	+(+)	++	Clearly supportive of this objective, and supporting text makes specific mention of land and aquatic features, trees and linear habitats. Effect builds over time as new planting takes hold.

2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	+	+(+)	++	Proposals do not necessarily attract people to the countryside and the supporting text acknowledges the need to protect some sites as they are re-established. Any negative impact must be outweighed by the clear benefits of improving biodiversity and husbandry of countryside resources.
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	+?	+?	+?	Depends where improvements occur – at worst the effect is neutral.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+	+(+)	++	Clearly supportive, and recognises the need to manage and regenerate features to maintain their quality. Activities will take time to deliver improvements so effect grows.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	+	+	+	Supports 3.2.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	?	?	?	Carbon-fixing benefit of vegetation?
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	+	+(+)	++	Text wording implies the council rather than private landowners have responsibility for these improvements, and this suggests they would occur where the public can enjoy the results.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	Any leisure benefits implicit in 5.3.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	+	+	+	Supporting text makes mention of coordinating work with volunteer groups.
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	
Summary of assessment: Clearly sustainable with a strong positive environmental focus that recognises countryside resources must need management to maintain quality.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified – policy is a reaction to secondary effects of agricultural practices.				

DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES POLICIES

DP/1 – Sustainable development

Development must be consistent with the principles of sustainable development in terms of form, design, materials and sustainable transport, as well as policy on mixed land-use developments.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	(+++)	(+++)	(+++)	Supportive, if the absolute impact of the development is ignored.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	(+++)	(+++)	(+++)	As above.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	(+++)	(+++)	(+++)	As above.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	+	+	+	Implicit (see below).
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	++	++	++	Protection is mentioned specifically.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	+	+	+	As for 2.2.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	~	~	Not mentioned but addressed by other policies.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	As for 3.2.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	++	++	++	Clearly supportive through sustainable transport improvements and requirement to avoid / mitigate impacts.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	?	?	?	Household waste is not mentioned specifically, although certain forms of recycling (eg. building materials) are covered.
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	+	+	+	Mentioned as a requirement..
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	(±±)	(±±)	(±±)	Implicitly in several measures, and substantiated by need for an HIA.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	+±	±+	+±	Clearly supportive.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	(+)	(+)	(+)	Implicit in point 12.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	Not mentioned specifically but is adequately covered by other areas of policy.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	+	+	+	As for 6.1.
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	

7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	+	+	+	Key word is 'appropriate'.
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	?	?	?	Assumed to be beneficial although relationship is indirect.
Summary of assessment: Clearly a very sustainable policy as would be expected. Some socio-economic aspects are not mentioned explicitly but are adequately covered by other policies.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None Post-consultation changes emphasis the requirement for SA and Health Impact Assessment of major development. The policy should define this in the same way as for TR/3 which refers to a definition in PPG13 (and assuming there is no appropriate alternative in national planning guidance).				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

DP/2 – Design of new development

Establishes basic principles of what the Council will determine to be good design and links this to other, supportive policies.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	(+)	(+)	(+)	Implied by point 2.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	(+)	(+)	(+)	Implied by point 2.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	++	++	++	Clearly a principal objective.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	+++	+++	+++	The primary objective of this policy.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	Addressed by policies DP/3 and DP/1.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	Incorporation of facilities is addressed by other policies.
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	As above.
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	(+)	(+)	(+)	Implicitly supportive.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	+	+	+	Clearly supportive.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	++	++	++	Quality and range are addressed in other areas of policy, but access and accessibility are clearly prioritised.

6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	++	++	++	Inclusivity also clearly signposted as a priority.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	(+)	(+)	(+)	Supports higher densities which implicitly helps to support housing needs provision.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	++	++	++	As for 6.2.
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	(+)	(+)	(+)	Implicitly supportive, though access to work is covered by DP/4 and DP/1.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	(+)	(+)	(+)	Implicit benefits.
Summary of assessment: Clearly sustainable.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: Although it is not necessarily clear in the assessment comments above, there are potentially strong synergies between providing well designed new developments and human health, residents' satisfaction with their surroundings, the attraction of an area as a good place to live, and the impact these factors have on attracting new employers and growing the sub-regional economy. In fact the effect is cyclical because this clearly adds to development pressure.				

DP/3 – Development criteria

Defines a broad range of criteria which will be used to assess desirability of development and cross-references these to other plan policies that define more specific objectives and requirements.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	+	+	+	Addressed in criteria on adverse impacts to be avoided.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	Addressed by policy DP/1.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	+	+	+	As for 1.1.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	+	+	+	As for 1.1.
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	+	+	+	As for 1.1.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	+	+	+	As for 1.1.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+	+	+	Covered by policy DP/2 and by the adverse impact criteria.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	(+)	(+)	(+)	Also covered by DP/2 but implicitly supportive.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	+	+	+	Implicitly supportive in that it encourages sustainable forms of transport.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	+	+	+	Recycling facilities are mentioned.

4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	+	+	+	Covered by policy DP/1 and by the adverse impact criteria.
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	Note really addressed by this policy but is dealt with elsewhere.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	+	+	+	Mentioned specifically.
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	+	+	+	Mentioned specifically.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	+	+	+	Safe access to buildings and safe road access are mentioned.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	(+)	(+)	(+)	Implicit in terms of use of Section 46106 agreements.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	+	+	+	Mentioned specifically.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	(+)	(+)	(+)	As for 6.2.
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	
Summary of assessment: Clearly sustainable.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: Taken together with specific policies cross-referenced in the text, these criteria present substantial limitations which may act as a disincentive to development, even if they are consistent with current policy guidance.				

DP/4 – Infrastructure and new developments

Coordinates the provision of a wide range of infrastructure in parallel with new development to ensure it is supported appropriately, and establishing the intention to seek developer contributions.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	(-)	(--)	(--)	There is an absolute impact of the development and supporting infrastructure on land requirements, though this must be ignored if development is mandated by national interests.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	(-)	(--)	(--)	As above.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	(-)	(--)	(--)	As above.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	?	?	?	Nature of environmental improvements is not defined, and it is not clear if contributions would be sought for habitat mitigation or compensation.

2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	-±	-±	-±	<u>Added to the list as a result of post-consultation changes.</u>
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	~	~	
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	+	+	+	Provision of infrastructure ahead of, or in parallel with development.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	+	+	+	Positive, compared to building houses without supporting health services and other facilities.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	+	+	+	Mentioned specifically as reason for seeking contributions.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	+	+	+	Intrinsically supportive.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	(+)	(+)	(+)	In principle it supports since costs of infrastructure required by growth in development is borne by developer and not wholly by the residents.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	++	++	++	Potentially vital policy for delivering this benefit.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	+	+	+	Some of the facilities that could be funded by contributions support this objective.
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	+	+	+	Educational facilities provided in parallel with occupation of the development.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	+++	+++	+++	The principal objective of this policy.
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	+	+	+	Implicitly supportive.
Summary of assessment: An essential policy given the nature and scope of development that ensuring equitable distribution of the costs of new infrastructure to support the new development, and ensuring a basic level of infrastructure is provided as the site is occupied. Contribution arrangements are crucial to meeting some objectives, notably affordable housing.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: Define environmental improvements that might be funded more clearly (we understand the Council will address this in a Supplementary Planning Document).				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None; the policy aims to prevent cumulative effects of development on the broader existing community infrastructure. Overall, the absolute impact of the scale of the development should not be overlooked.				

DP/5 – Cumulative development

Prohibits development on a piecemeal basis where larger-scale development would provide more coherent settlement patterns, and also ensures that a ‘salami-slicing’ approach cannot be adopted to circumvent certain planning criteria that depend on the size of the development.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

Assessment

Comments / Proposed Mitigation

[abridged in some cases]	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	+	+	+	Implicitly supportive though the main benefit is the efficient use of the available stock of land. See also 3.2. below.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	?	?	?	Possibly beneficial as development in larger numbers of units could lower the unit cost per dwelling of new technology.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	?	?	?	As above.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+	+(+)	++	Aims to prevent inappropriate, piecemeal development and will help to prevent creep onto countryside around settlements.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	+	+(+)	++	Supports 3.2.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	(+)	(+)	(+)	Implicitly supportive as it favours well-planned designs that incorporate open space from the outset rather than leaving it as unused blocks of land between development that may not be open to the public.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	+	+	+	Likely to be supportive because affordable housing provision (and funding) is more sustainable for larger developments.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	+	+	+	Appears supportive because it encourages larger scale development for which is it more likely to be appropriate to levy developer contributions to support infrastructure provision.
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local	~	~	~	

economy

Summary of assessment: An important policy given the limited supply of suitable, sustainable land as it supports the efficient supply of land (on a rolling basis). Clearly larger developments are intrinsically less sustainable than smaller ones in terms of their absolute impacts, but the former offer economies of scale in terms of infrastructure provision (especially through Section 46106 agreements). Moreover, favouring larger scale development enables the various competing land uses (housing, amenity, play space, open space) to be reconciled with good design providing a more coherent settlement pattern, creating spaces that work well, and which would be more difficult to achieve if development occurs on a piecemeal basis.

Summary of mitigation proposals: None.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: The policy aims to avoid secondary impacts on coherence and aims to exploit the economies of scale offered by larger scale developments (though it is not clear whether this is strictly a synergistic effect).

DP/6 – Construction methods

Established broad requirements for the planning and operation of construction activities to minimise the impact of traffic, noise and other facets of site development on the surrounding environment.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	+	+(+)	++	Clearly advocates recycling of construction waste and materials. We assume specific controls on the impacts of these activities will be established through an EIA and also specified in AAPs where appropriate.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	↔	↔	↔	Water requirement of construction activities, and the need for conservation, are not addressed.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+	+	+	Covers the temporary impacts of construction.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	+	+	+	Aims to limit odours, waste, noise, etc. Dust contamination is not mentioned specifically. See also objective 1.3.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	++	++	++(+)	Clearly supportive. See also 1.2.
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	Not mentioned specifically. We would expect any problems to be identified in Master Plans and/or EIA and addressed through appropriate mitigation depending on the local problems.
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	+	+	+	Intrinsic objective of good site management practices required by the policy.

5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~
Summary of assessment: An essential policy given the scale of development that will occur in the district.			
Summary of mitigation proposals: Explicit mention could be made of the need for construction activity to conserve water, and possibly also problems of dust contamination given the amount of topsoil-stripping that will occur, and the recent reduction in NAQS thresholds.			
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: The cumulative impact of extensive development at several locations in the district will need careful consideration and integration at the Master Planning stage to ensure traffic impacts in particular are minimised, and to ensure noise, odour, and other impacts are contained by the phasing of development.			

DP/7 – Urban frameworks

Provides a general permit for the development of unallocated land within urban areas provided it is in keeping with local character.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	++	++	++	Supports settlement and development hierarchy by seeking to maximise use of land within existing settlements.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	+	+	+	Implicitly supportive as it focuses development more centrally, though the incremental benefit is difficult to estimate at this stage.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	(+)	(+)	(+)	Indirectly supportive provided it does not infill green space or green corridors.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	?	?	?	Depends on surrounding land uses.

3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	(+)	(+)	(+)	Difficult to judge without understanding of the likely nature of development, but supportive in principle.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	(+)	(+)	(+)	Appears to focus development on more central sites in larger settlements so implicitly supportive.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	(-)	(-)	(-)	Must not lead to loss of open space.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	(+)	(+)	(+)	Supportive in principle though this depends on the nature of the development.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	(+)	(+)	(+)	As for 6.1.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	?	?	?	As for 6.1., although the use of unallocated land suggests the effective will be negligible.

Summary of assessment: Implicitly supportive policy encouraging extra land in settlements to be brought forward for development as appropriate. However the fact that such land lies outside allocations on the proposals map suggests the benefit may be negligible.

Summary of mitigation proposals: None.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.

DP/8 – Village frameworks

Restricts development in the countryside to rural land uses and aims to ensure development of unallocated land within village frameworks is in keeping with local character, will have no adverse impacts including the loss of amenity.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]

	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	++	++	++	Strictly controls the nature of development in rural areas.

1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	?	?	?	Does not preclude development but limits its scale and impact.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	?	?	?	As above.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	(+)	(+)	(+)	Implicitly supportive.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	+	+	+	Supportive.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	++	++	++	Designed to prevent inappropriate rural development.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	(+)	(+)	(+)	Likely to be supportive.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	(+)	(+)	(+)	Could be supportive if it prevents infill.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	?	?	?	Potentially supportive if it ensures no loss of key amenities.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	?	?	?	Depends on nature of development.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	?	?	?	Aims to support the rural economy indirectly by ensuring any land suitable for development is prioritised for appropriate uses.
Summary of assessment: Sustainable – aims to support appropriate development in the countryside.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

HOUSING POLICIES

HG/1 – Housing density				
Sets a minimum standard of 30 dwellings/ha. with higher densities desirable in central locations near services, amenities and public transport.				
Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	+++	+++	+++	Implicitly the principal objective of this policy, aiming to reverse recent trends of constructing larger homes at lower densities.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	(-)	-	-(-)	Clearly negative in absolute terms as the policy increases energy consumption per hectare (ie. increasing the environmental footprint). Although this implies poorer performance than recent lower density development its impact will be offset by policies NE/1, NE/15 and DP/1.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	(-)	-	-(-)	As above.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	(+)	(+)	(+)	Implicitly supportive if it makes better use of land allocated for development, relieving development pressure on other locations.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	++	++	++	Requirement merely to maintain distinctiveness can be achieved and increased density should not have an inverse effect on housing quality provided policies DP/2 and DP/3 are reflected in development proposals.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	++	++	++	As for 3.2.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	+	+	+	Intrinsic benefit from locating more people closer to work, services, transport facilities and its impact on travel mode.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	(-)	-	-(-)	As for 1.2.
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	?	?	?	Needs to be addressed carefully in designing in adequate open space in conjunction with SUDS (NE/14).
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	+	+(+)	++	Good design should ensure there are no impacts, and policies SF/12 and SF/13 (and DP/4 intrinsically) provide for recreational space and infrastructure proportional to housing provision.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	+	+	Should be designed out of developments, and greater densities can provide more overlooking of open space to add to security. Both issues are covered in principle in policy DP/1.
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	(+)	(+)	(+)	Implicitly supportive if it makes better use of allocated space and gives more flexibility in

				designing the other components of new settlement or development.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	(+)	(+)	(+)	Improvement by increasing population living close by.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	+	+	Assessed through other policies and affordable housing provision.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	++	++	++	Clearly supportive although the policy does not refer to density AND tenure arrangements.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	As for 6.2.
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	+	++	Improves accessibility in more central locations where affordable housing can be provided close to employment.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	?	?	?	As worded the policy does not directly address any of the objective criteria though it feels intrinsically supportive.
Summary of assessment: A sustainable policy consistent with current guidance on housing density. The policy encourages higher densities in appropriate locations although at lower rates than the possible maxima suggested by PPG3. We assume the Council would use its discretion to encourage densities closer to 50 dwellings/ha. in sustainable locations, but that the intermediate density of 40/ha. mentions in the policy will prevent taller development that may be out of keeping with local or district building character.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None, apart from possibly suggesting the higher density suggested above in specific locations, although we expect this will be addressed subsequently in AAPs.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: Implicit synergistic effect from improving the efficiency of use of land stock and the flexibility it might give in designing and integrating other components of the development (amenities, open space, etc.) .				

HG/2 – Market housing mix

Proposes a target mix of properties in terms of the number of bedrooms, which are based largely on a recent Housing Needs survey and which require at least 50% of new properties to have 1 or 2 bedrooms in order to redress an imbalance in housing demand and recent supply trends.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	+	+(+)	++	Moves development away from larger properties to smaller ones consistent with the policy on density (see HG/1).
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	(Resource sustainability issues of increased development have been stated adequately elsewhere).
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	As above.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	

3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	+	++	The assessment assumed that favouring smaller homes is consistent with local architectural patterns and character, whereas recent house-building that has favoured larger premises is not. High density clustering around service centres in new settlements must be treated as an exception which is necessitated by PPS1, PPG3, etc.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	++	++	++	Clearly supportive.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	As for 1.2.
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	?	?	?	Health benefits likely to be delivered through other policies on sustainable development, design, etc.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	(+)	(+)	(+)	Same comment as for policy HG/1.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	+	+	+	Policy is a way of achieving higher densities and therefore delivering mixed land-use development near service and transport hubs.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	+++	+++	+++	Probably the principal objective of this policy as the housing needs survey suggests a sizeable section of the population cannot get access to housing due to inappropriate development.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	++	++	++	Policy concerns density not tenure, but the links with housing mix are clear.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	+	+	+	Contributes to improved accessibility in some locations.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	
Summary of assessment: Given the importance of housing stock growth to the entire LDF this is clearly a key policy that does much of the work needed to realign housing provision with local needs for smaller units.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: The supporting text acknowledges the share of 1 and 2 bedroom properties is lower than the level revealed by the Housing Needs Survey without fully justifying the reason. Assuming a further Needs Survey will be undertaken in 2-3 years time we suggest the supporting text might indicate the Council's intention to review the shares at that stage and adjust them for any new development permitted subsequently. Equally, this draft policy is Alternative Option 3 from the Preferred Options Report and the level of 1 to 2 bedroom provision is higher than envisaged by the Council originally. The rationale for this change in option needs to be made clear and we understand this will be addressed in the Monitoring Plan for the LDF.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

HG/3 – Affordable housing within frameworks

Sets a requirement that affordable housing should represent 50% of all new development for all sites comprising 2 or more dwellings. The policy reiterates the intention to levy developer contributions for affordable housing on new employment that increases local demand for this type of accommodation among key workers and similar groups.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	~	~	
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	++	++	++	New affordable housing assumed to benefit those in poor quality social rented housing, hostels, etc.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	++	++	++	Clearly designed to reduce impact of disparities between earnings levels and prices in the open housing market.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	+++	+++	+++	The principal objective of this policy.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	

7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	++	++	++	Important if it helps to keep key workers in the community, and to attract in others to meet growth in new facilities.
Summary of assessment: Clearly consistent with current government policy and the strategy restated by the SoS in late January 2005. The supporting text justifies setting the threshold at 50% however it is not clear what impact this will have on developers' motivation to take forward very small sites, however this is addressed to some degree by policy HG/4				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

HG/4 – Affordable housing funding				
Provides for adjusting policy HG/3 in exceptional circumstances, particularly on smaller sites where the level of affordable housing may affect the economic of provision. In such cases the policy provides for taking contributions to fund housing elsewhere.				
Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	~	~	
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	++	++	++	New affordable housing assumed to benefit those in poor quality social rented housing, hostels, etc.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	++	++	++	Clearly a companion policy for HG/4 with the same benefits
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable	+++	+++	+++	The principal objective of this policy.

housing			
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~
Summary of assessment: Provides a contingency to ensure the low threshold at which affordable housing quotas apply does not act as a disincentive to development. We assume that the willingness to accept contributions in lieu of housing enables the Council to sweep such monies into a fund to fund affordable units in other locations where the economics are more favourable.			
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.			
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: Synergistic benefit appears to be the opportunity to sweep the contributions into a 'pot' so they can be used more effectively at other locations, hence avoiding fragmenting of the funding of this type of housing.			

HG/5 – Exceptions sites for affordable housing

Provides further spatial exceptions which relax development controls – including those on development in the Green Belt – to enable provision of 100% affordable housing plots in suitable locations that meet recognised local needs.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	?	?	?	The text does make it clear this approach is consistent with PPG2 and PPG3 provided that suitable alternative and more sustainable locations cannot be identified, although this may lead to a negative impact in absolute terms.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	–	---	Implies overall increase in consumption as affordable housing adds to stock and therefore a negative impact in absolute terms.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	–	---	As above.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	Protection assumed to be implicit in other plan policies.
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	As above.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	As for 2.1.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+	+	+	Policy text acknowledges the need to integrate this type of development into its surroundings.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	?	?	?	Difficult to assess though benefits those allocated the homes if it allows them to stay in the community in better housing.

4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	-	---	As for 1.2 / 1.3.
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	++	++	++	New affordable housing assumed to benefit those in poor quality social rented housing, hostels, etc.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	Net impact on open space is assumed to be negligible.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	++	++	++	Addresses both income and locational inequalities by providing a mechanism to ensure adequate affordable housing provision outside the principal settlements.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	+++	+++	+++	The primary objective of this policy.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	(+)	(+)	(+)	Intrinsically supportive if it allows people to remain in their existing community but in better accommodation.
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	(+)	(+)	(+)	Possibly benefits rural economy if it enables rural workings to remain on the land (again, in better surroundings).
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	
Summary of assessment: Suggests obvious sustainability issues in terms of the potential loss of undeveloped land, but this policy is used in exceptional circumstances and only when alternative sites are unavailable or exhausted. The policy might consider measures to remediate Green Belt or open space where this is lost though it is not clear how physical compensation might be funded.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: See above.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified provided such cases remain exceptions.				

HG/6 – Extensions to dwellings in the countryside

Establishes the development criteria for modification of dwellings outside village frameworks to ensure change is appropriate in scale and character. Exceptional circumstances for the expansion of very small properties (eg. workers' cottages) are defined.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	It is assumed development would not occur otherwise rather than shifted onto undeveloped land, therefore the effect is neutral.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	

1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	+	+	+	Implicitly assumed that scale of occupation does not change substantially and that setting of the property is largely unchanged.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+	+	+	Supportive provided development criteria also refer to use of appropriate materials.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	?	?	?	Depends on circumstances – eg. is the work the result of an improvement to a worker's tied cottage?
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	?	?	?	As above.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	
Summary of assessment: A policy that appears to be motivated by local conditions and the need to carefully control development in those instances where it is needed.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: The policy text provides for exceptional extensions vertically and laterally, the latter based on a threshold of 50% increase. Criterion 4 which states that the proposed extension should be in scale with the existing dwelling, whereas the 50% threshold suggests quite substantial extension would be permitted for a potentially wide range of properties. There is also a clear disparity between this threshold and that applied by policy HG/7. Should the threshold be reduced, or at least substantiated?				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

HG/7 – Replacement dwellings in the countryside

Permits one-for-one replacement with some scope for expansion provided issues of scale and character with surroundings are respected. The policy specifically excludes replacement of caravans and other mobile homes with permanent dwellings.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	It is assumed development would not occur otherwise rather than shifted onto undeveloped land, therefore the effect is neutral.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	Protection assumed to be afforded by other policies, and the scale of expansion of the property is modest compared to HG/6.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+	+	+	Effect should be neutral provided the scale, design and materials of the new property are integrated with the surroundings and consistent with local architectural styles.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	(+)	(+)	(+)	Implicitly supportive (see 3.2. above).
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	Not clear that this policy addresses affordable housing needs.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	?	?	?	Possible benefit for individuals if redevelopment of a sub-standard property enables them to remain in the countryside.
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and	~	~	~	

infrastructure			
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~
Summary of assessment: A policy that appears to be motivated by local conditions and the need to carefully control development in those instances where it is needed.			
Summary of mitigation proposals: Criteria should also reflect need to use appropriate materials as this policy covers demolition and replacement of the whole structure.			
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified; assumed to apply to individual and isolated developments.			

HG/8 – Conversion of buildings in the countryside for residential use

Limits conversion of structures (primarily those used for agriculture) as housing, other employment purposes or for live/work use. Other conditions ensure development, where permitted, is appropriate in scale, character and materials and offers flexibility to be adapted for a range of uses in the future.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	Policy addresses change to developed land.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	Impact assumed to be neutral.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	(+)	(+)	(+)	Implicitly supportive though benefit is very localised.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	?	?	?	Possibly supports 3.2.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	+(+)	~(+)	~(+)	<u>Policy aims to ensure better access for such properties primarily as a means of preventing any unnecessary growth in trips.</u>
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable	~	~	~	Conversion does not appear to relate to affordable housing provision for rural workers,

housing				though such development would have limited local benefit.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	(+)	(+)	(+)	May be beneficial if it results in redevelopment of a property no longer of value for agriculture but which provides localised employment and keeps a few people on the land.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	
Summary of assessment: Sustainable, supportive and consistent with related policies HG/7 and HG/9.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

HG/9 – Dwelling to support a rural enterprise

Permits construction of new dwellings to house those working permanently on the land in well-established businesses. Exceptions are made to allow temporary housing for newer businesses where there is a clear commitment for the occupant(s) to remain in tenure.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	It is assumed development would not occur otherwise rather than shifted onto undeveloped land, therefore the effect is neutral.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	Net impact of additional housing assumed to be negligible compared to other developments in the district.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	As above.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	Any protection requirements assumed to be covered by other policies.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	~	~	As for 2.2.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	

5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	+	+	+	Specific provision to support housing requirements of the forestry and agricultural sectors.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	+	+	+	Supports the rural economy by keeping people on the land although the scale appears limited.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	
Summary of assessment: Little to add as policy appears to address a need to maintain a rural labour force and to provide for its needs in the same way that broader affordable housing policy addresses the needs of other groups.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

ECONOMY & TOURISM POLICIES

ET/1– Limitations on the occupancy of new premises

Identifies priorities for non-housing and recreational uses which reflect on the sub-region's acknowledged strengths while providing for additional development in other usage classes to maintain a wider economic base.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	Not addressed specifically (this would be achieved through other policies).
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	–	–(–)	---	Clear implications for energy consumption in particular given the nature of the R&D strengths of the region. See summary comments for further discussion.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	–	–(–)	---	As above.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	

3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	~	~	
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	?	?	?	Depends on location of the development and employees. Impacts such as noise, etc., would be addressed by other policies.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	-	-(-)	---	Net contribution to waste, moreover the nature of the activities at these sites is likely to increase arisings of hazardous and clinical wastes.
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	?	?	?	Concerns about balancing employment with educational skills across the wider population (see 7.1).
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	?	?	?	Policy clearly plays to the region's internationally acknowledged strengths but establishing Northstowe and Cambridge East as sustainable and inclusive communities demands that a broad range of employment must be maintained to cover the full skill base of the local population and any newcomers.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	(++)	(++)	(++)	Supports provision of skilled employees to economy by ensuring supply of employment, although the objective criterion is more concerned with education than vocational provision.
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	+++	+++	+++	Clearly the principal objective of this policy, notwithstanding the comments against 7.1.

Summary of assessment: The policy clearly aims to prioritise non-industrial land development towards the sub-region's strengths in R&D and IT. An additional condition recognises the need, however, to maintain the broader base of opportunities for other categories (managerial, semi-skilled, etc.) which will be essential for provide employment for the wider population of the region. Potential drawbacks include the siting of such facilities in research parks and campus sites (not mixed land-use) and impacts on use of natural resources (which are discussed below).

Summary of mitigation proposals: It will be necessary to ensure that provisions in policies DP/1 and DP/2 on infrastructure and sustainable development apply also to these developments irrespective of their status, and that they should be well-served by a choice of travel modes. Both requirements could be met by a short statement requiring consistency with nominated policies.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: The need to expand the sub-region's capabilities in this area to maintain its leading position need to be balanced against the demands it makes on supply of energy and water, and the waste materials that some research sectors produce. Its principal competitor – Silicon Valley – suffers from similar constraints and it would be useful to understand how (or whether) they have affected the pace of development. In terms of absolute impacts, the government requirements for housing growth can be used as a mitigating argument for building new settlements in spite of the obvious impacts on natural resource use. Cambridgeshire's R&D expertise is internationally recognised, but it is not clear what strategic importance (in the national interest?) can be used to justify continuing substantial development if it makes additional demands on natural resources within the district. Note also that point 4 of this policy sets a maximum of 1850m² size on classes of industrial development of sites, and that this would apply to the site in perpetuity to control of development (ie. it would not result in successive phases of development each within this threshold).

ET/2 – Meeting housing needs from employment development

Requires developers bringing forward employment land to contribute to affordable housing provision for key workers where appropriate, or to provide housing within the development .

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	(+)	(+)	(+)	Provision within the development suggests the policy implicitly supports efficient use of land stock.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	?	?	?	(As with other development policies, this policy implies an increase in demand on natural resources and production of waste, the rationale for which does not have the same statutory prerogative as housing growth).
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	?	?	?	As above.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	~	~	
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	?	?	?	Co-location of employment and key worker housing would clearly affecting commuting but it is not clear on what scale this benefit would occur.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	?	?	?	As for 1.2 and 1.3.
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	

6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	+	+(+)	++	Clearly supportive if it helps to retain and/or attract key and intermediate workers essential to the broader community.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	+	+(+)	++	As above.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	+	+(+)	++	Implicitly supportive if it helps to reduce house price barriers to movement within the key worker labour market, allowing them to move to or stay within a preferred location.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	+	+(+)	++	By definition, key workers are essential part of the infrastructure supporting the local economy.
Summary of assessment: Clearly a supportive and sustainable policy designed to reduce housing barriers in order to encourage key workers to stay within or more into the local economy to support other areas of activity. The main concern is the impact of financial burdens on organisations employing key workers which may themselves have limits on funding for this requirement.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: Synergistic (marginal) impact by supplementing affordable housing provision through other channels.				

ET/3 – Promotion of clusters

Encourages development that will cluster prioritised activities such as biotechnology, R&D, etc. in specific locations. The policy is cross-referenced to the Northstowe and Cambridge East AAPs as both developments provide the opportunity to design clusters into new settlement patterns.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	?	?	?	Appears to support this policy, however clustering implies land would be required in larger volumes at appropriate locations and it is not clear what impact this might have on options for bringing forward development for other land uses at these sites or elsewhere in the district. Moreover it is only likely to be delivered if there are extensive tracts of brownfield land available otherwise it appears to suggest some loss of undeveloped land.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	–	–(–)	---	Comments about sustainability for ET/1 apply to this policy.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	–	–(–)	---	As above.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	~	~	

3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	(+)	(+)	(+)	Given design, security/safety requirements and issues affecting some of the activities listed in the policy, clustering may help to concentrate these impacts in an area rather than interposing them with other development. Moreover it will enable co-location of some activities that residents may not want nearby.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	–	–	–	Clustering implies separation of employment and housing and therefore it will contribute to commuting levels, requiring travel choices to be provided.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	–	–(–)	–	As for 1.2 and 1.3.
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	+	+	+	Clustering to date has included campus or park-type development which maintains good levels of open space in an area that has been redeveloped.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	–	–	–	The size requirements for clustering suggests this form of land use is not compatible with the development hierarchy that aims to direct new development towards more central sites with good transport access.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	+	+(+)	++	Clearly supportive of business development.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	(+)	(+)	(++)	Role in providing for education not clear but implicitly supportive.
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	+++	+++	+++	The primary objective of this policy.
Summary of assessment: A further policy (alongside EM/1) designed to play to the region's strengths. Other potential benefits are discussed under synergistic effects below. However the concerns about the sustainability of extensive new development raised for policy ET/1 apply here also, with resource demands and waste arisings concentrated in relatively small areas.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: As with ET/1 provision of good travel choice for clusters is essential to ensure their impact on commuting patterns is mitigated				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: One benefit is the possibility of attracting additional supportive employment around the clusters, in the way that automotive parts manufacturers cluster around car assembly plants.				

ET/4 – Development in established employment areas in the countryside

Provides scope for additional infilling on larger sites and campus areas of employment land outside settled areas provided the overall scale is limited and local impacts are negligible or mitigated.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	++	++	++	Clearly supportive if it reduces development pressure on the surrounding land, and provided it is clear that the capacity of the site is finite and it will not be extended further.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	–	–	–	As with other policies there is an implied absolute impact on resource requirements which must be balanced against the justification for additional economic growth.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	–	–	–	As above.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	(+)	(+)	(+)	Supportive in that it deals with localised development pressure by restricting growth to existing sites. Beneficial provided that the level of infilling is carefully controlled to maintain the generally open nature of the listed sites; and the policy does refer to the cumulative impacts of infilling. <u>Post consultation changes (see below) suggest biodiversity impacts may also be taken into account.</u>
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	--±	--±	--±	<u>Post consultation changes made clear the intention to prevent development which would have an adverse impact.</u>
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	+	+	+	Implicitly supportive – see 1.1, <u>and also 3.2.</u>
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	?	?	?	Policy text appears to imply infilling would be small-scale and it would therefore have only an incremental effect on employment at the site and on commuting levels. The policy text protects against adverse visual impacts, but the cumulative impact on transport should not be overlooked (see comments about cumulative effects).
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	–	–	–	As for 1.2 / 1.3, although their may only be negligible incremental change.
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	Activities at these sites are assumed to lie outside the range of functions listed in the assessment criteria therefore assessment is neutral.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	It could be argued that rural employment penalises those without a car, although the effect may be marginal provided there is an adequate supply of appropriate employment

				at more accessible locations.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	++	++	++	Supportive if it enables expansion of local employment on a controlled scale.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	+	+	+	Implicitly supportive.
Summary of assessment: A 'safety net' policy providing for carefully controlled incremental expansion on larger rural employment sites which, depending on land uses, may be consistent with the clustering strategy proposed in ET/3. However it is important that developers recognise that the size of each site is finite (as further expansion is restricted by other plan policies) and that permitting infilling should not contribute to, rather than relieve, development pressure.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: See below for an issue that may need to be addressed.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: It will be important to ensure that the policy does not provide scope for 'salami-slicing' of development on these sites. Depending on the type of land use, infilling may be on such a small scale that it falls below the threshold at which EIA is necessary, and issues such as traffic impacts may not be investigated. It will be essential to monitor the ongoing scale of development at these sites to assess their cumulative impact.				

ET/5 – New employment development

Provides opportunity for small-scale employment development to facilitate development of clusters or to maintain / expand the level of rural employment.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	++	++	++	Supports localised expansion which may help to relieve development pressure provided the scale is carefully controlled.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	?	?	?	Likely to make additional demands on energy and other resources, though the scale is difficult to assess.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	?	?	?	As above.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	?	?	?	The policy defines 'small-scale as less than 25 employees, yet provides for B8 development which can include large storage facilities that are not large employers. We assume visual and other impacts would be addressed through the planning application process, but question whether the scope of likely appropriate land uses might be more

				<u>carefully defined. Post consultation changes addressed concerns in the initial assessment that the scale of land use permitted should be better defined. By varying the floor space threshold by Land Use Class leaves the possibility that potentially intrusive warehousing facilities (for example) might be permitted that would not contribute much to the local employment market but which could have a substantial and intrusive visual impact. However other development control policies might be used to limit such effects.</u>
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	?	?	?	Employment growth implies more commuting even if such development is restricted to the more sustainable communities that may provide some degree of travel choice. Potentially a key cumulative impact for this policy.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	-	-	-	Depends on scale of development though increasing waste in rural areas will increase collection / disposal costs. Another objective where the main issue is long-term cumulative impact.
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	Impact neutral provided open space is not consumed.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	Benefits subsumed by comments under 7.1.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	+	+	+	Contributes to employment in rural areas.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	++	++	++	Clearly beneficial in increasing rural employment opportunities and making some contribution to reducing commuter trip length.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	++	++	++	Helps to sustain the rural economy.
Summary of assessment: A sustainable policy designed to ensure some beneficial and suitable development of new employment can still occur in rural centres away from parkland and campus complexes of the clusters and existing sites covered by ET/3 and ET/4. Although development is to be focused in larger settlements, a threshold of 25 employees for 'small scale' would be each development could add substantially to the amount of locally-available employment. Clearly this is potentially beneficial in reducing the distance between home and work, and in sustaining the rural economy, however some of the land uses envisaged could involve large structures for land uses that are not particularly labour-intensive (eg. warehousing buildings) and this should not be allowed to have a negative visual impact. <u>Consultation changes clarified the floorspace thresholds which would apply, but by varying these with Land Use Class still provides scope for intrusive development without further controls.</u>				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.				

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: As with other employment land policies, the planning duty will need to monitor the longer-term trend in such developments to assess a range of impacts on traffic, etc.

ET/6 – Expansion of existing firms

Provides for the expansion of firms within a wide range of settlements provided the enterprise is well-established and the growth will not result in undesirable environmental impacts.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	++	++	++	Helps to relieve development pressure in a range of locations.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	+	+	+	Supportive provided the premises are reasonably well served by transport or do not contribute significantly to commuting traffic. The policy prevents development with adverse traffic impacts.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	Growth assumed to have minor incremental effect.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+	+	+	Development can be turned down as a result of adverse impacts.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	(+)	(+)	(+)	Depends on scale, nature and location of development, although maintaining local employment is assumed to contribute to the vitality of the immediate community.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	+	+	+	As for 1.2.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	As for 1.3, though this depends on nature of land use.
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	Neutral impact provided no open space is lost.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	Businesses assumed to be predominantly industrial / commercial so any beneficial effects covered by 7.1.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	+	+	+	Helps sustain economies of smaller settlements.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	

7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	++	++	++	Clearly beneficial even if growth only increases employment by a small increment.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	++	++	++	As for 7.1.
Summary of assessment: Another policy designed to ensure increased focus of development on urban centres and in clusters does not prejudice the scope for development in smaller communities to support their vitality and to reduce commuting trips even if such benefits are only delivered on a small scale.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: Possible cumulative effects that will need to be monitored in the longer term.				

ET/7 – Loss of rural employment to non-employment uses

Aims to prevent the loss of employment land in rural settlements unless this would eliminate adverse impacts of the existing development or provide compensating benefit.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+	+	+	Policy is not explicitly concerned with design and character but the loss of locally important employment could have an adverse effect in the longer term.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	+	+	+	Implicitly the same issue as above.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	(+)	(+)	(+)	Small scale benefit if the enterprise employs people from the immediate community who would otherwise have to commute over greater distances.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	

5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	+	+	+	Helps to maintain supply of employment in rural areas.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	?	?	?	Depends on individual circumstances as a compensating benefit could be loss of employment use for affordable housing.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	+	+	+	Helps sustain local jobs in rural areas.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	+	+	+	
Summary of assessment: A sustainable policy designed to sustain rural employment unless there are compelling reasons to change land use.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified. There is an overall issue concerning the progressive loss of employment in rural areas but this would be symptomatic of a deeper problem that would have to be addressed by a strategic policy.				

ET/8 – Conversion of rural buildings for employment

Provides for limited conversion primarily of unwanted agricultural buildings for a range of small-scale commercial (not industrial) uses, provided development is appropriate in scale to the location and does not result in adverse impacts (eg. on traffic).

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

[abridged in some cases]

	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	(+)	(+)	(+)	Presumably supportive if lack of such buildings contributes to development pressures elsewhere.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	Some incremental increase but effect is negligible compared to that resulting from other policies in this section of the plan.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	As above.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	Protective measures assumed to prevent unwarranted noise and other disturbance. Policy prevents redevelopment of abandoned buildings that might be partially colonised by wildlife.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	(+)	(+)	(+)	Depends on the nature of re-use and whether it might attract people in small numbers.
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	

3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+	+	+	Protects against adverse impact while also ensuring the stock of rural buildings remains in use and therefore maintained.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	As for 1.2 and 1.3.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	As above.
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	+	+	+	Supports rural employment in a small way. See also comments for 7.1.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	+	+	+	Incremental benefit but provides scope for rural diversification of appropriate land uses (see also 7.3).
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	+++	+++	+++	The principal objective of this policy, helping to sustain rural employment and provide some scope for farm diversification. Many such opportunities will have limited funds and could not afford high rents, and such developments may also have a key role in providing a limited supply of affordable business premises.
Summary of assessment: A very sustainable policy the importance of which is easily missed. Affordability is focused almost entirely on housing yet businesses, and particularly those in rural areas which may have limited capital and modest cashflows, also need a supply of affordable local premises, which is what this policy facilitates.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

ET/9 – Replacement buildings in the countryside

Provides for replacement of buildings that will support employment use with similar controls to those for policy ET/8.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	(+)	(+)	(+)	Presumably supportive if lack of such buildings contributed to development pressures elsewhere.

1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	Replacement implies no net change.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	As above.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+	+	+	Provides for a better immediate environment while also ensuring the stock of rural buildings remains in use and maintained.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	As for 1.2 and 1.3.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	As above.
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	+	+	+	Supports rural employment in a small way. See also comments for 7.1.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	+	+	+	Incremental benefit but provides scope for rural diversification of appropriate land uses (see also 7.3).
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	?	?	?	Potentially the same benefit as for policy ET/8 although it is not clear what impact reconstruction (as opposed to conversion) would have on property prices or ground rents).

Summary of assessment: Little to comment on – same overall benefits as ET/8 with a slight change in circumstances.

Summary of mitigation proposals: None.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.

ET/10 – Farm diversification

Encourages farm diversification provided it is consistent in scale and scope with existing and surrounding land use.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	?	?	?	Depends on whether it enables development that would otherwise take land at a less sustainable location.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	?	?	?	Depends on nature of activity, and there should be controls to limit the impact that are consistent with those applied to other types of development.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	?	?	?	As above.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	Not addressed but covered by other policies.
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	(-)	(-)	(-)	As above, however land uses suggested by policy text suggest a potential loss of biodiversity value may occur, although this may be depend on the intensity of the previous agricultural regime, and would only apply to wide-area developments rather than new uses for farm buildings.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	+	+	+	Certainly true of some potential land use changes. Should the Council encourage some forms of development – eg. sustainable tourism – more than others?
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	As for 2.1.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	(+)	(+)	(+)	Supportive provided the land use change is appropriate to the surrounding area and does not introduce unnatural elements (eg. long sheds and floodlighting often seen on golf driving ranges).
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	(-)	(-)	(-)	The policy does not specifically address increase in rural traffic which would result from such developments (varying with type, presumably), and the final statement of the policy text does not mandate consideration of the environmental impacts.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	+	+	+	At worst impact is neutral but some land uses may contribute to healthier lifestyles.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	+	+	+	Several of the example land uses will make agricultural land more open to controlled access.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	+	+(+)	++	Potential increase in quality and range. Leisure facilities are less accessible than those in urban area but their extent means that locating them in sustainable locations in the surrounding countryside could help to relieve development pressures.

6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	++	++	++	Clearly helps the rural economy sustainably (both in terms of location and the durability of the development).
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	+	+	+	Contribution to sustainable tourism.
Summary of assessment: Sustainable policy designed to support farm diversification. We recognise that farms may have limited funding to provide supporting planning statements and other documents, but it will be essential that there is a mechanism to ensure that environmental impacts are fully considered and mitigated.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: See above.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None provided the number of developments is restricted.				

ET/11 – Tourism facilities

Requires new tourism facilities to be consistent with local character and land use. The policy encourages further development of the existing tourism and heritage assets rather than the creation of new ones.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	(+)	(+)	(+)	Prioritising the improvement of existing facilities should support this objective.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	?	?	?	Issue of transport impact is not addressed (see mitigation comments below).
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	Impact assumed to be neutral, and should be avoided.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	Any development related to designated sites would be controlled by English Nature, English Heritage, et. al.
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	?	?	?	Not clear what potential eco-tourism offers.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	++	++	++	Clearly a primary objective of this policy.
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	As for 2.1.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	(+)	(+)	(+)	Implicitly supported by prioritising existing facilities provided these are already well integrated with their surroundings.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	?	?	?	See mitigation comments.

4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	(+)	(+)	(+)	Depends on development and although open air recreation and facilities are intrinsically associated even with mild exercise.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	?	?	?	Potentially neutral if existing facilities are prioritised.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	+	+	+	Limited marking because quality is improved but range may be confined to existing attractions, and accessibility is an issue.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	?	?	?	Accessibility by those without cars.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	?	?	?	Potential employment gains that cannot be quantified at this stage.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	++	++	++	An intrinsic objective of this policy.

Summary of assessment: Sustainable in that it proposes careful management of the expansion of existing tourism facilities both to control their impact and to support the promotion of Cambridge as a principal English tourist destination.

Summary of mitigation proposals: Countryside attractions will inevitably generate traffic. While the need to address this issue may be implied by other policies, we recommend that the policy should indicate that development at sites well-served by existing transport facilities, particularly those offering travel choice will be prioritised (or particularly encouraged).

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: See above.

ET/12 – Tourist facilities and visitor accommodation

Limits provision of these facilities to conversion of premises in locations outside existing settlement frameworks and will only be permitted for short-stay accommodation.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	+	+	+	Prevents encroachment.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	?	?	?	Depends on size of property. Difficult to calibrate incremental and cumulative effect.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	?	?	?	As above.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	

2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	(+)	(+)	(+)	Implicitly prevents inappropriately-scaled development.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	(+)	(+)	(+)	Rural location suggests this is implicitly supportive.
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	~	~	See 2.2.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	?	?	?	Incremental growth in traffic assumed to be negligible and will presumably occur mainly in the summer months.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	+	+	+	Contributes to stock of tourism accommodation.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	(+)	(+)	(+)	Negligible impact? See comments below.

Summary of assessment: Appears a sustainable policy provided there are clear controls on the scale of development which ensures that traffic impacts are negligible. This issue highlights a slight inconsistency with the content of ET/11 which presumes Cambridge remains the primary tourist destination. Clearly a parallel urban policy must be prepared by the City Council but if the above reflects sub-regional priorities then we assume there is limited need and scope for this form of development.

Summary of mitigation proposals: None.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.

SERVICES & FACILITIES POLICIES

SF/1 – Protection of village services and facilities

Establishes measures to prevent undesirable loss of key village services and amenities.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+	+	+	Marking assumes loss of amenity would implicitly affect village character.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	(+)	(+)	(+)	Implicitly supports 3.2.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	+++	+++	+++	The principal objective of this policy in a rural context.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	++	++	++	Aims to prevent loss of services that would affect a community if residents have to travel to gain the same amenity elsewhere.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	+	+	+	Implicitly supportive, especially for halls, shops, pubs, etc.
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	+	+	+	Supports rural diversification.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and	?	?	?	More concerned with maintaining infrastructure rather than growing it.

infrastructure					
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	++	++	++		Intended to support the vitality of the rural economy.
Summary of assessment: Clearly a key policy in terms of preserving a basic level of amenity even in group and infill villages.					
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.					
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.					

SF/2 – Retail hierarchy

Identifies a hierarchy which identifies priorities for new development of retailing reflecting the size, accessibility and sustainability of the settlements, and which is consistent with the broader settlement hierarchy established in policies ST/2 to ST/5.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	(+)	(+)	(+)	Indirectly supportive in that it is consistent with the settlement hierarchy and the underlying aim of directly development to the most sustainable locations.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	++	++	++	Helps to create or maintain a critical mass of retail activity in the most suitable locations.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	+	+(+)	++	Aims to steer development to the most accessible locations that are best served by public transport. Assumed to grow over time as Northstowe and Cambridge East centres are established.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	-	-	-	Increase in waste arisings in absolute terms.
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	+	+	+	Shortening distances between homes and retailing should help to encourage more trips on foot or by cycle.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	+++	+++	+++	Clearly the principal objective of this policy.

6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	+	+	+	Implicitly supportive as it integrates the retail and settlement hierarchies and aims to reduce travel times for shopping.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	(+)	(+)	(+)	A spatial policy and therefore does not actually increase employment on its own.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	+	+	+	Aims for coherence between retailing and settlement hierarchies.
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	++	++	++	Clearly supportive.

Summary of assessment: A key sustainability policy that builds a coherent hierarchy for all facets of development when the links between this policy and those on settlement and housing are taken together. Any concern that this prioritises larger settlements at the expense of smaller ones must be offset by recognising it provides scope to link retail strategy with provision of public transport to shorten trips and encourage more of them to be made using modes other than the private car.

Summary of mitigation proposals: None.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: One concern is the need to coordinate this policy with equivalent policies for Cambridge City, which remains the sub-region's principal retail centre. It is not clear how the sequential test works across authority boundaries, and how the need to sustain Cambridge can be balanced against the need to build district centres at Northstowe and Cambridge East. Equally there is a concern about the tension between this policy, SF/3 and SF/1 if focusing development priorities on larger centres affects the catchment and viability of shops in smaller settlements. This problem exists regardless of whether new retail development is located in central Cambridge or around its periphery.

SF/3 – Applications for new retail development

Requires the use of a sequential test to justify applications to develop new retail sites away from the centre of the largest settlements. It also aims to prevent out-of-town developments and to steer new retailing to sites which offer good travel choice.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	++	++	++	Clearly aims to prevent land loss at the edge of settlements.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	(-)	(-)	(-)	New development clearly adds to energy consumption in absolute terms, although the policy can offset this by reducing trip lengths and encouraging use of public transport.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	-	-	-	As above, but without the transport benefits.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	

3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	++	++	++	Aims to maintain or build the coherence of settlement centres as retailing areas, providing convenience and comparison shopping insofar as this is compatible with the size of the settlement.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	(+)	(+)	(+)	Supports 3.2.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	+	++	++(+)	Reduction in emissions as shoppers are encouraged to swap cars for other forms of transport, although the rate of change / growth is speculative.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	-	-	-	Results in net increase in waste in absolute terms.
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	?	?	?	Potential benefits if more people shop on foot or by cycle.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	++	++(+)	+++	The principal objective of this policy.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	?	?	?	Implies some constraint on new retail development may occur if there is a shortage of suitable land, but other policies will assist, and the sequential test can then be used to support applications for other sites, though clearly these will be less sustainable.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	+	+	+	Aims to support coherent growth in retailing and the rest of the supporting urban infrastructure.
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	+	+	+	As above.
Summary of assessment: Clearly sustainable and supportive of SF/1 and SF/2.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None, although there is a slight concern that the policy text appears to treat Northstowe as a special case with provision for other centres mentioned only in the supporting text.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: See comment for SF/2.				

SF/4 – Retail development on land allocated for other uses

Prevents reallocation of land allocated to housing specifically, and potentially to other uses, except where this would not compromise achieving Structure Plan targets. Some latitude is available for reallocation to support mixed land-use developments that conform to policies SF/2 and SF/3.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

Assessment

Comments / Proposed Mitigation

[abridged in some cases]	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	(++)	(++)	(++)	Might be argued this adds to development pressure for retail land but it is clearly consistent with other SF/ and SP/ policies and such expansion is prevented by other plan policies such as GB/1.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	(+)	(+)	(+)	Implicitly supportive.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	(+)	(+)	(+)	As for 3.2.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	?	?	?	Depends on local circumstances but the policy provides for contingencies where this are consistent with other policies.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	+	+	+	Supportive if it optimises the supply of land for retailing with that for other uses.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	?	?	?	Aims to control location of development in support of other policies without compromising its effect on the economy.
Summary of assessment: Little to comment on – clearly sustainable and consistent with other services and facilities policies.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.				

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified. The contingency provides flexibility to allow reallocation in appropriate locations and which could help to reduce development pressures at other locations.

SF/5 – Retailing in villages

Limits the scale and scope of retailing development in villages to that consistent with local requirements and setting.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	Any increase in activity assumed to be confined within the village framework.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	See 4.1.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	++	++	++	Supportive, particularly in smaller settlements.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	(+)	(+)	(+)	Excessive growth could generate additional trips by people from outside the settlement, increasing emission levels, and therefore the policy controls this.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	+	+	+	Implicitly supportive with some constraints on the scale of development, however these are offset by character impact considerations.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	Does not preclude appropriate level of development, so is neutral at worst.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	

7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	Impact on local economy of settlement assumed to be negligible.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	(+)	(+)	(+)	Prevents excessive expansion but does not preclude growth,
Summary of assessment: Clearly sustainable and supports maintaining village character.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: It would be helpful to reword the second clause to improve clarity as it appears to begin with a double negative.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

SF/6 – Retailing in the countryside

Limits retailing to activities consistent with rural activities including, but not restricted to, agriculture. Some latitude is given to allow sale of convenience goods

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

[abridged in some cases]

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	Not obvious this outcome is intended by the policy, and it is addressed by ET/10 separately.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+	+	+	Prevents inappropriate development.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	(+)	(+)	(+)	Implicitly supportive if it prevents development that might generate significant additional traffic in tranquil areas.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	Objective is concerned primarily with services in settlements although the final clause of

				the policy provides for additional retailing where it would have no adverse impacts on established shops while improving amenity.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	+	+	+	Supports farm diversification.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	+	+	+	Intrinsically supportive. The final contingent clause can also be seen as a way of enabling farm shops to widen their range, which can provide local people with ready access to convenience goods as well as providing revenue to supplement sales of their primary goods.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	+	+	+	Implicitly supports farm diversification.
Summary of assessment: Clearly sustainable.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None, but see below.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: The Council will need to monitor the growth of such ventures to ensure there is no cumulative effect of increased rural traffic.				

SF/7 – Public art and new development

States the objective that public art will be provided as an integral part of new development, and that the Council will seek developer contributions in appropriate circumstances to part-fund provision.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	+	+(+)	Clearly an attempt to improve appearance and distinctiveness.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	+	+(+)	As above.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	

4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	+	+	+	Artworks assumed to be primarily open air.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	
Summary of assessment: Sustainable in a supportive way.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

SF/8 – Telecommunications

Controls the provision of telecommunications masts to limit their visual impacts and implicitly to address public health concerns. A contingency allows approval to be given if no suitable alternative site can be found.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	?	?	?	Controls limit visual impact rather than potential land take.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	

3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	(+)	(+)	(+)	Depends on location but implicitly supportive – see below also.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	++(+)	++(+)	++(+)	The primary objective of this policy. Impact is assumed to drop as the supply of suitable sites falls, and with increased mast sharing.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	(+)	(+)	(+)	Given public opposition to masts, controls must be seen as supporting this objective.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	?	?	?	Public health concerns, and the lack of conclusive proof about radiation effects, mean that this policy will need to give residents the belief that siting decisions will take account of their concerns.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	+	+	+	Supportive, depending on location.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	?	?	?	Difficult to see a relationship as this infrastructure is used by a nationwide market and not provided solely for local resident.
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	?	?	?	Impact of poor mobile telecoms coverage and/or capacity on local industry is difficult to judge.

Summary of assessment: Although sustainable in principle, the policy leaves some issues unanswered. The supporting text specifically to broadband services, although local access to these services are primarily carried in terrestrial cables. However the text appears to focus on mobile telecomm services whereas such structures are also needed for other high-capacity communications links that are part of the national infrastructure. It is not clear how the issue of environmental impact would be reconciled against issues of overriding national or commercial interest given their obvious importance.

Summary of mitigation proposals: See above.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: Any increased requirement for masts would appear to be intrinsically cumulative. These masts support a mobile service and therefore expanding capacity in one radio cell is likely to lead to demand for additional capacity in adjacent cells to provide unbroken service.

SF/9 – Underground pipes, wires, fibres and cables

Aims to prevent damage to ecological assets, particularly by linear features constructed at or below ground-level.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

Assessment

Comments / Proposed Mitigation

[abridged in some cases]	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	+	+	+	Aims to limit disturbance, though this is likely to be permanent.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	++	++	++	Stated as an explicit aim.
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	++	++	++	As above.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	++	++	++	As above.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	?	?	?	Addressed in part by concerns about the impact of HV power lines.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	+	+	+	Subsumed by the requirement to prevent “unacceptable environmental impacts”.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	?	?	?	Impact not clear.
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	?	?	?	Main focus is ecological and environmental impacts, and issues of human health and HV overhead lines is not addressed (though it is covered by other planning criteria).
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	(+)	(+)	(+)	Depends on location but aims to prevent lasting impact.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	Does not preclude infrastructure provision, but aims to control its impact.
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	
Summary of assessment: Little to comment on – clearly intended to limit prevent damage by linear structures.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

SF/10 – Lord's Bridge Radio Telescope

Prevents development that would adversely affect operation of facilities at the Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	~	~	
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	

7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~
Summary of assessment: A very specific policy which cannot be assessed as it applies controls to a specific site to protect an internationally important asset which itself has no significant environmental impacts.			
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.			
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.			

SF/11 – Protection of existing recreation areas				
Limits the scope to redevelop recreational land for other uses unless there are superior compensating benefits or provision of an equivalent amount of new recreational space elsewhere.				
Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	Recreational space is not strictly undeveloped land so the effect is assumed to be neutral.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	+	+	+	Some spaces for informal recreation may be in more open countryside, so this policy is protective and supportive.
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	++	++	++	Recreational space is a component of a broader definition of open space (though not necessarily part of provisioning obligations) so this policy is supportive.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	+++	+++	+++	A joint primary objective of this policy.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	(+)	(+)	(+)	Retaining local space should mean resource is accessible to residents on foot and cycle.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	+++	+++	+++	A joint primary objective of this policy.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	?	?	?	Policy addresses only the provision of land, and its character would need to be protected by other policies.
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	+++	+++	+++	A joint primary objective of this policy.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	+	+	+	Supports provision of accessible leisure facilities even if these are informal.

6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	+	+	+	Open space assumed to be accessible to all.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	(+)	(+)	(+)	Implicitly supportive.
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	
Summary of assessment: A key component of good urban design and retention of the existing recreational space is essential in the light of the considerable housing development that will be occurring in the district.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

SF/12 – Outdoor playspace, informal open space and new developments

Defines requirements for the provision of various forms of recreational space within and proportional to the scale of new development. The policy also establishes the Council's intention to seek developer contributions for these facilities.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	Space is within development therefore this objective is not addressed.
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	++	++	++	All open space aims to provide coherent structure to the settlement and provisioning standards therefore clearly support this objective.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	++	++	++	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	

4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	+++	+++	+++	A joint primary objective of this policy.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	?	?	?	Policy addresses only the provision of land, and security – particularly of children's' playspace - would need to be protected by other policies.
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	+++	+++	+++	A joint primary objective of this policy.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	++	++	+	Supports provision of accessible leisure facilities.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	+	+	+	Open space assumed to be accessible to all.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	(+)	(+)	(+)	Implicitly supportive.
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	
Summary of assessment: Clearly supports objectives of sustainable and inclusive communities.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None. Separately the Council has indicated that its approach to securing funding for these amenities from developer contributions will be detailed in a separate SPD.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

SF/13 – Open space standards

Specifies the minimum requirements for providing various forms of open space for informal and formal recreation, and designates the type of facilities to be provided, these requirements being consistent with government guidance and policy SF/12.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	Space is within development therefore this objective is not addressed.

3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	++±	±++	±++	All open space aims to provide coherent structure to the settlement and provisioning standards therefore clearly support this objective.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	++±	±++	±++	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	+++	+++	+++	A joint primary objective of this policy.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	?	?	?	Policy addresses only the provision of land, and security – particularly of children's' playspace - would need to be protected by other policies.
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	+++	+++	+++	A joint primary objective of this policy.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	++	++	+	Supports provision of accessible leisure facilities.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	+	+	+	Open space assumed to be accessible to all.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	(+)	(+)	(+)	Implicitly supportive.
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	
Summary of assessment: As for SF/12, however the definition focuses on the basic infrastructure and the desirability of a suitable, secure location which is extensively overlooked is not mentioned. We understand that these issues will be addressed in a separate SPD to be issued subsequently.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: See above.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: Playspace and other forms of open space are a further resource competing for limited land within a new development and this impact should not be overlooked. However other policies – notably DP/5 (cumulative development) are consistent, encouraging development in larger chunks to improve coherence and greater flexibility in integrating the need for this space with increased housing density.				

SF/14 – The River Cam

Limits the extension of marinas and moorings on the river.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives
[abridged in some cases]

Assessment

Comments / Proposed Mitigation

Short

Med.

Long

1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	+	+	+	Depends on designation; subsumed by 3.2.
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	++	++	++	Protects the aquatic environment to a degree although it does not preclude extension.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	?	?	?	Not obvious that this policy would prevent people from enjoying the amenity of the Cam.
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	?	?	?	Certain sections of the Cam within the district have important associations (eg. Byron's Pool) which should be protected from all forms of inappropriate adjacent development.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	<u>++</u>	<u>++</u>	<u>++</u>	Clearly supportive. See also comments against objective 5.3.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	Not obviously relevant in terms of the decision-making criteria.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	Impact on such developments on flood risk assumed to be negligible, and the extension of marinas is assumed to be largely increased mooring space rather than other structures for which flood risk is a more important issue in terms of its threat to material assets.
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	(+)	(+)	(+)	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	<u>++</u>	<u>++</u>	<u>++</u>	Does not improve it but ensures the public waterway is not despoiled by excessive and/or inappropriate development. Post consultation changes extended protection to other public rights of access.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	?	?	?	Does not preclude further provision of leisure facilities.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	

7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~+	~+	~+	<u>The post consultation change to this policy made its controls less specific in recognition of the need to allow sympathetic development that could enable the Cam to be exploited as a recreational and tourism resource, provided this was sensitive and appropriate to local character.</u>
Summary of assessment: Clearly intended to protect the quality of a key local asset without preventing continued use and carefully managed growth in facilities. It will be essential to afford thorough protection to stretches of the Cam within the district that have key heritage associations, although this would presumably be delivered through other policies. The impact of the policy was improved by post consultation changes to ensure protection was also afforded to public rights of way which are an integral part of the asset and its contribution to the community and local setting.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

NATURAL ENVIRONMENT POLICIES

NE/1 – Energy efficiency				
Prescribes a range of measures to improve the energy efficiency of new and re-developed properties which will be adopted as an SPD at a later date. Encourages developers to seek 10% improvement on CO ₂ /m ² emissions compared to minimum Building Regulations.				
Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	+	+(+)	++	The principal objective of this policy. Benefit accumulates as more energy efficient properties are built or converted. The 'start point' for the trend depends on the proportion of existing properties that already meet Building Regulations. We assume that the relatively recent adoption of efficiency standards means this will not be particularly high.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	Not addressed – but see mitigation proposals.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	~	~	
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	+	+(+)	++	The main objective of this policy, though as with 1.2 the benefit will grow over time from a relatively low starting point. However the positive rating must be qualified by the relatively 'light touch' of the proposals. See mitigation proposals for details.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	

4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	+	+(+)	Addresses issue of vulnerability of properties to long-term temperature change, though again the starting point is low.
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	?	?	?	There are some concerns that the cost of energy efficiency and other sustainability measures effects the price of new housing and this may have an effect on developers' willingness or ability to provide affordable housing. The significant of this impact cannot be calibrated on the information available at present.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	
Summary of assessment: Supports reduction in energy consumption and emission of greenhouse gases. The Council appears to have set a fairly low and easily achievable threshold for this policy. There is clear potential long-term impact on energy consumption if there is a large-scale growth in housing and other forms of development during the lifetime of the initial LDF, and this policy must maximise positive impacts.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: The policy has four components: the stipulated threshold; the calculation method; the assessment structure (Building Regulations); and the policy requirement ('encouragement' rather than obligation). Our initial assessment has proposed that the Council should adopt an alternative policy approach to enforce more stringent targets. However the Council has advised us that it limited scope to implement higher targets and that the main mechanism for this would be through changes to the Building Regulations.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: Potential increase in the stock of energy-inefficient buildings if new requirements do not keep pace with projected change in sustainable construction standards.				

NE/2 – Renewable energy

Renewable energy developments will be permitted where these do not infringe district-wide development criteria, where there is ready access to the National Grid, and the land can be redeveloped subsequently for other purposes.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]

	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	No obvious impact, although the policy and text does not mention biomass energy, which is one solution to renewable fuel provision and farm diversification.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	(+)	+	+(+)	Benefit through replacement, although the potentially slow rate of equipment of solar

				panels, etc., and reluctance to permit wind farms suggests slow incremental growth.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	+	+	+	Limited size of windfarms may have some benefits (removes potential impact on birds though farms can be sited appropriately with RSPB guidance), and limits visual impact.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+	+	+	Smaller windfarms are assumed to have less visual impact, although this assumes cumulative development would be controlled.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	(+)	+	+(+)	As for 1.2.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	+	+(+)	Contributes to reduced emission from energy generation sources.
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	

Summary of assessment: Clearly supports reduced reliance on non-renewable sources, however the incremental provision of technology suggests benefits will grow slowly. Baseline data does not enable comparison of current performance with national average, and any shift in target generation levels may require reconsideration of the position on windfarms and other approaches. **Post consultation change proposed reselling energy locally rather than selling it to a national supplier. This removes the constraint that generation sites need to be close to grid connection points, and this might make it possible to exploit more sites.** **A further change removed the apparent size restriction on wind farms. At this time it is not evident what impact this will have on opportunities for this form of energy locally. Removal of the wording may provide greater opportunity but it does not warrant changes to our assessments above without further corroboration.**

Summary of mitigation proposals: No mention of biomass as a way of meeting targets while also supporting farm diversification and keeping farmland under agricultural use.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified in the policy as proposed.

NE/3 – Renewable energy technologies in new development

Developments larger than 1000m² or 10 dwellings will include technology enabling at least 10% of their energy to be derived from renewable sources.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	+	+(+)	++	Clearly supportive.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+2(+)	+2(+)	+2(+)	Indirect benefit it is obviates need for windfarms and other solutions with visual impacts, although this must be balanced against the same incremental capacity of each new unit.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	+	+(+)	Incremental benefit from reduced consumption of energy from power stations.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	+	+(+)	As for 4.1.
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	Minor, incremental background changes that would only become significant with nationwide switch to renewable energy.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	?	?	?	Possible impact of technology on cost of new housing, and the knock-on effect on the provision of affordable homes. We also recognise that policy NE/1 advocates a more stringent position on providing energy efficient technology which might turn this into a negative assessment.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	

7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~
Summary of assessment: Policy encourage developers to build energy-efficiency into the housing stock, and this is clearly valuable given the scale of growth that will occur in the plan period. The baseline data suggests the District performs well against regional and national comparators, but this should not mean a slackening of the promotion of renewables. One concern is the possible impact of technology cost on the price of new units, and the impact this might have on affordable housing provision however we recognise that a balance must be struck between the suggestion for NE/1 or more stringent targets for providing this technology and its impact on house prices.			
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.			
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: Obvious long-term impact on the District's energy consumption although limited provision suggests this will be an incremental change.			

NE/4 – Landscape character areas

The areas will be defined on the Proposals Map, and development within these areas will only be permitted if it is sympathetic to local character and distinctiveness. Design policies will be detailed in an SPD to be produced at a later date.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	+	+	+	Policy specifically refers to the land management regime and not just built development.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	+	+	+	Vegetation is a component of landscape character and therefore this is implicitly supportive.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	+	+	+	Again, implicitly supportive.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+++	+++	+++	The principal objective of this policy. Supporting text acknowledges the care needed at the urban fringe, though this is addressed through policies GB/4, GB/5 and GB/7.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	++	++	++	Supports 3.2.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	

5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~
Summary of assessment: Supports objectives of respecting <i>landscape character</i> and (indirectly) maintaining the natural features of the landscape that sustain and <i>enhance biodiversity</i>. Some problems may be experienced with expansion of settlements, however these will be addressed in part by other policies in this DPD, notably those supporting the Green Belt.			
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.			
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.			

NE/5 – Countryside enhancement areas

Takes forward Cambridgeshire Structure Plan policy 7/3 to identify areas for enjoyment of the countryside and to take steps to enhance their natural characteristics while preserving tranquillity.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	Effect assumed to be neutral as designated areas are already subject to access controls and enhancement programmes by other agencies.
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	+	+(+)	++	Policy supports Biodiversity Strategy and provides for enhancement of specific areas. Difficult to calibrate impact as scope of work is not evident.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	+	+(+)	++	As above.
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	

3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+	+	+	Supportive.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	+	+	+	Objective tends to be assessed in urban setting, but equally importance in the countryside.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	(+)	(+)	(+)	Provides areas for quiet relaxation. Proximity to urban areas is not clear and will probably vary from site to site. Nevertheless, provision does not guarantee use. Implicitly supportive.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	+	+(+)	++	Assessment may be slightly optimistic as it is not clear yet how much space will be provided, but it is clearly beneficial.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	+	+	+	Supports quality of leisure facilities; accessibility is not addressed by the policy text.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~?	~?	~?	A post consultation change to the policy suggests the Council may seek developer contributions towards creating these assets where they will be close to the development and the obligation can be justified.
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	
Summary of assessment: Supports the District's Biodiversity Strategy and is consistent with other policies (eg. GB/8) although the degree of overlap is not clear.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: The supporting text envisages implies synergistic effects from combining enhancement programmes in certain localities. Presumably this will enable cost-effective provision of improvement of sustainable access.				

NE/6 – Biodiversity

Overarching commitment to maintaining and where possible enhancing biodiversity that prioritises prevention over mitigation and compensation.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]

1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings

Assessment

Short	Med.	Long
-------	------	------

Comments / Proposed Mitigation

~	~	~
---	---	---

1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	+++	+++	+++	Clearly supportive. In practice the policy is more concerned with protecting biodiversity broadly, recognising that designated sites have specific protection measures overseen by other agencies. The policy also clearly prioritises measures to support BAPs and achieve their targets.
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	+++	+++	+++	The principal objective of this policy.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	Addressed by other policies, and clearly needs to be balanced against conservation objectives (see GB/8 for example).
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	Objective refers primarily to human/built artefacts and sites.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+	+	+	Contributes to this objective especially due to the predominantly rural nature of the county.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	(+)	(+)	(+)	Vegetation benefits carbon-fixing.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	

Summary of assessment: A clear statement of support for supporting and *enhancing biodiversity* which is pragmatic insofar as it recognises the need to weigh conservation and development objectives in certain locations. It establishes a clear priority based on scarcity/importance (development will be resisted) and the measures used to resolve clashes between development and conservation, and also establishes the principle of using Section 46/106 developer contributions to fund appropriate measures.

Summary of mitigation proposals: Replace reference in supporting text to Section 406 with Section 46/47 (change has been made in policy NE/6). See also comments for NE/7.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: It is difficult to identify specific benefits. Much concern with biodiversity change has focused on the loss of woodland and farmland bird species. Clearly this will be addressed by this very broad policy, with specific activities dictated by other policies such as GB/8 and NE/5.

NE/7 – Sites of biodiversity importance

Establishes the controls on development that reflect the relative biodiversity importance of sites, corresponding to the strength of conservation designation.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	+++	+++	+++	The joint-primary objective of this policy.
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	+++	+++	+++	As above.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	Objective refers to built environment designations.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	(+)	(+)	(+)	Implicitly supports maintenance of natural landscape features.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	

7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy ~ ~ ~

Summary of assessment: The policy establishes a basic protection policy for sites covered by a range of designations, reflecting their scarcity and importance, and consistent with PPG9. In fact the inclusion of protective measures to County Wildlife Sites suggests a greater degree of protection that might be warranted by the status of these sites, but it is within the Council's discretion to do this. The policy also makes specific reference to scrutiny of applications affecting SACs/SPAs/SSSIs, and the need for careful assessment of any indirect effects.

Summary of mitigation proposals: The supporting text states that policy NE/6 suggests additional planning controls to ensure that development does not prevent people enjoying wildlife sites. This is not evident in the text for NE/6 and it is not clear, therefore, whether this is actually a reference to NE/7.

The supporting text notes that barbastelle bats occupying the cSAC at Eversden Woods have been recorded at other locations up to 11kms away. A number of the housing allocations in policy SP/1 and one employment land allocation in SP/4 lie within this range. As a precautionary measure it would be advisable that a bat survey is required as part of any planning application to ensure that the development will not interfere with flight lines.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.

NE/8 – Natural Areas

Prohibits development that would **unacceptable and** adversely affect biodiversity and nature conservation value of designated Natural Areas.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	++	++	++	Clearly supportive. The Natural Area designation effectively extends conservation beyond the relatively small sites or point locations covered by the main wildlife designations.
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	++	++	++	As above.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	(+)	(+)	(+)	Implicitly preserves biodiversity for public enjoyment.
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+	+	+	Implicitly supportive.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	

6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~
Summary of assessment: Extends the scope of conservation beyond the boundaries of designated sites to cover the broader Natural Areas (a non-statutory designation). The main problem with this policy is that it sets an overall objective without making it clear how biodiversity harm would be assessed consistently from one site to the next.			
Summary of mitigation proposals: Consider removing this policy or merging it with NE/6.			
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.			

NE/9 – Regionally important geological and geomorphological sites

Affords protection to natural features although no such designated sites exist in the district at present.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	+	+	+	Supportive. Low rating merely reflects the lack of such sites in the district at present.
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	+	+	+	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+	+	+	Particularly true of geomorphological features.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	Assumed neutral; any benefit subsumed by comment for 3.2.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	

4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	?	?	?	Supportive in principal, though sites may be less popular than, say, wildlife reserves.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	
Summary of assessment: A safety net policy to ensure the natural physical features are afforded protection comparable to that given to biodiversity assets.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: The policy text refers to Section 46106 agreements which needs to be qualified by additional text. Whereas biodiversity can be compensated by translocation and habitat recreation, the loss of physical landscape features is more final and difficult to compensate. This issue should be taken into account when reviewing planning applications, balancing the loss of the feature against the importance of or need for the development.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

NE/10 – Groundwater

Prohibits development that threatens groundwater resources.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	?	?	?	Not strictly relevant as the policy protects the quality and quantity of groundwater supply rather than addressing demand.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	

3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	~	~	
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	+++	+++	+++	Explicitly protects groundwater resources from potential pollution.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	(+)	(+)	(+)	Very indirect support in terms of the effect of maintaining the water table in clay areas to prevent shrinkage and potential increase in subsidence problems.
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	+	+	+	Pollution protection is included in policy objectives.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	?	?	?	Groundwater controls should also affect farming practices; their effect on farm diversification opportunities is difficult to quantify.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	

Summary of assessment: Sustainable in providing overarching protection of groundwater resources.

Summary of mitigation proposals: None.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: The supporting text refers to the need to recharge groundwater and clearly the large scale developments included in the LDF will have substantial effects on local rates which need to be addressed. However policies NE/11 and NE/14 deal with preventative and mitigation measures and have parallel policies in the corresponding AAPs. All address the supply-side issues which mirror the demand-side focus of this policy.

NE/11 – Water and drainage infrastructure

States the requirement that development proposals must show adequate provision for water supply, removal of foul water, and other drainage that is consistent in scale with the phasing of the development. The policy makes clear the Council’s obligation to coordinate these matters for large-scale development, but that developers must liaise with water companies for smaller sites.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

[abridged in some cases]

	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural	~	~	~	

holdings				
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	(++)	(++)	(++)	Policy does not actually restrict consumption but ensures supply and demand are coordinated.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	Policy states this objective is the responsibility of other agencies.
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	As above.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	~	~	
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	(+)	(+)	(+)	Does not reduce pollutant levels directly but aims to ensure it does not occur as a result of the lack of treatment and/or removal infrastructure.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	++	++	++	Ensures supply of water for new development.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	+++	+++	+++	The principal objective of this policy.
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	
Summary of assessment: Little to consider as this policy makes clear it is essential that development and provision of the supporting infrastructure (in this case water supply) are coordinated from the outset.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.				

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: Clearly the principal cumulative effect concerns the demands made of local water supply by the scale of development that will occur in the district over the next 10-15 years. That is not addressed by this policy which is primarily concerned with ensuring the timing of supply. It is assumed modelling of water demand has been undertaken already, and that supply rates will be monitored during development to ensure supply and demand are matched.

NE/12 – Foul drainage: alternative drainage systems

Defines requirements for providing sewerage facilities for most forms of development including structures and the road system, and for special provision for sites producing slurry or effluents.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	++	++	++	Does not address water supply / consumption but makes provision to protect groundwater from contamination.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	Relevant comments subsumed under 2.2 below.
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	+	+	+	Intrinsically aims to prevent leakage, spills and other problems of foul materials that would adversely affect humans and the natural environment.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	~	~	
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	++	++	++	Deals with removal of domestic and industrial pollutants.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	Materials handled by these systems cannot be recycled.
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	++	++	++	The principal objective of this policy.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential	~	~	~	

and location			
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~
Summary of assessment: Clearly a sustainable policy requiring the provision of adequate and appropriate infrastructure to remove solid and liquid effluents, or for their storage, supporting maintenance of good water quality.			
Summary of mitigation proposals: None; policy DP/6 also provides for protection of ground and surface water resources from contamination during construction.			
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: See above.			

NE/13 – Flood risk

Proposes to restrict all development in designated high flood risk areas, and development in some areas where the lower level of risk cannot be substantiated and / or minimised, and to prevent development which might contribute to flood risk.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	(+)	(+)	(+)	Indirect / tenuous link insofar as run-off impacts of development could be cited as a reason for declining planning permission in rural areas.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	+	+	+	Could help to reduce threats to habitats that are sensitive to changes in water levels.
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	+	+	+	As above.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	~	~	
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	+++	+++	+++	Clearly the principal objective of this policy.
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	

6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~
Summary of assessment: Given the district's position at the edge of the fens, an essential policy prohibiting development in risky locations. The policy wording and supporting text provide flexibility in permitting development in areas of lower risk provided that appropriate defensive or mitigation measures are provided, and that these are appropriate to the estimated risk/			
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.			
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: The main potential issue is the increase in impermeable surface areas as a result of the major new development, although this is addressed by policy NE/14.			

NE/14 – Sustainable drainage systems

Requires the use of SUDS where appropriate and establishes the right to seek Section 46106 contributions for this infrastructure.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	Additional land required for these systems is assumed to be negligible and use of brownfield land is assumed to be a priority.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	+	++	Supports objective by limiting the impact of development on the pattern and rate of run-off.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	?	?	?	Impact of water release onto fluvial systems and nearby habitats is assumed to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis.
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	+	+	+	As above. Moreover development proposals for Cambridge East and Northstowe integrate these features into the open space and green corridor strategy.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	+	+	+	As above.
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	(+)	(+)	(+)	Depends on design, but supportive in principle – see also 2.2. above.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	(+)	(+)	(+)	As for 3.2.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	SUDS assumed to be separate from foul water systems.

4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	+++	+++	+++	The principal objective of this policy.
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	+	+	+	Can contribute, provided facilities do not constitute a safety hazard and there are rights of way.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	Space for SUDS assumed to have no effect on land available for other purposes.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	
Summary of assessment: Another policy stating an essential measure required by the vulnerability of parts of the district to flooding, and the need to address water shortages by maximising the rate at which groundwater resources can be recharged.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

NE/15 – Water conservation

Mandates the incorporation of water-efficient and water-saving technologies into new development, while ensuring this does not adversely affect the water environment.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	+++	+++	+++	Clearly the principal objective of this policy is to minimise the impact on water resources of the significant development in the district in the immediate future.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	+	+	+	Need to avoid damage to the natural environment in general is stated.
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	+(+)	+(+)	+(+)	As above.

2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	~	~	
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	++	++	++	Meets design standards that are evolving to deal with climate-change related problems.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	+	+	+	States requirement for measures that will not pollute water courses.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	+	+(+)	Clearly an aim of this policy although the benefit will take time to build without retrofitting of technology to existing properties
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	(+)	(+)	(+)	Implicitly supportive.
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	+	+	+	As for 4.1 and this is assumed to have implications for human health also, particularly as technologies include greywater recycling.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	?	?	?	Neutral provided that technology does not significantly increase new house prices affecting the provision of affordable property.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	+	+	+	Supports provision of a type of infrastructure essential for dealing with climate change problems.
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	

Summary of assessment: A further sustainable policy necessitated by limitations on the district's water supply. One slight concern is the impact of technology costs on the price of new housing, however this should be offset by the scale of new construction which should mean the unit cost per home is lower than, say, retrofitting to an existing property.

Post consultation changes reflecting the Council's legal powers to mandate specific technologies do not appear to have significantly weakened this policy, providing flexibility without removing the obligation on developers. The additional change of requiring a Water Conservation Strategy for developments of 1000m² or more is also supportive, although it should not be seen to add to the procedural burden on developers if this information could be provided in a masterplan or development brief, which might be produced for development on this scale.

Summary of mitigation proposals: None.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.

NE/16 – Hazardous installations

States a procedural and legal requirement to consider human health risks and other impacts when considering planning applications for developments where hazardous substances will be present.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	(+)	(+)	(+)	Implicitly aims to prevent spills, leaks, etc. by appropriate preventative measures.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	~	~	
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	+	+	+	Provides a control mechanism for ensuring people are not at risk from nearby hazardous materials or facilities.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	+	+	+	Aims to reduce accidental emissions and their consequences.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	+++	+++	+++	The principal objective of this policy.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local	~	~	~	

economy

Summary of assessment: A further largely procedural policy reflecting the Council's obligations to prevent development in locations where the nature of the materials or activities constitute an unacceptable risk to human health and/or safety.

Summary of mitigation proposals: None.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None.

NE/17 – Lighting proposals

Identifies five requirements for external lighting (implicitly for both routes and sites).

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	?	?	?	Proposals to limit times when lighting is permissible can also be used to control consumption, indirectly supporting this objective.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	+	+	+	Supporting text acknowledges potential impact of night-time light pollution on some species though the significant of this impact cannot be determined at this stage.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	(+)	(+)	(+)	Implicitly beneficial in terms of night-time effects, particularly in rural areas where excessive light pollution reduces remoteness.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	(+)	(+)	(+)	Supports 3.2 implicitly.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	+	+(+)	++	Given the substantial light pollution at present, application of the policy to new development will introduce only incremental change, though clearly this is desirable.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	++	++	++	Policy balances need to reduce pollution with its role in providing a secure environment.
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	

6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~
Summary of assessment: Addresses issue of increased awareness of the impact of light pollution on the character of the area, and the particular impact in rural areas. Applying policy to new development limits its overall impact in an area where skyglow is already a problem.			
Summary of mitigation proposals: Is it practical to consider measures to address the problem with existing light sources, or to survey were the problems are worst.			
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: The existing problem is the principal cumulative effect; the policy proposals will limit further problems but not redress the root cause.			

NE/18 – Noise pollution

Establishes policy principles to prevent unacceptable noise from new development; to prevent new development where ambient noise levels might be unacceptably high; and general conditions under the EPA to prevent noise nuisance.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]

	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	?	?	?	Policy deals with noise but not vibration, and mentions the impact of traffic. Development should not lead to an increase in road traffic that might adversely affect listed properties that may be at risk or in susceptible locations.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	~	~	
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	+	+	+	Eliminating noise nuisance and controlling ambient noise levels should contribute to residents' satisfaction with their environment.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	+++	+++	+++	The principal objective of this policy which deals with noise from new development. It is assumed that noise nuisance from existing sources is addressed through the EPA.

4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	(+)	(+)	(+)	There must be an implicit health benefit from reducing noise where it is a nuisance, even if this does not correspond directly to the criteria for this objective.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime				
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	?	?	?	Other policies (including NE/5) address provision of recreational space and tranquil rural areas. The policy text is primarily concerned with urban areas and these other sites are not identified as potentially sensitive receptors.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	Noise constraint on development could limit the availability of sites (although the policy makes provision for B1(a) uses which may subsume much of the demand in the district. This is a long-term cumulative impact that is hypothetical at present and difficult to quantify.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	
Summary of assessment: Policy establishes measures to prevent increases in ambient and point-based noise from new development, and to ensure new development will not be subjected to noise from existing sources.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: The policy and supporting text appear to refer principally to noise in settlements. Other Natural Environment policies propose establishing areas of tranquil countryside and it appears appropriate that this over-arching policy should include measures (at least in outline) that support NE/5 for example.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

NE/19 – Emissions

Requires development proposals to identify and mitigate / minimise emissions to prevent impacts on the surroundings, and to comply with relevant pollution control regulations.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

[abridged in some cases]

	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	

2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	(+)	(+)	(+)	Implicitly supportive.
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	(+)	(+)	(+)	As above.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	(+)	(+)	(+)	As for 2.1 / 2.2.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	~	~	
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	(+)	(+)	(+)	Implicitly beneficial if it limits nuisance from fumes, dust, etc.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	++	+++	++(+)	The joint-primary objective of this policy. The time trend reflects the potential impact during the construction of Northstowe and Cambridge East
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	++	+++	++(+)	As for 4.1. The policy mentions air quality and pollutants, and it might be help to make clear that this includes dust, which will be a significant potential problem during construction of the new settlements.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	
Summary of assessment: An essential policy outlining the need to prevent contamination by pollutants, whether airborne or carried by other media, and which is particularly necessary given the potential impacts of major phases of construction at Northstowe and at Cambridge East.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: Possibly make clear the controls apply to dust also. Policies in the Transport section mandate the provision of a Transport Assessment, should the Council encourage good/best practice by suggesting that developments likely to generate pollutants or emissions should be supported by a Health Impact Assessment. In order for this to be practicable we assume there would need to be a size threshold above which this option might apply.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: Clear impacts from the scale of development, although this would be mitigated to some degree by the phasing of development on both of the principal sites.				

NE/20 – Land contamination

States the procedural requirement to investigate the nature and extent of contamination in all development proposals where there are reasonable grounds to assume this is an issue, and to implement appropriate treatment and monitoring of the site.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	~	~	
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	++	++	++	Procedural requirement to ensure unforeseen contamination does not occur, and which is necessitated by the high proportion of brownfield land being used for new housing development in the district over the plan period.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	++	++	++	Clearly the principal objective of this policy.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	

7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~
Summary of assessment: A high-level statement of the Council's obligation to ensure new development does not constitute a risk to human health, and which is given added weight by the large volume of housing development in the district that will occur on former military and industrial land.			
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.			
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.			

NE/21 – Protecting high quality agricultural land				
Establishes a blanket ban on any development that takes Grade 1, 2 or 3a agricultural land without providing scope to return it to its current use.				
Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	(+++)	(+++)	(+++)	The principal objective of this policy. <u>Post consultation changes introduced very general clauses indicating conditions under which land would be acceptable. These changes indicate the pragmatic position the Council must take, especially in increasing housing stock to meet shortages and support future growth. As a result the strong positive benefit has to be qualified in absolute terms, although we would expect other Development Control policies to limit the number of cases where this occurs, the amount of land taken, and to ensure that such events are treated as exceptions.</u>
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	+	+	+	Limited provision for alternative reversible change provided this retains the openness of the area.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	?	?	?	In absolute terms, retaining land under agriculture limits public access, however intensive cultivation means these areas have degraded biodiversity value, and keeping them in agricultural use as a national resource has a much higher priority.
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+	+	+	As for 2.2
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	?	?	?	Difficult to assess in the light of the adverse impact of intensive farming practices on water quality. Baseline data indicates river quality is improving and does not refer to any nitrate or phosphate problems although much of the district is a Nitrate Sensitive Zone.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	?	?	?	Possibly prevents development that could interfere with groundwater recharge, although this would be localised and its impact on flooding, etc., negligible.

5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	Only potential threat is supply constrain on development land and the impact this may have on the ability to bring through enough stock of land for employment. This cannot be quantified at this stage.
Summary of assessment: Clearly an essential policy to safeguard one of the district's strategic resources, although post-consultation changes have somewhat affected its thoroughness as a protective measure.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: There is a potential impact of land shortages on provision of housing and employment land in the longer term, though this cannot be quantified at present. However the policy does allow for a pragmatic position, recognising some loss of land will occur in the current plan period.				

CULTURAL HERITAGE POLICIES

CH/1 – Historic landscapes

States that planning permission will not be granted for development that will affect historic landscapes regardless of whether or not they are covered by statutory designations.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]

	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	++	++	++	Assessment assumes a broader definition of undeveloped land than might be implied, since some open landscapes, though the result of human activity, are not undeveloped
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	(+)	(+)	(+)	Benefit primarily from other conservation designations, but policy will implicitly support this objective.
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	(+)	(+)	(+)	As for 2.1.

2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	+	+	+	Policy mentions parkland areas and other sites which will be afforded protection, as well as wider areas of the countryside.
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	+++	+++	+++	The primary objective of this policy.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	++	++	++	The secondary objective of this policy.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	?	?	?	Presumably the district's residents will value the policy if it prevents inappropriate development.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	(+)	(+)	(+)	Supportive in that it will help to maintain open recreational and leisure space beyond settlement boundaries, although Green Belt policies probably afford more protection within the plan.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	(+)	(+)	(+)	Does not necessarily improve it but maintains it.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	+	+	+	Supportive as assessment criteria include the quality and range of leisure facilities.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	
Summary of assessment: Clearly another sustainable policy which gives the Council broader power to turn down development applications which would adversely affect the local landscape. It is not clear what protection this policy affords in addition to those on Green Belts, protection of biodiversity, protection Natural Areas, and other CH/ policies. However this does not mean it should be dispensed with. Note that a number of the major developed sites addressed by policy GB/6 are in parkland settings and this policy should also control the nature of development at those sites.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

CH/2 – Archaeological sites

Prevents development without inspection by experts to assess a location's importance in order to determine whether development should be prevented (only in cases where there would be damage to a nationally important asset) or appropriate mitigation measures.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	+++	+++	+++	The principal objective of this policy.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	(+)	(+)	(+)	Beneficial in that it supports protection of visible archaeological and heritage features (eg. earthworks).
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	

7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~
Summary of assessment: Little to comment on as the policy ensures adequate opportunity to assess the potential importance of sites and to provide for inspection. We assume that practical controls and the timing of inspection (and removal of materials if necessary) would be coordinated through the EIA for the development.			
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.			
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.			

CH/3 – Listed buildings				
Proposes that development affecting listed buildings would only be permitted if it helps to preserve or appropriately enhance the structure. The policy also provides contingency for situations in which partial or total demolition of a listed structure is proposed, requiring a clear case for its loss, assessment of its value, and the need to preserve a documentary record and any materials.				
Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	+++	+++	+++	The primary objective of this policy.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	++	++	++	Clearly supportive, particularly within conservation areas.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	++	++	++	As for 3.2.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	

6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~
Summary of assessment: As for CH/2 this policy ensures priority is given to preserving and (where possible) enhancing heritage assets. The policy and supporting text also provide for extension or conversion of use provided this is consistent with the fabric of the building, and in extreme cases for demolition.			
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.			
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.			

CH/4 – Development within the curtilage or setting of a listed building

Establishes that planning permission will not be granted for development that would adversely affect its setting.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	+++	+++	+++	Clearly the principal objective of this policy.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	++	++	++	Ensures policy principles apply to individual buildings within an urban setting to ensure character is not affected.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	(++)	(++)	(++)	Implicitly supportive.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	

5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~
Summary of assessment: Supports CH/3 in preventing inappropriate changes to the setting of listed properties, which would have particular benefits for individual listed properties within settlements and in locations that are not afforded protection through conservation area status.			
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.			
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.			

CH/5 – Conservation areas

Prohibits development that has an overall adverse impact on a conservation area, although development that enhances it would be permitted in principle, subject to scrutiny of the proposal.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	(-)	(-)	(-)	Buildings in conservation areas will have poor thermal insulation and designation effectively prevents improvements to reduce heat loss and other problems. However this clearly affects a relatively small part of the housing stock and must be balanced against the benefit of maintaining character.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	++	++	++	The joint objective of this policy.

3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	++	++	++	As above.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	++	++	++	Supports 3.1 and 3.2.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	+	+	+	Presumably supportive since open space can be part of the layout that the designation aims to preserve.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	
Summary of assessment: Clearly sustainable in terms of its effect on preserving the character and setting of areas within existing settlements. The constraints on redevelopment mean that even small improvements to reduce, for example, heat loss are impractical and this may imply a marginal impact on the quality of the dwelling, but this must be weighed against the need to preserve the setting of these areas.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

CH/6 – Protected village amenity areas

Prohibits development that would adversely affect pre-defined areas within a wide range of villages.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives
[abridged in some cases]

Assessment

Comments / Proposed Mitigation

	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	++	++	++	Prevents loss of such land (typically open space) within the fabric of the village.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	

1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	+	+	+	Beneficial where it preserves open space and character that is settled by local wildlife.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	?	?	?	Indirectly supports 2.2?
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	+	+	+	The objective applies to sites with more formal designation, nevertheless other policies (eg CH/1) establish the principle that much of the district has valued character, and this applies too to the setting of villages, which are protected by this policy.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+++	+++	+++	The primary objective of this policy.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	++	++	++	Implicitly supports 3.2.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	+	+	+	Likely to be some beneficial impact if open recreational space is preserved within villages.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	It is assumed that preventing development would not result in the loss of amenities.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	Policy is preventative and does not preclude development in an appropriate site which might support this objective.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	
Summary of assessment: Another sustainable policy which extends the principles of conservation area preservation to a wider range of locations. This policy also intrinsically supports the settlement hierarchy defined in policies ST/2 to ST/5, providing an additional constraint on inappropriate development.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: The supporting text does not indicate where PVAAs are defined (presumably in the village framework); detail of where to find information on designated areas and structures is provided for other CH/ policies.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

CH/7 – Important countryside frontages

Protects areas of countryside that partially penetrate settlements, effectively providing a localised green corridor.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	++	++	++	Land covered by this policy is implicitly open / undeveloped.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	++	++	++	Policy concentrates on the visual / structural value of the countryside frontage but it may also act as a green corridor for wildlife.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	(+)	(+)	(+)	Implicitly supportive (see above).
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	(+)	(+)	(+)	Text supporting policy CH/1 suggests there is widespread intrinsic and historic value of much of the district's countryside and this suggests that preserving these features will contribute to this objective.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	++	++	++	Clearly supportive.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	++	++	++	As above.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	(+)	(+)	(+)	Preserves some open aspects though benefit depends on whether these areas are open to public access.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	(+)	(+)	(+)	See 5.1.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	Primarily concerned with preserving setting, so impact on availability of space for development is assumed to be limited.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and	~	~	~	

infrastructure			
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~
Summary of assessment: Supports other policies designed to preserve and enhance the unique character of parts of the district.			
Summary of mitigation proposals: It would be helpful to give more specific examples of these features if possible.			
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.			

CH/8 – Advertisements				
Establishes broad principles that restrict the size and impact of advertisements.				
Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+	+	+	Implicitly the purpose of this objective.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	(+)	(+)	(+)	Prevents obtrusive displays.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	+	+	+	Specific measures to prevent advertisting that would constitute a road safety threat.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	

7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~
Summary of assessment: The policy provides overall control to prevent unwarranted intrusion by advertising hoardings, canopies and similar facilities regardless of location, but with specific controls on their impact in areas covered by conservation and other designations.			
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.			
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.			

TRAVEL POLICIES

TR/1 – Planning for more sustainable travel

Proposes that new development will only be permitted in locations that are readily accessible or will attain accessibility by a range of transport modes that encourage reduced use of cars. The policy also provides for broad linkages between the Local Transport Plan and LDF policies, and the coordination of policies on car parking with those that encourage cycling and walking.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	+	+(+)	++	Implicitly supportive because development will be directed towards more accessible sites in urban centres.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	+	+(+)	++	Promotion of non-car transport implies reduced fuel usage as more people walk, cycle or use shared (public) transport.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	(-)	(-)	(-)	Policy is primarily concerned with new housing or employment development. Other policies on the Green Belt and Natural Environment, and TR/4, will help to facilitate non-car access to countryside areas, however it is likely this objective would be compromised if there is not appropriate provision for car access.
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	?	?	?	Not clear if this would result in long-term reduction of vibration problems. Concerns about damage to rural features must be balanced against need to provide for access (see 2.3 above).
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	(+)	+	+(+)	Potential longer-term aesthetic improvement if settlements are less dominated by traffic (cf. town centre pedestrianisation).
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	(+)	+	+(+)	As above.

4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	+	+(+)	++	Clearly supportive of reducing emissions by more efficient use of public transport and non-fuel burning modes.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	+	+(+)	++	Difficult to calibrate benefit, which will clearly be greater if more people cycle, walk or use public transport.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	+	+	+	Addresses physical safety and theft.
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	++	++(+)	+++	Impact depends on level of new development, but this policy is clearly consistent with sequential testing of sites for retail units and the settlement hierarchy proposed in ST/1 and ST/2. Must be marked as strongly positive as this is the core objective of this policy which meets all the supporting criteria.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	+	+(+)	++	Central location near transport ought to benefit the less mobile and disabled and to integrate public and other transport mode provision (eg. for cyclists) benefiting those without a car.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	?	?	?	May be supportive but may also contribute to development pressures particularly in existing centres (as opposed to planned new development at Cambourne, Northstowe, etc.). See comments below on secondary and other impacts.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	++	++	++	Support objective of easier non-car access between homes and jobs.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	(++)	(++)	(++)	Although not explicit, The original policy and supporting text appeared to imply Section 46106 agreements may be used to secure developer contributions to appropriate transport improvements. (This issue is covered explicitly by policy TR/3). <u>The intention was made clear by the insertion of an additional paragraph following public consultation.</u>
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	+	+(+)	+(+)	Impact on the economy should be beneficial but this depends on the volume of land available for development in appropriate locations.

Summary of assessment: Proposes spatial policies for locating new development in the most accessible locations that is consistent with the broader strategic policies on housing and development in general stated in ST/1 and ST/2, and that is also consistent with current planning guidance in PPS1 and PPG13.

Summary of mitigation proposals: None.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: The main issue is that this and other policies focus development towards generally the same locations – readily accessible central sites in the main Rural Centres in the district. This will clearly contribute to development pressure though the impact of this is difficult to judge at this stage. Nevertheless it suggests some principles may need to be defined to help determine whether a particular suitable site close to the centre of one of the district’s main settlements is best developed for housing (presumably with affordable housing provision), for employment, or for other amenities.

TR/2 – Car and cycle parking standards

Proposes provisioning levels for car and cycle parking that are set out in separate annexes, the former detailed extensively for a wide range of Use Classes. The policy also states the intention to adopt more stringent standards for new development at sites that are well-served by public transport.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	+	+	+	In general the policy prevents over-provision of parking (though not specifically to meet this objective), and more stringent standards in central sites will contribute to making the best use of limited brownfield land stock.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	(+)	(+)	(+)	Support is implicit rather than explicit.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+	+	+	Implicitly supportive if it limits the amount of space given over to parking areas, whether for housing or amenities.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	+	+	+	As above.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	+	+	+(+)	Implicit support for sustainable transport objectives although the main benefits would be delivered by other policies (eg. TR/1).
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling				
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	?	?	?	More tenuous benefit than 4.1. Depends on whether it really does encourage more people to walk or cycle.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	+	+	+	Controls on parking space clearly give more flexibility in designing space in new developments.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	+	+	+	Impact may need to be monitored. The rural nature of the district means more people will be reliant on private cars, and parking for amenities, retail areas, etc. Maximum standards should provide flexibility to adjust to local circumstances.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	?	?	?	Could be beneficial if it supports more efficient use of land stock and enables more provision of this type of housing.

6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	?	?	?	As for 6.1, in terms of parking at employment sites.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	?	?	?	As for 6.1
Summary of assessment: The policy proposes car and cycling parking / provisioning standards that are consistent with those in PPG3 and PPG13. However those are national standards that apply generally as a target in support of sustainable transport policy, and it will be important to ensure that parking provision still meets local requirements. In particular, as the county is predominantly rural, many people will continue to rely on their cars to visit shops, amenities, etc. in the short-term, and it may be necessary to monitor the effect of these standards to ensure they are not counter-productive, discouraging people from visiting rural centres because of perceived parking difficulties. This concern applies also to parking at employment sites but is perhaps less important.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: Ensure monitoring plan evaluates impact – this would probably have to be achieved through surveys of shoppers, commuters and residents.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: Principal issue is addressed in the summary above.				

TR/3 – Mitigating travel impact

Requires developers to take measures to mitigate any predicted impact on travel patterns. Development likely to have significant transport impacts will need to be supported by a Transport Assessment and a Travel Plan as appropriate.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	+	+(+)	++	Travel Plans are implicitly assumed to optimise transport provision or arrangements for some of those living or working at the new development, and it is also assumed mitigation would involve a greater level of provision and use of public transport than might otherwise occur. Assumed to grow over time as supporting documents mentioned by the plan are mandatory.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	?	?	?	Depends on proximity of designated sites to new development.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+	+	+	Policy supports objective by preventing traffic congestion.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	+	+	+	As above.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	+	+(+)	++	As for 1.2.

4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	+	+	+	Assumed to be beneficial if mitigation measures and/or Travel Plans result in more people walking or cycling.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	+	+	+	Overall objective of this policy is optimising the mode and capacity of transport infrastructure, however mitigation will prevent congestion arising from new development which clearly affects accessibility of a wide range of other facilities.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	+	+(+)	++	Supportive if it helps to ensure access for the less mobile but also benefits all travellers if it helps to reduce congestion.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	+	+	+	Should contribute to non-car access. It is not evident what effect the requirements to produce both a transport assessment and a travel plan will have on developers' willingness to bring forward new land uses, however we must assume the impact is likely to be negligible given the buoyancy of the sub-regional economy.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	+	+(+)	++	Makes clear the possibility using Section 46 106 agreements to secure private sector funding for transport improvements that are necessitated by new development.
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	+	+	+	As for 7.1.

Summary of assessment: An essential policy to anticipate and where necessary mitigate the impact on the district's heavily used transport network (and particularly the road system) in advance of new development. It is particularly important to understand the transport impacts given the scale of new development that will occur across the district during the life of the plan, although parallel development in different areas may make the assessment of these effects more complex. Mitigation will be needed on a site-by-site basis and therefore directly proportional to trip generation and size of site, so this should be applied on an equitable basis to all scales of development.

Summary of mitigation proposals: Since the additional planning documents will take time and money to develop, should the policy set a size threshold below which the requirement is not mandatory so that those planning to develop smaller sites are not penalised?

Post-consultation changes clarified that a travel plan and transport assessment would be required also for all "major development" as defined in the Core Strategy DPD. This change sets a threshold as low as 10 dwellings which, on a high-density site, would be relatively compact. This situation suggests the need for the level of detail required in both documents to be scaled in proportion to the size of the development and this point is clarified in changes to the supporting text. The changes also clarified the requirement to produce a transport assessment only for smaller development, and this appears to answer the comment above which was made in the assessment prior to public consultation.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: Principal synergistic impact should be beneficial because it not only prevents traffic problems in the locality of the development, but also more broadly across the district.

TR/4 – Cycling and walking provision

Establishes the Council's commitment to improving the provision of cycling infrastructure, secure parking facilities, etc. to encourage modal shift, and equivalent measures to encourage walking where this is currently impeded by concerns about crime and physical safety. The policy defines priorities as facilities for local commuting and shopping first, then safer routes to schools, then leisure activity.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	+	+(+)	++	Promotes reduced use of private cars. Rate of modal shift cannot be predicted at present so the rating (no change) is assumed to be conservative.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	+	+	+	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	+	+	+	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	+	+	+	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	+	+	+	Aims to encourage recreational cycling and walking and therefore this should support other policies designed to encourage access to the countryside.
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	+	+	+	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	~	~	
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	(+)	(+)	(+)	Longer-term benefit if it results in settlement layout in which the road network has less impact – should contribute to improved satisfaction with one's immediate environment.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	+	+(+)	++	As for 1.2.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	+	++	+++	Clear benefit which should grow so long as infrastructure provision does result in modal shift.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	+	+	+	Incorporates measures to secure and improve access to rights of way which supports this objective even if the land itself does not count towards open space provisioning targets.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	+	+(+)	++	Supports the objective of improving accessibility of amenities and work using non-car modes. Rate of growth is speculative.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	+	+(+)	++	A range of benefits including general safety measures for cyclists and pedestrians, and needs of less mobile can be catered for in improvements for pedestrian access.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	

6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~
Summary of assessment: Little to say other than this is another policy supporting sustainable transport objectives and integrating them with urban design both in new settlements, and also with existing infrastructure such as the National Cycle Network. We understand the broad definition of the first priority reflects the central location of schools as well as local employment, retail and amenities and therefore the policy supports a wide range of potential movement within a community and between adjacent ones.			
Summary of mitigation proposals: Possibly make it clear that infrastructure should be designed to facilitate use by the less mobile – eg. access to footbridges by ramps rather than steps.			
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.			

TR/5 – Rail freight

Encourages development of freight interchange facilities at locations that meet the requirements of other plan policies.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	(+)	(+)	(+)	Impact not clear but is likely to lead to use of suitable brownfield land and is therefore implicitly supportive.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	+	+	+	Rail movements generate emissions but these are assumed to be lower than those from road transport.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	(+)	(+)	(+)	Beneficial if it can reduce HGV movements, though the impact depends on how many sites are close to and affected by main roads.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+	+	+	Again, supportive if HGV movements are reduced.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	+	+	+	As for 1.2.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	(+)	(+)	(+)	Although it is not a criterion for the objective, there are potential benefits from reduced

				emissions on air quality and therefore respiratory problems, etc.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	?	?	?	Impact is entirely speculative without specific plans, although interchanges would act as nodes for employment growth.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	?	?	?	As for 7.1.
Summary of assessment: Another policy on which there is little to add as there is a single north-south rail link capable of carrying large-scale freight movements, nevertheless its objectives are consistent with guidance in PPG13.¹				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: Scale of rail infrastructure suggests there might only be scope for a single facility, though this could have some benefit if it can supplant HGV movements, but recognising that it would also focus them on a particular site.				

TR/6 – Eastern Rapid Transit

The policy states the Council's intention to seek developer contributions for a rapid transit service linking the new urban extension at Cambridge East with the city centre.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	Policy is primarily concerned with financing the link, although the assessment also assumes the link will not take additional land from a development that is almost entirely brownfield.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	+	++	Investment in public transport infrastructure and contributes to reducing traffic congestion in Cambridge.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	

¹ We are aware that there is a spur east from Cambridge to Newmarket, however this is single-track and assumed to be unsuitable for large rail shipments.

2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	+	+	Beneficial if it can reduce congestion or prevent it worsening once Cambridge East is being redeveloped.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	Any benefits subsumed by comments for 3.2.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	+	++	As for 1.2.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	+	+	Potential air quality benefits if it reduces congestion.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	++	++	Obvious benefits for accessing Cambridge city centre, and will also help to support establishment of the district centre in Cambridge East by making amenities there more accessible for residents in other parts of the city.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	+	+	Expands public transport infrastructure and therefore benefits those unable to afford or use a car.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	++	++	Improves access to work using non-car modes.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	+	+	Seeks private sector investment in public infrastructure.
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	+(+)	++	Impact difficult to judge at this stage but any reduction in congestion could have at least indirect benefits to the local economy.
Summary of assessment: The policy primarily seeks finance for transport infrastructure from developers, but the assessment highlights the broader benefits that the link would bring, and these are more likely to occur if financial contributions mean the project goes ahead.				
Note: post consultation changes as a result of an objection GO-East removed this policy on the grounds that the location of the facility meant it was more appropriate to deal with it through the Cambridge East Area Action Plan. Notwithstanding this change, the assessment is retained here as a record of our comments.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: Traffic congestion improvements may spread into other parts of the city. More importantly the link will support the establishment of the district centre at Cambridge East by making it readily accessible from the city centre.				

TR/7 – Aviation-related development proposals

Proposes a range of development criteria and controls that would permit development or expansion of aviation-related activities (including those of small flying clubs) to limit environmental, landscape and transport impacts.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	Assumed to be neutral, and development would be blocked by other policies in the plan.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	+	+	+	Implied by the policy wording.
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	+	+	+	As above.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	+	+	+	As for 2.1 / 2.2.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	~	~	
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	++	++	++	Clearly addresses issue of noise.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	+	+	+	Planning controls to prevent noise impacts and maintain rights of way, contributing indirectly.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	

7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy ~ ~ ~

Summary of assessment: An overarching policy intended to place development controls on aviation-related developments over a potentially wide scale, ranging from larger airfields such as the current Cambridge airport, to small sites used by flying and gliding clubs.

Summary of mitigation proposals: None.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.

SITE SPECIFIC POLICIES

SP/1 – Housing allocations in rural areas – explanatory notes

The assessment uses the standard template, but comments are only provided where specific clarification is needed of local circumstances. Assessments have been informed by information in the adopted Local Plan and by more detailed statistics from a study of the impact of PPG housing guidance which was published in 2000, and which evaluates the District's villages using scores and other data showing the availability and/or accessibility of services and amenities.

Assessment of absolute impacts on energy, water and waste (objectives 1.2, 1.3 and 3.2) are scaled according to the size of the development. The overall impact of each development is negligible alongside the new settlements planned for elsewhere in the district. The assessments are made in absolute terms, and are offset if it is recognised that expansion of housing stock is required by government policy and targets in the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan.

Certain objectives have been excluded to save space:

3.3 – spaces that work well – will be resolved by development design, and any issues about the scale of development with respect to its surroundings will be reflected in 3.2

5.2 – crime / fear of crime – again addressed through design

6.2 / 6.3 – redress inequalities and provide affordable housing – although the former has a wider context it will primarily be achieved through other policies, whereas policies DP/1 and HG/3 mean that all these developments will contribute to objective 6.3. The Local Plan identifies developments where affordable housing provision will be specifically sought, however it is superseded by policy HG/3 which provides scope to seek contributions at most sites.

6.4 - community involvement – will be delivered through other policies, and possibly Section [46106](#) agreements for the development

7.2 / 7.3 – infrastructure investment and economic vitality – these will be addressed through other policies, and the relationship between new housing and local employment will be addressed in 7.1.

Objective 4.1 is reinterpreted to assess the sensitivity of the site to impacts from surrounding land uses as policy NE/18 in particular prevents development where there are known adverse impacts. Objective 7.1 is reinterpreted to assess the availability of school places and local employment. The scoring is structured to show the availability of primary and secondary school places and local employment. We understand the Council will address educational provision through a Planning Obligations SPD, however our assessment has been retained here so that the position is clear, although this factor is based on the 2000 village assessments and the age of the data should be borne in mind when reviewing these assessments.

It should also be noted that the adopted Local Plan gives a substantial amount of supporting detail about each development site and the nature of mitigation or remedial measures (some of them mandatory in order to protect designated sites). We understand the Council intends to produce a more detailed Development Brief for each site which will address mitigation and other issues which are raised in these assessments.

Due to time constraints it has only been possible to undertake assessment of the largest allocations (those above 2ha. and a few below it where there are potential cumulative impacts. Further investigation of some detailed impacts may be necessary and are identified in the text.

SP/1a – Impington, North of Impington Lane

1.42 hectares supporting 57 dwellings.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	+	+	+	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	-(–)	-(–)	-(–)	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	-(–)	-(–)	-(–)	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	~	~	Extension of residential development that infills between built up land and commercial property. The southern edge of Impington already presents a mixture of residential, open and industrial land use so the impact of development appears to be negligible.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	+	+	+	Guardedly positive assessment due to proximity to employment land on the south of Histon, other business parks in Histon and Impington, and the technology parks. Position is potentially advantageous if a station for Histon / Impington is built on the guided busway. The impact of noise from this route on dwellings on the south of the development is assumed to be negligible. There is a potential problem with road access, which would increase traffic on Saffron Road.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	-(–)	-(–)	-(–)	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	(+)	(+)	(+)	Possible benefits from relatively close access to employment in Histon and the opposite side of the A14.
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	?	?	?	Possibly seek contributions for sports improvements, though it is not clear whether these could be provided in the vicinity.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	+	+	+	Development is approximately equidistant from the limited central facilities in Impington and the Rural Centre of Histon.
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	(+ / – / +)	(+ / – / +)	(+ / – / +)	Data show large number of spare primary school places but an even larger shortfall of secondary school places. Employment opportunities as for 5.1.

Summary of assessment: No significant impacts identified although the site does not currently have good vehicle access. Benefits from proximity to Histon and Impington centres, and it could also benefit if a station to serve the community is built on the guided busway, which passes the southern edge of the site.

Summary of mitigation proposals: The 2004 recreational survey identifies a shortfall in facilities including need for a new sports pavilion, and the Council might seek a Section 46106 contribution. However the survey addresses Histon and Impington collectively and it is not clear whether such a requirement would be deemed appropriate to the development if it benefits Histon.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.

SP/1b – Sawston, Land at Portobello Road – SITE REMOVED FROM SUBMISSION DRAFT

0.96 hectares supporting 38 dwellings.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	++	++	++	Uses existing industrial land (but see 4.1).
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	-(–)	-(–)	-(–)	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	-(–)	-(–)	-(–)	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+	+	+	With appropriate and sensitive design it is assumed this will be an improvement in character, especially for residents to the south and when viewed from the recreation ground to the west. The land abuts high street retail uses on the east. Careful design will also be essential as half the site lies within the conservation area and provisions of policies DP/6 and CH/5 will apply.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	?	?	?	Some local employment opportunities and good bus services into Cambridge could limit car-based commuting. However there are obvious concerns about land contamination due to current land use, and which would need thorough remediation consistent with policy NE/20.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	-(–)	-(–)	-(–)	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	?	?	?	Health impacts in terms of commuting and current land use are as for 4.1. Conveniently close to recreational space. Some concern about traffic impacts and safety (see policies DP/3 and TR/3) as entrance to site will be via Common Lane and close to its junction with High Street, which is at its narrowest at this point.
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	Not clear if a contribution will be sought; the recreation survey identifies the need for new and upgraded facilities.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	+	+	+	Consistent with settlement hierarchy as development lies within a Rural Centre.

7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	(+ / - / + +)	(+ / - / + +)	(+ / - / + +)	Primary but no secondary school capacity. Employment in retail and commercial uses in Sawston, with access to Cambridge and relatively easy reach of Babraham and Abington research parks
--	------------------	------------------	------------------	---

Summary of assessment: Clearly a sustainable proposal as development is occurring on brownfield land in a nominated Rural Centre.

Summary of mitigation proposals: Priority is remediation of any contamination arising from current use of land. The plot straddles the boundary of the conservation area and therefore we assume the entire site will need to be subject to appropriate design guidelines to be addressed subsequently in the Development Brief. There are also concerns about traffic impacts which suggest a transport assessment is essential.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.

SP/1c – Melbourn, Dolphin Lane – SITE REMOVED FROM SUBMISSION DRAFT

0.99 hectares supporting 5 dwellings.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	-	-	-	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	(-)	(-)	(-)	Negligible in view of the size of the development.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	(-)	(-)	(-)	As above.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	+	+	+	Local Plan links development to provision of open recreation / wildlife space (Melbourn 3B) immediately to the west and this is used to justify the low density of the site.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	+	+	+	As above.
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	?	?	?	Local Plan refers to the archaeological interest of the site, though it is not evident from the Plan and the proposals map what this is.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+	+	+	Development provides for low density to provide appropriate design of village periphery that is consistent with policy GB/4 (although the adjacent land is not in the Green Belt) and will also be integrated with the conservation area immediately to the east.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	Negligible impact. Note that it is not clear how road access to the site will be provided.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	(-)	(-)	(-)	As for 1.2 / 1.3.
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	++	++	++	Provides for open / recreational space, and Melbourn is already well served compared to other locations.
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	+	+	+	As above.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	+	+	+	Limited local retailing. See also below.
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	(+ / ++ / +)	(+ / ++ / +)	(+ / ++ / +)	2000 survey showed spare capacity in primary and secondary schools. Development in

and location	++)	++)	++)	Rural Growth Centre with local employment and good links to London, Royston and Cambridge. Would be marked higher if the development was larger.
Summary of assessment: A small infill development providing low density housing designed to fit alongside an allocation of open space for recreation. Good public transport links, local employment and some local amenities which is clearly sustainable, although its benefit is limited by its size.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: Design to sympathetically integrate the development with the village periphery to the west and a conservation area to the east.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

SP/1d – Waterbeach, North of Bannold Road

2.4 hectares supporting 85 dwellings.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	+	++	All residential development occupies brownfield land even though it lies just outside the existing village framework (the allocation has been brought forward from the adopted Local Plan).
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	-(–)	-(–)	-(–)	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	-(–)	-(–)	-(–)	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	None in the vicinity.
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	Although site has been cleared it appears to lie between housing and military land use. This suggests lack of recolonisation due to disturbance, low biodiversity value and a lack of features that would need to be retained.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	?	?	Residential areas to the west and south have differing density suggesting it may be easier to integrate the higher density (30/ha.) of this development into its surroundings. Some screening of the area from open land to the east and housing to the south, although the abandoned state of the site and military facilities to the north suggest the development itself can afford some visual mitigation with appropriate design.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	+	+(+)	Village assessment suggests Waterbeach is relatively well provided for by public transport to Cambridge and London thanks to the extended service of the Cambridge Flyer service. Access to the northern fringe business parks would be improved by the Chesterton Sidings interchange development (see policy SP/3). Waterbeach also contains business parks on the west side of the settlement.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	-(–)	-(–)	-(–)	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	+	+	Development proposal in Local Plan proposes non-brownfield land at the site will retained

				for open / recreational use.
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	+	+	As for 5.1. The recreation survey identifies the need for a play area which might be addressed in developer contributions for this site.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	In spite of the relatively small size of the plot policy DP./1 provides scope to seek developer contributions for amenities which might include those provided in the adjacent open space. Notwithstanding this, Waterbeach is Minor Rural Centre with a small retailing core and other amenities to support the new development.
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	(- / - / +)	(- / - / + +)	Some local employment on the business park, plus good access to Cambridge city centre and central London. 2000 village survey suggests a shortage of educational provision at both levels.

Summary of assessment: This appears one of the most sustainable developments of those reviewed at this stage, reusing brownfield land for a modest expansion of an already sizeable and sustainable settlement. Immediate access to a small retail core and good rail services to Cambridge (and even London) appear particular strengths, and the infilling of currently abandoned land could provide mitigation for some of the surrounding properties,

Summary of mitigation proposals: See above. Developer contribution might also be sought towards expansion of primary education facilities and/or provision of a play area.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.

SP/1e – Willingham, South of Berrycroft and East of Balland Field – SITE REMOVED FROM SUBMISSION DRAFT

Just over 1 hectare supporting 31 dwellings.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	Occupies a small plot of land surrounding by housing which, it is assumed, does not represent the scale of productive agriculture envisaged by the objective. However mitigation would be appropriate if this involves the loss of allotments.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	-	-	-	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	-	-	-	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	Current position and size of the plot suggests it has modest biodiversity value.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	?	?	Development will be at higher density than surrounding properties so mitigation through good design will be essential.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	-	(~)	(+)	Limited public transport services at present and little employment in the vicinity, although this would change with new development at Northstowe to the south. The scale of the site suggests some cumulative traffic impacts alongside allocation SP/1f.

4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	–	–	–	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	?	?	No clear benefits other than indirect improvements in recreation which might be delivered through developer contributions (this is mentioned in Local Plan text for development in the village).
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	+	Some small scale provision to meet standards.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	+	(++)	(++)	Modest facilities within the village, although this would be supplemented by growth at Northstowe and incremental development of this Minor Rural Centre as defined in policy ST/3. Accessibility depends on improvement of public transport links.
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	(? / – / –)	(? / – / –)	(? / – / –)	Limited educational and employment facilities in the vicinity, though both could be improved by development at Northstowe.
Summary of assessment: A small development between residential development of different density on three sides and necessitating good design in providing for infilling at higher density while limiting intrusion on the existing properties.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: In conjunction with policy SP/1f, make clear the desirability of seeking developer contributions to improve the social infrastructure in the village.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: Clear potential cumulative impact alongside development in policy SP/1f.				

SP/1f – Willingham, West of High Street and North of Over Road – SITE REMOVED FROM SUBMISSION DRAFT

4.82 hectares supporting 72 dwellings.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	–	–	–	Land appears to be occupied by a small farm, outbuildings and small cultivated areas, though their importance and quality cannot be estimated at this stage. However the Local Plan notes this land has been allocated for development to compensate for other areas that have failed to come forward in the last 10 years.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	–(–)	–(–)	–(–)	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	–(–)	–(–)	–(–)	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	?	?	?	Appears to be largely open land but may involve loss of hedges.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+	+	+	Development represents a moderately large extension to the west side of the village though its impact is mitigated somewhat by using the lowest density permitted by the current guidance.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	–	(~)	(+)	Limited public transport services at present and little employment in the vicinity, although

				this would change with new development at Northstowe to the south. However the scale of the site suggests potential traffic impacts due to the lack of local employment.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	-(-)	-(-)	-(-)	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	No clear benefits other than indirect improvements in recreation which might be delivered through developer contributions.
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	Though it could be argued the land is not open now and therefore any open space planned into it would improve the situation.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	+	(++)	(++)	Modest facilities within the village, although this would be supplemented by growth at Northstowe. Accessibility would depend on provision of good public transport links.
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	(? / - / -)	(? / - / -)	(? / - / -)	Limited educational and employment facilities in the vicinity, though both could be improved by development at Northstowe.
Summary of assessment: The Local Plan notes this allocation is necessitated by lack of development at previously allocated sites. Notwithstanding this the site takes some agricultural land on the west of the village, while the limited local amenities and employment suggest an increase in trips many of which may be by private car. The overall impact may be reduced in the medium term (or longer) if the community benefits from the creation of new amenities and employment in Northstowe, and if good public transport links are available.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: See above.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

SP/1g – Bassingbourn, North of High Street – SITE REMOVED FROM SUBMISSION DRAFT

0.6 hectares supporting 18 dwellings.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives
[abridged in some cases]

	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	?	?	?	Current use of the land cannot be determined from desk survey, however it appears open at present.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	-	-	-	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	-	-	-	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	Site infills at the edge of the existing village and is assumed to have negligible biodiversity value.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	++	++	++	Local Plan identifies presence of Medieval remains on the site and makes provision for their inspection. This will need to be reflected in the subsequent development brief for this site.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	(-)	(-)	(-)	Housing to the east and north appear to be of moderate density, and will help to integrate

				the somewhat higher density of this development into this area. The allocation comprises two sections, the smaller of which lies within a conservation area, while the larger adjoins it, requiring careful design to integrate the new development into its surroundings. The eastern edge of the development overlooks open countryside and this will have to be taken into account in design or landscaping.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	Negligible impact assumed due to the small size of the development, however light spill at the settlement edge should be avoided. The Local Plan comments on possible traffic impacts and the need for junction improvements in Kneesworth.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	-	-	-	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	+	+	+	Bassingbourn is limited rural growth centre with a modest range of local facilities
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	(+ / - / ?)	(+ / - / ?)	(+ / - / ?)	Lack of secondary school capacity. Good public transport links to Cambridge and Royston which is nearest source of employment.
Summary of assessment: A relatively small allocation that appears appropriate to Bassingbourn's status as a limited growth centre.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: Need for sensitive design to integrate the development into the conservation area and to prevent adverse visual impacts on adjacent open The Local Plan notes archaeological remains are on the site and these must be inspected, and also possible traffic impacts which may require junction improvements in neighbouring Kneesworth.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

SP/1h – Highfields Caldecote – SITE REMOVED FROM SUBMISSION DRAFT

4.4 hectares supporting 76 dwellings.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	?	?	?	Development on a small amount of agricultural/open land that is surrounded by housing and therefore of limited value.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	-(-)	-(-)	-(-)	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	-(-)	-(-)	-(-)	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	See 1.1.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	-	-	-	Local Plan maps suggest this is part of a large area to be developed and which appears to be a potentially significant increase in the size of the settlement. However although the

				site is described as residual, it is not clear what development is already planned for the remaining 7 hectares. Moreover the density proposed is substantially higher than that in the rest of the village.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	-	-	-	Lack of local employment and school capacity could both affect trip volumes. Some screening of the development from the properties to the east and west may be necessary if the higher density affects design, and the Local Plan notes the need for noise abatement measures due to dog kennels at the sound end of the site. Road access to the site is also potentially problematic.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	-(-)	-(-)	-(-)	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	+	+	+	Recreational space recently provided within the settlement. This might be supplemented by developer contributions related to this site which might be used to fund other amenities alternatively.
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	(+)	(+)	(+)	Could be an improvement if open space is designed into the development.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	-	-	-	2000 survey suggests the wider settlement of Caldecote lacks any amenities.
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	(? / - / -)	(? / - / -)	(? / - / -)	Size of overall development, coupled with limited primary school capacity in 2000, lack of local secondary school capacity and employment suggests this is a problem for this site. The need for additional primary capacity is acknowledged in the Local Plan as a pre-requisite for further development.
Summary of assessment: Appears a potentially problematic site due to the location of the plot within two lines of housing, some problems of road access, the lack of employment, services and amenities in the village, and the potential difficulty of blending the high density proposed for this site into a ribbon-settlement in which most properties have large gardens.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: See above for priorities.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified; principal impacts are primary.				

SP/1i – Comberton, East of Swaynes Lane – SITE REMOVED FROM SUBMISSION DRAFT

1.21 hectares supporting 25 dwellings.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	-	-	-	Appears to involve loss of open land though its use cannot be determined at this stage. However we note that development permission for the site was given back in 1993.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	-(-)	-(-)	-(-)	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	-(-)	-(-)	-(-)	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	-	-	-	Possible loss of open land - biodiversity value uncertain but it currently borders open farmland that lies in the Green Belt.

2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	(+)	(+)	(+)	Qualified positive assessment as the Local Plan acknowledges the need to landscape the eastern side of the site which forms the village periphery (policy GB/3 applies). The allocation also provides for a density below that required by policy HG/1 and we assume this provides for appropriate design to integrate it into the low density housing to the north and west.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	(-)	(-)	(-)	Limited public transport, though effect offset by small scale of the development. Local Plan also notes Highways Agency approval needed to access plans for the site.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	-(-)	-(-)	-(-)	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	(-)	(-)	(-)	Some need for local sports facilities although the modest size of the development suggests this may not be appropriate.
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	No obvious impact.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	(-)	(-)	(-)	Limited facilities in the village but again offset by small size of the development.
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	(+ / - / -)	(+ / - / -)	(+ / - / -)	Primary school capacity only. Limited public transport access to employment sites, many of which on the closest side of Cambridge.
Summary of assessment: A small development where Local Plan proposals (which are assumed to be reflected in a subsequent development brief) allow for low density to provide appropriate visual mitigation given the site's position between the edge of the Green Belt and low-density housing to toward the village heart.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: Visual mitigation of the border with the Green Belt.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

SP/1j – Fowlmere, East of Long Lane – SITE REMOVED FROM SUBMISSION DRAFT

0.9 hectares supporting 16 dwellings.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

[abridged in some cases]

	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	(-)	(-)	(-)	Appears to result in loss of open land in the core of the village though it is assumed this is not public land.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	-	-	-	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	-	-	-	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	?	?	?	Fowlmere Watercress beds SSSI approximately half mile to the east, outside the village framework. This is a water-sensitive environment although the nature and size of the development suggests it would not pose problems.
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	(-)	(-)	(-)	Appears to remove open land from the core of the village although the biodiversity value

				of this plot cannot be determined.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	(--)	(--)	(--)	Local Plan refers to archaeological significance of the site in terms of the development of the settlement, and the existing of remains within it. The Plan suggests these assets could survive redevelopment, although this cannot be determined without a more detailed development brief.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	--	--	--	New development will occur within the conservation area and the need to integrate it with much lower density housing (which, from its pattern, appears to have evolved piecemeal) suggests a considerable design challenge.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	-	-	-	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	?	?	?	Section 46106 agreement being used to secure affordable housing rather than contribution to recreation (or other amenities).
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	?	?	?	May be small improvement from open space on the development.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	-	-	-	Very limited village facilities although impact limited by modest scale of the development.
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	(? / ++ / -)	(? / ++ / -)	(? / ++ / -)	Good secondary school capacity at Melbourn but there is little local employment and limited transport links to Cambridge.
Summary of assessment: There are sustainability concerns about this allocation which would introduce new housing into a conservation area in the heart of an old settlement. The Local Plan identifies archaeological remnants are on the site and suggests these could survive redevelopment, though this cannot be substantiated at this time. Although modest in scale the development also occurs in a village with relatively few amenities, employment or transport links.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: Sympathetic design and archaeological survey and preservation (if warranted) are essential.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None, provided the scale of development does not affect groundwater levels.				

SP/1k – Girton, North of Thornton Road – ~~SITE REMOVED FROM SUBMISSION DRAFT~~

9.45 hectares supporting 277 dwellings.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	-	-	Development takes agricultural land which lies outside the current Green Belt.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	--	--	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	--	--	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	?	?	Mainly appears to entail loss of open land with minimal loss of hedgerows.

2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	(+)	(+)	The adopted Local Plan notes the presence of archaeological finds and the need for examination and appropriate treatment. This is not repeated in the DPD text.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	(-)	(-)	Its impact will depend to some degree on its design but the development represents a potentially large extension to the part of Girton to the south of the A14. This will be reduced by the inclusion of open space and community facilities. Note also that the current details suggest a housing density slightly below the 30 dwellings/ha. threshold although this appears to be higher than the layout of the surrounding housing.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	+	+(+)	Girton appears relatively well-served by public transport links into Cambridge centre, and the Local Plan notes there is small-scale B1 employment within the village. The 2000 village assessment identifies the Northern Fringe business parks as centres of employment and these are within cycling distance of Girton. Accessibility could be improved by orbital bus links.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	--	--	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	++	++	++	2004 survey notes the village is well served by recreational facilities.
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	+	+	Proposal includes open space provision to improve availability in the southern half of the village.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	(+)	+	Proposal also provides for improved communal facilities – again the Local Plan notes these are largely concentrated to the north of the A14, where the villages limited retail facilities are concentrated. It is not clear whether this situation will lead new residents to use the village centre or to travel into the city centre.
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	(~ / - / ?)	(~ / - / ?)	Limited primary school capacity in 2000; secondary school capacity in Impington is already above capacity; and there is limited local employment, although see comments for 4.1.

Summary of assessment: A sizeable development on the northern side of the part of Girton lying south of the A14. The main issues appear to be the integration of such a large extension into that part of the settlement, although this is offset somewhat by improving open space and provision of community facilities in the southern half of the community.

Summary of mitigation proposals: Principal mitigation requirement appears to be integrating the development into the existing settlement, recognising that it will have higher building density than in the adjacent, established areas. See below also.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: Possible impact on car commuting to the business park area if there is inadequate cycle access across to the east.

SP/11 – Guilden Morden, Off Church Lane – ~~SITE REMOVED FROM SUBMISSION DRAFT~~

0.59 hectares supporting 18 dwellings.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural	(--)	(--)	(--)	Size of development exceeds the threshold for Group villages, and it is not evident from

holdings				desk research that it will use brownfield land which provides the case for exceptional development. This may require clarification, however use of the land for housing has been established in the adopted Local Plan.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	-	-	-	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	-	-	-	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	Impact assumed to be negligible but depends on current land use.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	+	+	+	Local Plan notes the likelihood of some remains on site and the development brief should make provision for expansion.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	-	-	-	The plot lies within the village framework but outside the large conservation area. Nevertheless the surrounding housing is low density and this will require careful integration through good design and possibly landscaping or screening.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	-	-	-	Need to prevent light spill if this adversely affects the area (it is assumed much of the village is unlit at night). Lack of local employment and amenities suggests an increase in trips though the allocation represents a relatively small increase on the existing housing stock.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	-	-	-	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	?	?	?	2004 recreation survey identifies need for tennis facilities and pavilion improvements which might be sought through developer contributions, although the benefit is restricted by the small size of the development.
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	?	?	?	Local Plan refers to importance of open space within the village (there are two PVAAs) however the development would not affect them, and the low density nature of the surrounding housing suggests a need for open space within the development so it is integrated into its surroundings.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	-	-	-	The village has limited facilities, however the impact is assumed to be negligible due to the small size of the development.
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	(? / - / —)	(? / - / —)	(? / - / —)	The 2000 village survey notes the lack of employment within the village and within the vicinity.
Summary of assessment: A small proposal that suggests some problems of integrating new higher density development into the well established and open character of the settlement. Its sustainability is not improved by the lack of retailing and other amenities in what is a modest-sized village which has no employment within the vicinity.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: Main issues are again the need for careful design to mitigate the visual impact of higher density dwellings in a setting where other houses are widely spaced. There is also a need to provide for archaeological inspection, which will need to be reflected in the development brief for the site.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

SP/1m – Longstanton, North of Over Road – SITE REMOVED FROM SUBMISSION DRAFT

22.23 hectares supporting approximately 500 dwellings.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	—	---	Represents substantial loss of agricultural land, although the area has been identified previously in the Structure Plan and Local Plan as suitable for an extension of the village, and lies within the currently defined village framework.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	—	---	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	—	---	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	None identified nearby
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	—	---	Involves the loss of considerable area of open farmland which is crossed by a small brook and a number of field boundaries, which are assumed to be hedgerows.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	Effect assumed to be largely neutral as it is not clear what level of public rights of way are available across this land.
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	The area is at the opposite end of the village from conservation areas and known archaeological remnants to the east.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	—	---	The development represents a very significant extension of the village in an area of open countryside, and the Local Plan acknowledges the need for visual mitigation measures.

4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	?	?	The development represents a significant increase in dwellings and will require careful street design to ensure that lasting impacts of light spill are minimised since it extends the built-up area of Longstanton (although the area between the village and the A14 to the west is open farmland). Impact on traffic levels and emissions depends on growth in employment. The plan links the development to the need for a bypass for Longstanton but not to the provision of a business / research park to the south (see policy SP/4) or to provision of employment in Northstowe once it is built. The development appears to add to potential traffic using the B1050 and A14 to commute into Cambridge and therefore provision of a good link to a guided bus stop on the north edge of Northstowe appears vital in providing a travel choice for residents in this development and the existing village. Based on the 2000 village assessments, current bus services into Cambridge are modest. Nevertheless, the policy allows for the site to be half-developed before the bypass is complete and this suggests a potentially significant increase in road traffic on the B1050 and the access roads in the northern half of the village. It would therefore appear prudent to prioritise access provision from Over Road rather than from Station Road, Longstanton. The adopted Local Plan also notes that continued pig breeding on farms adjacent to the site will need to be taken into account when planning the development, and this implies the need to relocate these activities away from the area at some time.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	—	---	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	?	?	The western edge of the development abuts against the floodplain to the west of Longstanton and is crossed by a small brook. The floodplain will be more extensively impacted by the proposed bypass and it is therefore essential that a flood risk assessment is undertaken once the scheme is finalised to ensure that the road will not extend flood risk into the footprint of the development.
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	?	?	Impact is difficult to discern in terms of sustainable commuting, and the distance from principal employment sites suggests this will be negligible. There will be some benefit from including recreational space in the development, as indicated in the policy. The 2004 recreation survey notes the need to expand space to keep pace with the village's growing population, however this is addressed by an allocation in policy SP/7.
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	+	+	Will be incorporated into the development.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	+	++	Policy makes provision for limited local retail and health care facilities
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	(+ / ? / -)	(+ / ? / -)	2000 village survey shows adequate primary school capacity, but lack of secondary capacity at Swavesey, and a lack of employment in the village at present. School capacity needs may be addressed by the development of Northstowe, but priority there will be given to primary school provision, and development of the site is not linked to the creation of the business park on land allocated in policy SP/4.

Summary of assessment: This is the largest development in the plan, representing a very significant northwestern extension of Longstanton. The site has been assessed as suitable for development in previous plans, nevertheless it will still have substantial impacts in terms of its visibility from the surrounding land, demand for education and employment, and the effect both these will have on commuting patterns.

Summary of mitigation proposals: Access to the development should be prioritised towards Over Road to limit the impact on the existing village and ideally there might be a requirement to complete the bypass before a lower percentage of the development is complete, provided access can be provided (and subject to policy DP/3 point 2). Mitigation of the effects of construction will be necessary and is defined by policy DP/6. Screening and/or landscaping is recognised in the adopted Local Plan as necessary to limit the impact of the extension on the northwestern edge of the existing village and settlements to the north. Given the flat local terrain it appears this is more likely to involve vegetation screening, some of which can be integrated with mitigation measures for the bypass, which will also need to include noise abatement measures for the western edge of the development. This edge may also require modest flood protection as it abuts a floodplain to the west and these will need to be integrated with flood protection measures for the bypass which uses a substantial area of floodplain.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: There are clear cumulative impacts of this development taken alongside that of Northstowe, the first part of which is likely to be developed in a similar period. The need to limit access of construction traffic from the rural areas to the east of Longstanton suggest that impacts on traffic flows will start early and this would need careful coordination between master planning and operational planning for both this site and Northstowe. Furthermore, unless there is an early and substantial shift of commuter traffic onto the planned guided bus service, the development will add to local traffic requiring access to the A14 at Bar Hill, and contributing to congestion on the link into Cambridge and across to the northern business parks. Furthermore the scale of the development suggests a secondary impact on educational provision as existing secondary education facilities are above capacity and will not be provided early in the development of Northstowe.

SP/1n – Meldreth, North of Chiswick End – SITE REMOVED FROM SUBMISSION DRAFT

0.95 hectares supporting 29 dwellings.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	+(+)	+(+)	+(+)	Half of the site is in industrial/commercial use; the rest appears to be open land at present.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	-(-)	-(-)	-(-)	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	-(-)	-(-)	-(-)	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+	+	+	Replacement of current land use should be positive with design and visual mitigation as appropriate. This will be particularly important on the south side where housing is of low density, and the north and west where the development will form the periphery of the village (policies GB/3 and GB/4 apply in terms of visual impact even though the adjacent land is not in the Green Belt).
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	++	++	++	Good public transport links to Royston, Cambridge and London. Nature of current business use cannot be determined and issues of contamination, etc. may need to be addressed. The Local Plan notes traffic nuisance of this site though it is not known what

				level of employment there is and where the change in land use would improve or worsen the situation.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	-(-)	-(-)	-(-)	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	(+)	(+)	(+)	Meldreth station is relatively accessible on foot.
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	?	?	?	Appears to involve loss of some open space though it is not known if there is public access at present.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	?	?	?	Limited local facilities suggest some incremental increase in commuting for non-work trips.
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	(- / ++ / ++)	(- / ++ / ++)	(- / ++ / ++)	Only problem appears to be local primary school capacity. Good links to employment locally and in London.
Summary of assessment: Another development with no obvious sustainability issues provided design integrates it effectively into the neighbouring housing and village periphery.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: Possible need for contamination remediation, depending on current industrial land use, and design essentials specified above.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: Not clear if the traffic problems of the existing site will be improved or worsened by the change in land use.				

SP/1o – Oakington, North of Coles Lane – SITE REMOVED FROM SUBMISSION DRAFT

1.2 hectares supporting approximately 39 dwellings.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	-(-)	-(-)	-(-)	Appears to take open land beyond the current edge of the village but within the defined framework.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	-	-	-	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	-	-	-	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	-	-	-	Loss of open land with no indication of whether compensation would be sought through developer contributions, or whether it is feasible.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	---	---	---	Local Plan notes that the land has traces of ridge and furrow structure which would be destroyed by development even if prior inspection is mandated.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	?	?	?	East edge of site borders the conservation area and will need to be integrated with careful design. The proposed density is clearly higher than the adjacent properties and it is not clear what road access is available.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	?	?	?	Difficult to judge but may be negligible given the relatively small size of the development.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	-	-	-	

4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	-	-	-	Recreation survey notes poor quality of current facilities at recreation areas.
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	?	(+)	(+)	Limited facilities in Oakington, but these will be supplemented by development at Northstowe.
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	(? / - / ++)	(? / - / ++)	(? / - / ++)	Conveniently located for new employment at Northstowe, and reasonably close to business parks and other areas in Girton and Histon.
Summary of assessment: The main concern with this allocation is the possible irrevocable destruction of ridge and furrow field structures, though it is not clear of its local importance or whether other examples are preserved elsewhere in the vicinity. The development is small in scale and will fill in one of the last open areas in the village framework.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: Visual mitigation (some through planting, some through design) will be necessary to limit the intrusion of the new development on the larger properties in, and character of, the conservation area immediately to the east. Other measures will be necessary on the northern side of the plot to ensure its impact on adjacent open land is minimised and subject to policies GB/1 and DP/3.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: Some potential cumulative effect taken with policy SP/1p which will add almost 70 new dwellings to the village.				

SP/1p – Oakington, South of Water Lane – SITE REMOVED FROM SUBMISSION DRAFT

1.06 hectares supporting approximately 32 dwellings.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	++	++	++	Will occupy part of current council depot site.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	-	-	-	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	-	-	-	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	

3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+	+	+	Local Plan notes that current residents regard the depot as a 'bad neighbour' even if its operation is controlled to limit impact. A change of land use would therefore improve the situation if the scale of operation is reduced, although this is implications for achieving objective 4.1 (see below). The development lies between the conservation area and Green Belt boundary and appears to require a higher density than that of surrounding properties, so good design and careful integration with the village and peripheral setting will be essential.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	?	?	?	Redevelopment may reduce the operations in the depot although the development will need careful screening and mitigation, particularly if it lies between the existing adjoining properties and the working area. See also 5.3 below.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	-	-	-	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	-	-	-	As for SP/1p.
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	+	+	+	Part of the site appears to overlook tennis courts and the village graveyard, and therefore a change in land use which reduces impacts from the depot on these potentially sensitive receptors would be an improvement on the quality of these areas.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	?	(+)	(+)	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	(? / - / ++)	(? / - / ++)	(? / - / ++)	As for SP/1o.
Summary of assessment: Appears more sustainable than SP/1o as it would result in replacement of part of a council depot that is not popular with existing residents with a more integrated form of land use.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: Care needed in integrating higher density of dwellings with surrounding areas, and with the conservation area and Green Belt edge to either side.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: As for SP/1o.				

SP/1q – Over, North of Chapman Way – ~~SITE REMOVED FROM SUBMISSION DRAFT~~

0.38 hectares supporting 14 dwellings.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	?	?	?	Uses residue of earlier development. Land is assumed to be currently unused although nature of use is not known.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	-	-	-	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	-	-	-	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	

2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+	+	+	Local Plan notes the need to limit visual impact on the adjoining sports field which is a PVAA and therefore the provisions of policy CH/6 would apply. Some care is likely to be needed in integrating the higher density housing with the adjacent properties which are of a lower density.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	-	-	-	Negligible impact assumed due to the size of the development. However the Local Plan advises access via Mill Lane which involves a long route doubling back through the eastern edge of the village and adding to traffic in this area. It is not evident from the available information why access cannot be provided at the southwest edge of the site from Chapman Way.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	-	-	-	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	++	++	++	Recreation survey notes excellent quality of facilities.
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	Neutral impact provided the development does not adversely affect the setting of the playing field.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	?	?	?	Over has limited local facilities for a sizeable (in terms of area) settlement although the situation will improve once the District Centre at Northstowe is established.
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	(+ / - / + +)	(+ / - / + +)	(+ / - / + +)	Primary school had capacity in 2000. Good public transport links to Cambridge (also some to Huntingdon), and employment within the village, and relatively nearby at the Cambridge Northern Fringe (and Northstowe in due course). The village is close to but not on the proposed Rapid Transit route.
Summary of assessment: A small development in a large village with few sustainability issues. The settlement has limited facilities although there is local employment, and both issues are assumed to improve once the initial phase of Northstowe is complete.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: Need for careful visual design to prevent the development affecting the setting of the adjacent playing fields. The Local Plan proposes access to the development via a circuitous route (rather than from Chapman Way), which would add to traffic in the eastern part of the village.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

SP/1r – Papworth Everard, East of Ermine Street South – ~~SITE REMOVED FROM SUBMISSION DRAFT~~

3.81 hectares supporting 135 dwellings.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives
[abridged in some cases]

	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	(+)	(+)	Described in the Local Plan as the infilling of land originally part of Papworth Hall, but as such it is not strictly brownfield land.

1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	-(-)	-(-)	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	-(-)	-(-)	The 2000 village survey notes limited capacity at the current Cambridge Sewage Treatment Works.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	?	?	The northwestern edge of the development would be around 400m from the edge of Papworth Wood SSSI, an important secondary woodland area. Further investigation of this impact is continuing, however mitigation measures from construction impacts would be needed regardless of the scale and timing of development. (The site is more likely to be impacted by the possible redevelopment of the hospital site – see policy SP/11).
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	(+)	(+)	The adopted Local Plan notes the need to preserve a belt of trees lying between the south edge of the site (designated as a PVAA) and an adjacent industrial area, and to ensure appropriate landscape measures are included in the scheme design to retain the open aspect of the area. These points are not currently reflected in the policy wording, and it is not clear whether the requirement would be restated in supplementary guidance.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	(+)	(+)	The northeastern edge of the area provides access to roads and tracks out to the east of the village, although access needs to be managed carefully to prevent disturbance of the SSSI.
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	?	?	As with 2.2, the Local Plan states the need for development that respects the setting of Papworth Hall and its grounds and this will need to be accommodated in the scheme design and enforced through the EIA process. Once again this requirement is not stated in the current policy text, and the conditions of policy CH/5 would apply as the grounds are a conservation area. There is also a scheduled ancient monument in the northeastern edge of the grounds of the hall within the conservation area.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	(-)	(-)	Impact depends on the scheme design, however the policy suggests a density of 35 dwellings/ha. which is clearly at odds with the open aspect of the current site and the generous grounds of many of the houses at the south-western end of the site along Ermine Street. This suggests good design and screening will be necessary to limit the visual impact, particularly given the need to respect the parkland setting of Papworth Hall.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	-	-	Landscaping / screening and other design aspects will be needed to limit the intrusion of noise and light from the development into the parkland area to the north. The policy predicates development on contributions to the cost of the Papworth bypass but this suggests development could precede completion of the road. Traffic impacts depend on employment patterns, and with only a small business park to the south, any new residents not working in the hospital would have to commute to Cambridge, Huntingdon or St Ives, which are served by bus routes with moderate frequency (based on the 2000 village assessment)
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	-(-)	-(-)	See 1.3.

4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	+(+)	+(+)	+(+)	Generally good range and quality of facilities.
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	?	?	It is not clear from desk research whether the development occupies land that is currently open to the public, in which case the assessment would be negative. If this is not the case then policy SF/12 should ensure an increase in open space within the development. Equally, there should be access to rights of way to the east of the village (see 2.1. above).
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	-	-	Development is purely residential and services/amenities in Papworth are limited at present, resulting in additional shopping trips to nearby market towns including Cambourne. These are linked by bus services although there is no information at present about the level of usage.
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	(? / - / +)	(? / - / +)	2000 survey shows very limited primary school capacity, and no capacity for secondary education. Given the maturity and specialised nature of the hospital facilities it is assumed there will be limited employment which is more likely to be found in Cambourne to the south, or in the market towns to the north, and in Cambridge.

Summary of assessment: A sizeable development that will require sensitive design to accommodate dwelling densities higher than those in the rest of the village, and which do not adversely affect the visual character of the area which is part of the grounds of Papworth Hall. Along with policy SP/1t, development will pressure on local education and new residents are more likely to seek work in Cambridge or the market towns to the north.

Summary of mitigation proposals: There is a clear need to protect the setting of Papworth Hall and the open land to the east from the effect of moderately dense new housing, and the rolling nature of the area may mean a mixture of vegetational and physical landscaping can be used. Specific mitigation measures to prevent impacts on the SSSI not far to the north must be implemented and will need to be defined in the detailed scheme and tested through the EIA process.

The policy states that developer contributions to the cost of the Papworth bypass would be sought. The lack of local employment and limited local facilities suggest the development could add to traffic in the south of the village, and it appears advisable to link the phasing of the development to the bypass.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: The principal secondary / cumulative impacts concern the effect of a substantial increase in population as a result of the parallel development of sites 3A and 3C in Papworth. Both will put strain on existing educational facilities and amenities, and the limited provision of core services in the village suggests an increase in local traffic if residents travel to nearby centres for these facilities. At this stage it is not clear to what extent development to either side of Ermine Street will be coordinated. Any impact in terms of dust, etc. on the SSSI must be avoided, and we assume also that this development would not occur in parallel with any redevelopment of the hospital site (see policy SP/11) which would cause further cumulative environmental quality and traffic impacts (see also the assessment for SP/1t).

SP/1s – Papworth Everard, West of Ermine Street North – ~~SITE REMOVED FROM SUBMISSION DRAFT~~

0.38 hectares supporting 11 dwellings.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	?	?	?	Appears to take a small area of open land though current use cannot be established at this time.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	Negligible impact alongside the scale of SP/1r and SP/1t.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	

2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	Site is remove from Papworth Wood SSSI so no impact assumed.
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	?	?	Local Plan notes the need for visual mitigation to screen the proposed bypass, and this may also be needed along the south of the site which adjoins hospital accommodation.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	?	?	Need for careful control of construction due to proximity of the accommodation mentioned above.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	See 1.3.
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	+(+)	+(+)	+(+)	As for policy SP/1r.
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	-	-	As for policy SP/1r.
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	(? / - / ?)	(? / - / ?)	As for policy SP/1r.
Summary of assessment: A small development with few impacts, especially when considered alongside the more substantial growth involved in SP/1r and SP/1t.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: Visual mitigation of views across to the proposed bypass, and to limit construction impact on hospital accommodation along the south of the site.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified, though clearly it will contribute marginally to the impacts of the three allocations for Papworth, as well as the employment allocation (see policy SP/5) and possible redevelopment of the hospital site (policy SP/11) .				

SP/1t – Papworth Everard, West of Ermine Street South

11.98 hectares supporting 359 dwellings.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	--(-)	---	Appears to take a substantial area of open land.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	---	----	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	---	----	The 2000 village survey notes limited capacity at the current Cambridge Sewage Treatment Works.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	?	?	Site is less than 1 km from the Papworth Wood SSSI and therefore there is a potential impact from air pollution in particular during development of the site.

2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	-	-	Detail not evident from maps, but the Local Plan comments on the presence of tree belts around the village and it appears this development could result in the removal or truncation of some of these. In this event mitigation of the habitat / feature will be necessary and could be integrated with mitigation of visual impacts.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	Not evident at this stage and access to the west of the village and the development should not be truncated by the bypass, with appropriate provision made for safe crossing points.
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	?	?	This development does not offer the same integration challenge as plot 3A (policy SP/1r), nevertheless its northern end will lie opposite the parkland area surrounding Papworth Hall, separated only by Ermine Street and a single line of widely-spaced houses either side of the road. This suggests site design will need to pay attention to visual impact mitigation in this area. The Local Plan also notes that the northwestern edge of the development will lie close to the conservation area surrounding St Peters' Church, and mitigation to prevent adverse impact on its setting will be necessary.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	(-)	(--)	Even more than with policy SP/1r this development results in a substantial extension of the village into an open area. Housing density will only achieve the minimum threshold, but this is still higher than that of the adjoining properties along Ermine Street South, and the setting of the hospital accommodation blocks at the north end of the site. The Local Plan notes that the development would be situated on a slight ridge alongside the main road, and this will clearly require screening / landscaping to restrict visual impact, in parallel with measures to limit visual intrusion on the village and conservation area to the north, and the open land and (proposed) bypass to the west. Other issues of integrating the higher density design with village character and the requirements of other policies (eg. on open space) will need to be addressed in the detailed scheme design.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	-	--	There is clear potential for sizeable impact during construction and the impact of noise, light and air quality in particular would have to be mitigated to prevent adverse effects on the residential properties to the east of the development, open land to the west, and accommodation blocks to the north. Impacts from dust must be avoided in terms of their effect on the SSSI to the east of the village. The development also raises concerns about air quality as for SP/1r, although on a greater scale due to the volume of housing growth.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	-(-)	--	See 1.3.
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	Lies to the south of currently estimated flood risk area.
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	+(+)	+(+)	+(+)	As for policy SP/1r. The 2004 recreation survey identifies some need for infrastructure improvements for local recreation which might be addressed through developer contributions. Post consultation change clarifies that the development will, although the policy text suggests funding fund construction offer the bypass is the priority for this allocation and SP/1r.

5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	?	?	It is not clear from desk research whether the development occupies land that is currently open to the public, in which case the assessment would be negative. If this is not the case then policy SF/12 should ensure an increase in open space within the development. Equally, there should be access to rights of way to the west of the village. This should be coordinated with the development brief for the bypass which should prevent the truncation of rights of way and provide for safe crossing points.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	-	-	As for policy SP/1r.
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	(? / - / ?)	(? / - / ?)	As for policy SP/1r.

Summary of assessment: The assessment is best summarised as the same as for policy SP/1r, only more so, due to the size of the development.

Summary of mitigation proposals: There will be a need to integrate the internal design of the development with extensive visual mitigation measures protecting houses along the main road, the setting of Papworth Hall, open land to the west, and the hospital area and conservation area to the north. It is not clear how the construction might be phased with that of the eastern site, and also with the possible redevelopment of an industrial area on the southeast edge of the village (see policy SP/5). Noise mitigation will be especially important at the north end of the site due to the proximity of hospital grounds. As with SP/1r, it may be prudent to directly link the phasing of the development with construction of the bypass (not just its financing) to limit transport impacts. Moreover one of the principal access points appears to be at the extreme south of the site, opposite the entrance to the current (and possibly enlarged) industrial area, and this suggests a need for a small roundabout to control flow and access to both side roads.

We also note that policies SP/1r and SP/1t seek developer contributions for the bypass although the 2004 recreation survey identifies the need for some infrastructure improvements which might be delivered through one of these two policies.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: The main impacts are as for policy SP/1r. The principal concern is the cumulative impact of development at this site with that to the east of Ermine Street, the possible redevelopment of an industrial land allocation, and the construction of the Papworth bypass. All of these developments are potentially scheduled for the near future and suggest a prolonged period of disruption in a setting containing many highly sensitive receptors. These issues suggest the need for thorough coordination of the development briefs for each of the development although prolonged if not cumulative impact appears inevitable if all the developments go forward.

SP/1u – Steeple Morden, North of Ashwell Road – SITE REMOVED FROM SUBMISSION DRAFT

0.96 hectares supporting 10 dwellings.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	++	++	++	Re-uses land currently occupied by a waste transfer station.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	(-)	(-)	(-)	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	(-)	(-)	(-)	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	+	+	+	Outline of development proposal given in Local Plan suggests replacement of industrial land with mixed use including open space, which should be beneficial.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	++	++	++	Local Plan details specific requirement for restoration of a mill, and we assume this will be

				reflected in a site development brief.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	++	++	++	Again, the Plan provides for appropriate landscaping to preserve the setting of the mill, and we assume this explains the low density. Nevertheless the landscaping requirements for the mill suggests only a portion of the available land will be used for housing and therefore careful design to integrate it into the adjacent housing and setting will be necessary. However the change in land use is presumably advantageous.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	?	?	?	Limited impact due to small size of development. There are concerns about contamination due to the current land use, though these are offset by the improvement in the immediate environment once the WTS closes.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	(-)	(-)	(-)	Assessment assumes the waste transfer station will be relocated and not lost.
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	-	-	-	Limited impact; depends on use of land surrounding the mill. However the 2004 recreation survey notes the poor quality of the facilities in the village.
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	+	+	+	Open land around the mill.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	(-)	(-)	(-)	Limited bus service to Royston and a single village shop.
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	(? / - / -)	(? / - / -)	(? / - / -)	Limited access to Royston and limited local employment. Not clear whether the mill is to be restored as a heritage asset or whether appropriate small-scale local employment can be developed. Limited primary school capacity and no secondary.
Summary of assessment: A small low density development capable of improving character in a quarter of the village by replacing a waste transfer station and incorporating renovation of a listed building on the site. Development is consistent with policy ST/4 although the lack of local amenities and employment suggests an incremental increase in commuting levels.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: Appropriate design considerations for the housing and survey of land contamination given the current land use. The assessment assumes the waste facility will be relocated and not lost (which would be unsustainable).				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

SP/1v – Heathfield, West of Kingsway

1.22 hectares supporting approximately 37 dwellings.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	++	++	++	Uses part of former military camp.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	-	-	-	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	-	-	-	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	

2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	+	+	Site partly occupied but biodiversity value is unclear. Local Plan requires provision of open space.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	?	?	?	Local Plan refers to scheduled monument on the north west of the site but there is no evidence of this on details supplied by the Council or on the proposals map. It is not clear whether this is in fact an oblique reference to Duxford Camp and museum, however further investigation of this asset is clearly necessary.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+	+	+	Will infill between open countryside and mix of military housing and industrial/commercial land uses on the west side of the settlement, and screening of the latter from the open land to the west may be beneficial. The Local Plan states the requirement for open space between the housing and the commercial land both for recreation and visual mitigation.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	-	-	-	Limited bus services and lack of amenities and local employment (see 7.1) suggest an incremental increase in commuting by car. Local Plan notes need for noise abatement measures at the south end of the site which is passed by the A505.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	-	-	-	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	+	+	+	Provision of open recreational space beneficial as it addresses local shortcoming.
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	+	+	+	As above.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	+	+	Local Plan and DPD text both refer to intention to use Section 46106 contributions to assist provision of community facilities though it is not clear whether this will include a shop.
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	(- / - / -)	(- / - / -)	(- / - / -)	Village survey has no information about schools although most of the village is a small former military camp and it is assumed none is available. Some bus services into Cambridge but limited employment in the vicinity (possibly in Duxford itself?).

Summary of assessment: A small infilling on former military land. The scale of the development and lack of facilities in the existing settlement make it difficult to justify on sustainability grounds, although will provide an opportunity to secure developer contributions for village amenities.

Summary of mitigation proposals: Need for careful design reflecting policies GB/1 and DP/3 as the site is bounded by the Green Belt, and noise abatement along the A505.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.

SP(x) – Bayer Cropscience, Hauxton

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

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

[abridged in some cases]

	<u>Assessment</u>			<u>Comments / Proposed Mitigation</u>
	<u>Short</u>	<u>Med.</u>	<u>Long</u>	
<u>1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural</u>	<u>+++</u>	<u>+++</u>	<u>+++</u>	<u>Clearly positive – no greenfield land take envisaged. Moreover the site is not currently part</u>

<u>holdings</u>				<u>of the Green Belt any extension would contravene other policies in the LDF.</u>
<u>1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>In principle there is an absolute negative impact due to the more varied and possibly intensive use of the land compared to the current use which may include some processes that require substantial energy. This is an opportunity to reduce this impact with more energy efficient structures.</u>
<u>1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>As for 1.2.</u>
<u>2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species</u>	<u>≈</u>	<u>≈</u>	<u>≈</u>	
<u>2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>It is not evident that redevelopment would strictly affect this objective although it does not appear to have an adverse impact.</u>
<u>2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places</u>	<u>+(+)</u>	<u>+(+)</u>	<u>+(+)</u>	<u>We understand the initial proposal provides for some improvement of the existing rights of way along the adjacent Cam (although an initial desk survey suggests none exist on the west bank which the site will occupy). We assume the Council would seek their delivery through planning obligations.</u>
<u>3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings</u>	<u>≈</u>	<u>≈</u>	<u>≈</u>	<u>There is a listed building (water mill) on the northern edge of the site, and we assume that redevelopment will respect its setting.</u>
<u>3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape</u>	<u>(+)</u>	<u>(+)</u>	<u>(+)</u>	<u>Impact depends on specific design which is not yet determined. Clearly there is potential to replace a highly visible industrial / office premises with development that has a lower elevation and part of which blends with the nearby residential areas. See also below.</u>
<u>3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well</u>	<u>(+)</u>	<u>(+)</u>	<u>(+)</u>	<u>Again this depends on the eventual design of the site. One issue identified in the initial assessment is the relationship between the site and the adjacent housing around St Edmund's church. A balance needs to be struck between mitigating the edge effects of the site on the existing village with the need to integrate it into its fabric, and this part of the site has a key role to play.</u>
<u>4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants</u>	<u>≈</u>	<u>=</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>As most of the site is no longer operational road traffic to / from it should have fallen, and redevelopment would therefore lead to adverse impacts following redevelopment and re-occupation in the medium-term. The initial brief recognises the possible synergies with development of the Trumpington West site as part of the Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP, and there is a clear opportunity to extend public transport services (shown in a 2000 survey to be fairly poor) past that site and across the M11 to Hauxton. See also comments against objective 6.1.</u>
<u>4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling</u>	<u>(-)</u>	<u>=</u>	<u>=</u>	<u>Negative in short term – assuming on-site processes may affect ability to re-use materials that are demolished. Later on growth will increase waste arisings on the site. (Any reduction in industrial / commercial and hazardous wastes is assumed to have occurred already.) This is a negative impact in absolute terms which could be offset to some degree by other LDF policies.</u>
<u>4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts</u>	<u>(-)</u>	<u>=</u>	<u>---</u>	<u>Around 20% of the site appears to lie in the functional (100-year event) floodplain of the Cam and therefore a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment would be required to identify any</u>

				measures needed in addition to those which already protect the industrial site in order to comply with PPG25.
<u>5.1 Maintain and enhance human health</u>	≈	≈	≈	There are various potential, incidental effects that are positive (activity from access to the Cam, using public transport to commute) and negative (noise and other impacts from re-development). None appears particularly significant and the adverse ones can be mitigated. There is a specific issue relating to road accidents on the A10 (a busy strategic route) and how best to provide access to the site, recognising the number of movements will increase compared to when it was in industrial use.
<u>5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime</u>	≈	≈	≈	
<u>5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space</u>	(+)	(+)	(+)	The current proposal is a little ambivalent about the disused recreational facilities on the west side of the A10 opposite the site, and this clearly provides an opportunity to assist in meeting open / recreational space targets through renovation rather than reallocation.
<u>6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities</u>	≈	±	++	The site appears to offer synergies with Trumpington West in providing a 'market' for a public transport link from the Trumpington Park & Ride to Hauxton. The collective growth might provide opportunity to seek financial contributions from the outset to sponsor an extended service which would provide access to the centre of Cambridge, shops and amenities in Trumpington, and employment on the enlarged Addenbrookes site. The latter two areas are also within easy cycling distance.
<u>6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.</u>	≈	?	?	Details of housing tenancy proposals are not known though it is assumed the development would make a contribution to affordable housing. The relatively distant location from amenities suggests it may be less suitable for special needs and similar housing unless there is a specific requirement in the village.
<u>6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing</u>	≈	?	?	As above.
<u>6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community</u>	≈	?	?	As indicated in the comments against 3.3, one concern is that the development sits at the northeast edge of the village and separated from the rest of the housing, the bulk of which lies approx. 0.5km south and contains the limited range of local amenities. Ideally the development should deliver communal facilities to encourage interaction, and this could include the sports field mentioned above.
<u>7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location</u>	≈	±	++	Assessment assumes that most of the site is no longer operating, so any development that delivers employment units is potentially supportive. We assume other Core Strategy and Development Control policies on the type of employment uses favoured, clustering, etc. will apply.
<u>7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure</u>	≈	≈	≈	(Marked as neutral though we assume planning obligations will be implemented to secure the necessary infrastructure).

<u>7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy</u>	~	±	±	<u>It is not known what effect closure of the site will have on the local employment market, however redevelopment for mixed use suggests a substantial degree of compensating growth which will replace need for sector-specific skills with a broader range of requirements.</u>
---	---	---	---	--

Summary of assessment: Generally a sustainable proposal with strengths in its re-use of brownfield land, proposal for mixed use development which can provide new jobs locally, and the opportunity it offers to seek contributions to benefit the wider village. It is interesting in terms of the scope it offers to integrate new public transport connections for the development with those at Trumpington West, and then also to the southern end of the Rapid Transit link at Addenbrookes.

Summary of mitigation proposals: Specific issues will need to be investigated once the development proposal is more comprehensive. However the extent of flood risk will require attention, as will the need for appropriate traffic management to coordinate increased access to the site with through traffic on the A10. Furthermore there is a need to develop a strategy for integrating the development into the existing settlement as its industrial use means that it has been isolated at one end of the village. Fortunately this is the end closest to Cambridge.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: The main impact concerns transport, and the potential synergy of a transport link also serving Trumpington West. Conversely there is a potential cumulative impact on road traffic from development at both these sites if public transport links are not provided and used.

SP/2 – Cambridge Northern Fringe West

Proposes redevelopment of an area of open land lying between the northern edge of Arbury and the A14. The site would be redeveloped for mixed land use comprising high-density housing, B1 employment uses, a small shopping facility and a station on the proposed Rapid Transit link to St Ives. The site is predominantly but not wholly within South Cambridgeshire.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	(-)	(-)	(-)	Development will entail loss of open land although it is not clear of its value given it is hemmed in between the A14 and suburbs.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	(+)	(++)	(+++)	Impact on fuel consumption by providing a transport interchange which also serves the existing northern suburbs is offset by the absolute impact of increased energy consumptions by housing and other land uses at the site.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	(-)	(--)	Absolute impact is negative due to change in land use.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	Not covered by any designations.
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	(+)	(+)	(+)	Biodiversity value is unclear but master planning / subsequent EIA might consider appropriate habitat compensation. However the policy text does provide for retaining 'features of ecological interest'.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	+	+	+	Recognises the need for appropriate treatment of the Arbury Camp archaeological site (this is not a scheduled monument but is assumed to appear in the SMR), favouring preservation in situ.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	?	?	?	Difficult to judge this as an adverse effect as the presence of the A14 to the north may have a degree of blighting effect.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	(+)	(+)	(+)	Cannot be assessed without at least a master plan, and the position of the site alongside

				the A14 presents particular challenges in terms of mitigating visual and noise impacts so that it become an attractive area to live.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	+	++	Longer term benefit assumed to be positive if the interchange facility affects commuting habits, although light spill northwards will need to be controlled as the site and land on the opposite side of the A14 are open at present.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	(-)	(--)	Absolute impact is negative due to change in land use.
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	(+)	(+)	(+)	Incremental improvement through provision of public open space within development on land that at present has no public access. There may be some rights of way but these are not extensive as they are truncated by the A14 to the north.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	+	++	Supported by mixed land use development and provision of the bus interchange. It is assumed that the layout of the area to be developed means it is impractical to provide access to the interchange from the A14 to provide a park & ride facility for this side of the city.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	+	++	Clearly intended to contribute to this objective when taken alongside policies DP/1 and HG/3.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	+	++	Policy provides for employment uses integrated within the development.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	+	+	Assumed to be positive; achievement of objectives such as this one are the primary reason for justifying development and the absolute impacts on land take, energy, etc. that it entails.

Summary of assessment: Overall a sustainable policy to redevelop land previously identified in the Structure and Local Plans as appropriate for redevelopment under the conditions defined in RPG6. Development will entail some adverse impacts, including the loss of open land and increased energy and water use. However this can be weighed against the benefits of providing an interchange with the guided bus route to encourage modal shift, the efficient use of the land for mixed development, including higher density housing, and the questionable importance of the land under its current use as it is hemmed in between Arbury and the A14. This last point suggests the need for appropriate mitigation of noise from the A14, and the impact of possible widening of that road is not addressed in the current policy. The text currently provides for protection of the Arbury Camp archaeological site however it is difficult to provide further assessment as a master plan is not yet available.

Summary of mitigation proposals: The principal challenge appears to be accommodating the high density of the development within a relatively small plot of land while meeting open space and good design standards, and creating an area that people will want to live in. The nature of mitigation will become clearer once the master plan is available. See below also.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: The principal synergistic effect is the opportunity to provide an interchange on the guided bus route which will serve residents of the development and those in Arbury to the south. This would be maximised if there are good east-west links through the site which is elongated, and it would be appropriate to seek improvements to bus services along Histon Road which abuts the west end of the development.

SP/3 – Cambridge Northern Fringe East: Chesterton Sidings

Proposes a mixed land-use development incorporating a rail interchange, housing and open space which needs to be integrated with north-south rail infrastructure and east-west routes which are primarily footpaths and towpaths to maximise its sustainability. The policy defines some broad objectives and content for the master plan of the site which has not yet been prepared. The site lies across the boundary between the District and Cambridge City.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	+	++	Uses brownfield land but current status means no benefits in the immediate future.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	(+)	+	Some possible demand for additional energy as a result of the development but this would be increasingly offset over time by reducing car use if the interchange facilitates modal shift.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	(-)	-	Redevelopment implies an increase in water consumption in absolute terms as the land is currently largely railway sidings.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	(+)	(+)	(+)	The policy acknowledges the presence of a protected species on the site. Its location and extent of its distribution is not known at this stage. The protection Schedule means that it cannot be transplanted and therefore its immediate habitat would need to be incorporated into the development, supported by measures to prevent disturbance. This would have some impact on the design, which could be a problem if it is in a central position.
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	Much of land assumed to be of limited biodiversity value (though this would need to be confirmed at the EIA stage), and any other appropriate comments are subsumed under 2.1.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	None identified at this stage.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	(+)	(+)	(+)	With good design the development can improve an area of potentially unsightly railway sidings. However it is overlooked by water meadows to the east in an area of relatively open aspect and the visual impact would need to be addressed, particularly if the development expands onto land to the east of the main rail line (covered by policy CNF6 in the adopted Local Plan, though some of this land is apparently proposed as a possible site for the travelling community).
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~(+)	~(+)	~(+)	The intended objective <u>which is reinforced by the post-consultation change requiring that development is considered both as a standalone and as part of a broader redevelopment of this quarter of the City and adjoining land in the District. However this;</u> cannot be

				assessed without a master plan.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	(+)	++	Benefit from reduced emissions would build if the development contributes to modal shift, although it will have some light impacts assuming the sidings are currently unlit. There will also be construction impacts due to limited road access, though this is primarily through an industrial area to the northwest.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	(-)	---	Increase inevitable in absolute terms as a result of the change in land use.
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	?	?	?	The eastern side of the area lies between the rail line and the edge of the Cam floodplain, and may need some flood protection measures to deal with rare events. The policy text refers to use of 'land within the river valley at Chesterton Fen' and we assume this refers to the land covered by CNF6 and does not imply extension onto the floodplain.
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	+	+	+	Potential benefit if interchange facility encourages more commuting on foot or cycle. The policy does refer to making use of the Cam towpath at the south end of the site to provide a link into Chesterton and the inner northern edge of Cambridge.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	(+)	+	Policy states requirement for open space to be designed into the development in line with policy SF/12.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	+	++	Clearly supports this objective in providing an interchange between the rail line and proposed Rapid Transit link out to St Ives. However it is not clear what impact this will have on commuting patterns. There is an area of industrial land to the northwest of the site which is largely occupied by the Cambridge Sewage Treatment Works. This facility is to be reduced in size offering potential for redevelopment next to a transport node and this might encourage people working in new businesses to commute by alternative modes, however this is not a function of this policy. Apart from this the primary impact of the interchange appears to benefit people living in the new development and in the housing areas to the southwest as it would provide rail, bus and other links to the city centre. However it would also provide interchange between the rail and bus systems which could benefit those living along and using the Rapid Transit system in the northern part of the District.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	Difficult to assess impact at this stage, any benefits are mainly in terms of affordable housing and development close to public transport (ie. benefiting those without cars).
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	+	+(+)	Policies DP/1 and HG/3 mean this development would contribute to affordable housing stock.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	+	+(+)	Supports the objective of improved access by non-car modes which will particularly benefit those commuting in from northern villages along the rail and bus routes.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and	~	+	++	Supportive.

infrastructure				
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	The adopted Local Plan mentions possible inclusion of B1 uses in the development although we understand the primary focus is now on residential and transport uses.
Summary of assessment: The overall impact of the development is a little difficult to judge at this stage without a master plan indicating the layout of land uses, nevertheless it is clearly supportive of sustainable transport objectives and guidance in PPS1 which advocates mixed land-use development integrated with transport interchanges. The assessment assumes the primary benefits will be from the interchange between rail, guided bus, walking and cycling routes, and these will be available to residents in the new development, those in housing to the southwest, and those commuting into Cambridge from the north on rail and bus links.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: The policy acknowledges the presence of a protected species on the site, the nature of which means it would have to be left in situ, affecting site design. The area to the east of the site is largely open watermeadow (with some vegetation barriers) and the design would need to incorporate elements to mitigate visual impact as well as providing some flood protection at the eastern edge which abuts the Cam floodplain. In human terms, the key priority will be to ensure good access from the interchange to the employment sites to the northwest as this will help to encourage modal shift.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: The principal synergistic impact is the opportunity to shift commuters from cars onto alternative transport modes, and providing good links from the site to adjacent employment areas will be just as important as providing an interchange for links into the city centre (recognising also that Cambridge station is not located centrally).				

SP/4 – Allocations for class B1 employment uses

Proposed allocating two sites at Longstanton (6.3ha for mixed business and research use) and Pampisford (2.3ha for business use).

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
In the assessments below, where appropriate, the first symbol refers to Longstanton; the second to Pampisford				
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~ / ~	- / ?	- / ?	Development at Longstanton appears to take open land though it is not known if this is agricultural or fallow. There is a cumulative loss of land as a result of the planned bypass for the village. Land at Pampisford is partially brownfield but there is a part at the west side of the site which may be agricultural or fallow.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~ / ~	(-) / (-)	- / -	Development of both sites would have an absolute impact on energy use, although their size would be limited alongside the potentially greater demands of the new settlements planned for the District.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~ / ~	(-) / (-)	- / -	As above
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	No problems evident at either site.
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~ / ~	- / ?	- / ?	At Longstanton there is uncertainty about the intrinsic wildlife value of the open land, although the impact of the development would be limited somewhat by a parkland design which maximised retention of the existing vegetation features. Given its proximity to industrial land uses the potential biodiversity value of the site at Pampisford appears lower, although this would need to be assessed during EIA if development proceeds.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	

3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~ / ~	- / ~	- / ~	Although the Longstanton development is proposed as a campus style parkland it will intrude into the open land between the A14 and Longstanton. Any development proposal would therefore have to provide for screening and landscaping. At Pampisford the development would extend an existing small industrial area and therefore its impact would be less, though screening from open land to the west would be preferable (and should be addressed at the EIA stage if necessary).
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~ / ~	- / ~	- / ~	Main concern at Longstanton is cumulative impact of a bypass, development of this site, and the impact of Northstowe being built immediately to the east and south.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~ / ~	(-) / (-)	(-) / (-)	Neither site is well served by transport choices, and the site at Longstanton is most readily accessible via the Bar Hill junction on the A14, which is already heavily congested. However there will be compensating traffic benefits – see 5.1. below.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~ / ~	- / -	- / -	Both will contribute to waste arisings in absolute terms along the small size means this will be negligible alongside the effect of developments elsewhere in the District.
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~ / ~	~ / ?	~ / ?	The Longstanton site lies close to but outside the floodplain but a small area at the southwest of the Pampisford site will require protection.
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	?	?	?	See 4.1 as the criteria for this objective include travel choices. There is a clear opportunity to affect commuting patterns if the development to the north (see policy SP/1m) provides housing for workers at the campus, or if people currently living locally by working in Cambridge are relocated or change jobs to work locally.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~ / ~	(-) / (-)	(-) / (-)	As for 4.1. <u>A post consultation change establishes a clear link between timing for the development and delivery of the bypass. This should ensure additional traffic has negligible impact on Longstanton itself, but it does not obviate the impacts of that traffic on the road system or on other villages. However we acknowledge the Council intends that, ideally, much of the employment on the site will be taken by people living in Longstanton and Northstowe and, if correct, this will limit these impacts to some degree.</u>
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	? / ~	? / ~	The policy states the Council's intention to seek contributions to the cost of the Longstanton bypass from the development of the site, although this must be weighed against the travel impacts referred to in other sections.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~ / ~	+ / +	++ / ++	Both developments appear to offer the opportunity to establish new employment within the local community and it is assumed at this stage there is a reasonable match between the local skills supply and the nature of these developments.

7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	(+)	(+)	(+)	Clearly both developments contribute to local employment, although their small scale suggests this will be incremental. We note also that the Local Plan policy defines Pampisford as a site for possible industrial development (consistent with the adjacent uses), whereas the current policy stipulates B1 use only.
Summary of assessment: Both proposals provide for modest-sized land use changes with varying overall impacts. At Longstanton the development is envisaged as a campus-style business park consistent with similar developments around Cambridge. While this is consistent with the broader objective of strengthening the sub-region's excellence particularly in the research sector, neither this plan nor the Local Plan clearly define the precedents for these developments in the same way as those in policies SP/2 and SP/3. At Longstanton the development would introduce structures into an open and flat landscape. A further concern is the cumulative impact of development which is discussed below. At Pampisford the development would extend an existing light industrial site and therefore the overall impact would be less than at Longstanton. Neither site is particularly well-served by transport routes other than public roads, although both introduce new employment at the edge of existing settlements and it is assumed there is a strong match of skills in these communities with the needs of businesses occupying the sites.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: Both sites appear to need some degree of visual mitigation, especially at Longstanton where the development will occur within a flat and open landscape with few vegetation barriers, and where on-site impacts such as light pollution must also be mitigated. Development at Pampisford will need limited flood protection as the site impinges on the Granta floodplain.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: The principal concern is the cumulative impact in the vicinity of Longstanton which would see the creation of a campus area of development, and loss of land to the bypass, both of which would add to the range of impacts on Longstanton from the development of Northstowe to its east, and the specification of the B1050 as one of the main routes into the new settlement.				

SP/5 – Allocations for class B1 and B2 employment uses

Proposes allocations for sites at Gamlingay (4ha), Over (1ha) and Papworth Everard (6.5ha). All proposals reflect allocation proposals from earlier plans.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives
[abridged in some cases]

	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
In the assessments below, where appropriate, the first symbol refers to Gamlingay; the second to Over; and the third to Papworth Everard, and these locations are referred to as G, O and P respectively.				
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	- / ~ / -	- / ~ / -	In absolute terms development at G and P appear to take open land that may be currently under agriculture and is undeveloped, whereas that at O extends an existing industrial / business area.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	- / ~ / -	- / ~ / -	Again, in absolute terms, all three will increase energy use, although that at Over appears modest due to its small size.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	- / ~ / -	- / ~ / -	As above.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	Gamlingay Wood (SSSI – ancient woodland) lies to the north on the opposite side of the village from the proposed development.
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	?	?	?	Biodiversity value of the sites cannot be established at this stage, but both G and P involve loss of open land and suggest some impact.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	

3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	- / ~ / (-)	- / ~ / (-)	At G development extends an existing industrial site but it lies across a small valley from the village college and its playing fields and therefore visual impacts will need mitigation. This applies also to P where the development, if it occurs in the near future, would overlook the hospital, although the need for visual mitigation is already recognised in the adopted Local Plan. At O development is proposed beyond the village framework in an business/commercial area where its impact should be negligible provided the structures are low-level.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	?	?	?	Effect assumed to be neutral provided adverse impacts such as visual intrusion are negligible or mitigated effectively.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	(+)	(+)	Incremental contribution if development provides employment for local residents, reducing commuting and encouraging non-car access, however other impacts such as noise, dust, etc. will depend on the nature of the planned development and cannot be determined at this stage. Developers should be required to submit a transport assessment to identify access routes and to ensure any growth in car traffic and good vehicles is mitigated and, where necessary, routed to avoid impacts on the adjacent village. It may be appropriate to seek developer contributions for the Papworth Everard bypass, and to consider where the site should be developed before the bypass is open if it is likely to affect current traffic through the village.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	- / - / -	- / - / -	All developments likely to contribute to waste arisings. Specific impact depends on land use, with research facilities possibly producing additional special wastes.
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	? / ~ / ~	? / ~ / ~	Flood risk is an issue at G where approximately half the site lies within the floodplain of Millridge Brook, although only a small proportion lies within a flood risk area. Minor mitigation may be needed reflecting provisions of policy NE/13.
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	+ / + / +	+ / + / +	Potential contribution in each case provided the policy does result in local employment for local people who commute on foot or cycle.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	Assessment assumes the land taken is not currently open for the public.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	+ / + / +	+ / + / +	As for 5.1.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	+ / + / +	+ / + / +	In principle the proposals contribute to employment provision in rural areas, though they are offset by other impacts.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	+ / + / +	+(+) / + / +(+)	Clearly the principal objective of this policy. Scores are higher for G and P where the scale of development, and therefore growth in employment, are assumed to be greater. Also

				implicitly supports the rural economy.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	+ / + / +	+ / + / +	Small scale contribution to business development, but effect on other criteria depends on nature of land use.
Summary of assessment: The policy proposes three small business or commercial (not industrial) developments, two of which extend existing B-class land use. It supports proposals to provide small-scale growth in rural employment which also supports sustainable transport and development objectives. The policy restricts land use change to business and research (rather than commercial / industrial) use which will help to limit its impact.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: Main requirements are for visual mitigation, particularly at Gamlingay where the development would be overlooked by recreational areas, and at Papworth Everard where the site would be partly overlooked by the hospital if it is developed in the near future. Developers should be encouraged to submit transport assessments for redevelopment in line with policy DP/1. That at Papworth should also be linked to the proposed bypass and consideration may need to be given to delaying a change in use if it is likely to add to traffic levels through the village. Both requirements are covered by policies in the Development Proposals section.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: The policy aims to exploit synergies of providing rural employment in appropriate sites and sustainable transport objectives.				

SP/6 – West of St Mary's church, Gamlingay

Proposes a modest extension of the church's graveyard.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	Effect assumed to be negligible given the size of the development.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	No important sites in the immediate vicinity, and nature of the development means little appreciable impact.
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	Appears to take a small field and therefore implicitly provides for increased access, albeit on a small scale.
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	++	++	++	Policy makes clear provision to allow inspection and assessment of archaeological remains believed to be present and which is consistent with policy CH/2. The nature of the remains and their importance cannot be established at this stage, however CH/2 determines the appropriate treatment. <u>A post consultation revision also requires any further change to include landscaping to prevent an impact on nearby listed buildings.</u>
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	~	~	
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	

4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	Lies several hundred metres north of the floodplain / flood risk area of Mill Brook. Impact of water table level on proposed use of the land cannot be determined at this stage.
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	(+)	(+)	(+)	Increase in graveyard space presumably necessitated by the lack of land in the yard adjacent to the church.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	+	+	+	Supporting text makes it clear the choice of site was made with local public involvement.
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	
Summary of assessment: Little to comment on. The policy involves land use change in the south-west corner of the village on a plot overlooked by housing. However it represents a largely sympathetic change of land use, leaving the site open and also more accessible. There are no clear local impacts, and the site is adjacent to the church and has road access.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

SP/7 – Allocations for open space

Proposes to allocate adjacent to existing recreation grounds and playing fields to extend them in order to meet minimum targets for the provision of open space or improve quality of this space for certain schools at two sites in Over and one each in Stapleford, Swavesey and Longstanton. All policies have been saved from the adopted Local Plan.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives
[abridged in some cases]

Assessment

Comments / Proposed Mitigation

Short Med. Long

In the assessments below, where appropriate, the first symbol refers to Over; the second to Stapleford; the third to Swavesey and the fourth to Longstanton.

1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	?	?	?	Nature of current land use cannot be determined from map evidence although all appear to be open, undeveloped and possibly fallow land or pasture. Development at Stapleford will take land just to the north of a farm but this is surrounded by other open land and recreational space. That at Swavesey is assumed to take land from an adjoining farm. However in each case the development does not entail irreversible loss.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	?	?	?	Unable to determine whether any site has any importance. The change of land use may result in some disturbance for local wildlife, assuming the plots currently have no public rights of way.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	+	+	+	Clearly supportive.
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	~	~	
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	+	+	+	Intrinsically supportive in providing for an appropriate level of local amenity. The nature of the land use change is sympathetic and those at Stapleford and each development increases the size of a single area, which appears to offer more flexibility for its use compared to fragmented space.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	Swavesey site is entirely within the floodplain of an adjacent brook although its open aspect clearly supports flood risk mitigation.
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	++	++	++	Providing areas for exercise readily accessible on foot or cycle.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	+ / ? / ? / ?	+ / ? / ? / ?	+ / ? / ? / ?	Positive rating for Over where both the recreation ground and school playing field are overlooked by housing on three or four sides, whereas at Stapleford the space is more open and overlooked on one side only. At Longstanton the land lies within the village framework and is barely overlooked (although this may change with proposed redevelopment of the land to the west – see policy SP/4). At Swavesey it is outside the framework by adjacent to it and a coherent extension of the existing Glebe.
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	+++	+++	+++	Clearly the primary objective of this policy.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	++	++	++	Supportive of 5.3. One site at Stapleford is known to have a pavilion and it is not clear whether expansion of the playing fields would require extension of this building, or how this would be funded as there is no residential development planned in the vicinity.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	+	+	+	Implicitly positive as the policy deals with current under provision, which is an issue of each of these settlements.

6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	?	?	?	Impact unclear but at worst neutral and may encourage more local recreation.
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	
Summary of assessment: Policies are sustainable, necessitated by government open space standards, consistent with those in the Structure Plan and in this DPD (SF/13). The Over playing field extension and land at Longstanton lie within the existing village framework; that at Swavesey lies outside the framework but adjacent to it, while that at Stapleford lies in the Green Belt. In each case the nature of land use change will retain the areas's open aspect, and improve access to recreational facilities without apparently affecting local character (ie. it is consistent with policies CH/6, DP/8 and GB/6, without compromising GB/7).				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

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

Proposes 4 additional recreation sites in Histon / Impington.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives
[abridged in some cases]

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

<u>3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape</u>	≈	≈	≈	
<u>3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well</u>	±	±	±	<u>Intrinsically supportive in providing for an appropriate level of local amenity. The nature of the land use change is generally sympathetic. The changes at the Rec. Ground and Manor Park extend existing facilities which appears to offer more flexibility for use compared to fragmented space. Nevertheless we recognise the other allocations help to achieve targets of providing recreational space within easy reach of various parts of this large residential area.</u>
<u>4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants</u>	≈	≈	≈	
<u>4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling</u>	≈	≈	≈	
<u>4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts</u>	≈	≈	≈	<u>Not evident any site lies within the floodplain.</u>
<u>5.1 Maintain and enhance human health</u>	++(+)	++(+)	++(+)	<u>Representations by the parish council identify a need for more recreational space, and we assume these allocations (specifically those off Mill Lane and at Gunns Lane) provide capacity in those parts of the community which are currently poorly-served (ie. they are furthest from the other spaces. Development of the area at the Recreational Ground appears to be on such an extent (when combined with the existing facility, football ground, etc.) that it is not clear whether this is part of the Strategic Open Space.</u>
<u>5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime</u>		- / ? / + / -		<u>The scorings reflect the extent to which the sites are overlooked since their peripheral location limits the opportunity for external lighting at night. The negative scores for two may be harsh especially in the case of the Recreation Ground if this is well used.</u>
<u>5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space</u>	+++	+++	+++	<u>Clearly the primary objective of this policy.</u>
<u>6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities</u>		++ / + / ++ / +		<u>As indicated above it is assumed that the sites at Mill Lane and Gunns Lane 'infill' gaps in recreational space provision around the settlement. The other two are marked slightly more positive because combination with existing facilities may provide synergies for providing infrastructure (eg. new or enlarged changing rooms) which may be more costly to provide at the new sites.</u>
<u>6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.</u>	±	±	±	<u>Implicitly positive as the policy deals with current under provision, which is an issue of each of these settlements.</u>
<u>6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing</u>	≈	≈	≈	
<u>6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community</u>	?	?	?	<u>Impact unclear but at worst neutral and may encourage more local recreation.</u>
<u>7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location</u>	≈	≈	≈	
<u>7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure</u>	≈	≈	≈	
<u>7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local</u>	≈	≈	≈	

economy

Summary of assessment: Little to add to the assessments for those sites included in the consultation draft. The sites at the Recreation Ground and Manor Park appear marginally more sustainable insofar as they extend existing sites and may offer synergies if there is existing infrastructure (eg. changing rooms, showers, etc.) on site. However the additions appear to respond to representations from the parish council seeking to address shortages of space, and we assume the other two sites also offer sustainability benefits if they provide new space within easy reach of parts of the community that are poorly served at present. All sites will take open land and some of this may be agricultural at present, however the nature of change is not irreversible.

Summary of mitigation proposals: None.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: Sharing infrastructure as mentioned above. Also, the expansion of the area around the Recreation Ground appears to bring this closer in scale to the sort of site envisaged as Strategic Open Space, though it is not clear what are the implications.

SP/8 – Character of village centres

Proposes specific measures to control any change of use or redevelopment in the centres of Great Shelford and Histon, both of which are already congested, such that further problems would not adversely affect their character.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives
[abridged in some cases]

	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	++	++	++	Clearly intended to preserve character in these local centres and the residential areas around them, and to prevent further domination of these areas by vehicles.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	++	++	++	As above.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	+	+	+	Will prevent further congestion and its local impact on air quality.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	+	+	+	As for 4.1.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	(-)	(-)	(-)	The policy does not preclude sensitive and/or appropriate development, however it suggests that the capacity of the existing employment land stock is largely exhausted.

				This limits the scale and type of redevelopment that might occur, and appears inconsistent with policy ST/2 which nominated both settlements as Rural Centres and therefore priority sites for additional development.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	Indirect relationship insofar as the policy prevents conversion of housing adjacent to the village centres to other uses.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	?	?	?	Suggests there are potential limits on local employment growth although this does not preclude some change in opportunities if sites are redeveloped.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	(-)	(-)	(-)	Suggests limited scope to expand the local economy since these constraints apply in Rural Centres and in potentially the most accessible sites, and are therefore consistent with
Summary of assessment: Consistent with Structure Plan policies and with those in this plan on retail development (SF/5) and protecting village character (SF/1). However, while this policy does not preclude appropriate redevelopment it appears to suggest these centres are close to capacity, with limited additional space for development and traffic problems. While this policy clearly aims to prevent a worsening of any access problems it also suggests an inconsistency with: their designation as Rural Centres in policy ST/2; their role in the retail hierarchy in policy SF/2; and sustainable development objectives (see policy ST/2 bullet point 2).				
Summary of mitigation proposals: Resolve the apparent inconsistency outlined in the comment above.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: The policy appears to deal with cumulative effects of the growth of these two villages as rural service centres and, as such attempts to mitigate further adverse change. However, if this constrains further immigration of services and development it may be pushed into less sustainable locations. The impact of this development is unclear, and it should also be borne in mind that Northstowe and Cambridge East have higher priorities for growth as Rural Centres.				

SP/9 – Linton special policy area

Proposes to constrain further development of the village to the south of the A1307 as this location is already severed from the main part of the settlement by the main road.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	

3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	~	~	
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	(+)	(+)	(+)	Indirectly supportive in that it aims to prevent inappropriate development in an area that is not a coherent part of the existing settlement.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	(+)	(+)	(+)	Aims to prevent further development in a part of the village which has poor accessibility to local services.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	(+)	(+)	(+)	As for 6.1.
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	
Summary of assessment: A preventative policy which recognises the dislocation of part of the existing settlement and aims to ensure it will not worsen. The policy text does not refer to measures to improve access for residents in the area and the assessment assumes that the Council is satisfied that the level of dislocation is acceptable.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: See above.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

SP/10 – Former Land Settlement Association estates

Safeguards land in Great Abington and Fen Drayton.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

[abridged in some cases]

	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	+++	+++	+++	At both sites the land is currently under agriculture (level of production is unknown).

1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~+	~++	Proposes re-use of the site for sustainable living projects suggesting a possible supportive role in achieving this objective, and which could also apply to objectives 1.3 and 4.2 even if it is relatively small in scale.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~+	~++	As for objective 1.2.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	+	+	+	Liable to be supportive as it mains the openness of the existing land use.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	Presumably remains under limited access but this is not the objective of this policy.
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	(+)	(+)	(+)	Contributory role which is slightly reinforced by the post-consultation change which requires new development to be support concepts of sustainable living-.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~+	~++	As for objective 1.2.
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	As for 2.3.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	+	+	+	Aims to maintain agricultural use and therefore local employment in an appropriate sector.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	
Summary of assessment: A sustainable policy designed to retain two quite substantial areas which are currently given over to small plots of agricultural use to prevent loss of resource and expansion beyond the village framework. The policy intrinsically supports many of the environmental objectives insofar as it prevents the land being used for purposes that might increase water or energy consumption, and is consistent with a policy in the Structure Plan.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

SP/11 – Papworth Everard village development

Provides an outline of possible sympathetic redevelopment of the heart of the village in the event that Papworth hospital is relocated to an enlarged Addenbrooke's site.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	+++	+++	+++	Clearly aims to maximise use of brownfield land.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	?	?	?	Depends on nature of replacement land uses, although these are likely to be negative in absolute terms as redevelopment would increase the level of occupancy.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	?	?	?	As above.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	–	–	–	The eastern side of the eastern half of the development abuts Papworth Wood SSSI which is an important area of secondary woodland. Further consideration of the specific impacts is continuing.
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	?	?	?	Development proposals would need to maintain the open aspect and ideally preserve the tranquillity of the site (particularly the eastern part).
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	The hospital area is not strictly countryside as it lies within the village framework.
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	++	++	++	Proposals clearly identify the need to preserve the setting and associations of the hall and the hospital. This might be achieved by redevelopment of the key structures for appropriate alternative use, however any changes would have to be meet conditions of policy CH/5 as the site has conservation area status.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	++	++	++	Clearly the principal purpose of both components of the policy. It is assumed that redevelopment of the West Central site would prioritise employment and community use provision along the high street, particularly at the northern end opposite the existing library and other village centre facilities.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	(++)	(++)	(++)	Relocation of the hospital suggests a significant disruption of the community if/when it occurs, and it is not clear from text in this policy or the adopted Local Plan whether this will be phased. To achieve this objective the relocation and redevelopment would ideally need to be phased to minimise the disruption of local life even if this extends the time needed to complete the changes.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	+	++	Clearly beneficial if redevelopment provides more local jobs, although the extent to which relocation of the hospital would force relocation of its staff is not evident at this stage.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	?	?	?	Would imply a significant change in the nature of wastes, and presumably an overall increase if redevelopment results in an increase in population.
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	?	?	?	Impact not clear at this stage. Assuming a high level of local residents work in the hospital

				then a change of some land to other employment for residents in the village would not result in any change, while some residents might face commuting journeys to the hospital's new site (though this is a consequence of relocation and not of this policy).
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	Impact is neutral provided redevelopment on the eastern side of the village can retain its open nature.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	(+)	(+)	(+)	The policy provides for at least maintaining the level of basic amenity and improving it if possible in conjunction with providing other amenities, facilities and alternative employment.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	+	++	Redevelopment with housing would enable the Council to apply policies HG/2 and HG/3 to support this objective.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	(+)	(+)	(+)	Provides for community facility provision, and this could be quite important in view of the change to village life if the hospital relocates.
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	(-)	(-) (+)	Relocation would presumably shift a large proportion of local employment in the hospital and associated facilities to another site, which the policy would only partly compensate with new employment. However this adverse impact is primarily the result of the decision to relocate, not of this policy. <u>Post-consultation changes to this policy provide greater emphasis on mixed use redevelopment which may help to address this issue and therefore the longer term outcome is more positive than originally considered.</u>
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	<u>??+</u>	<u>++?</u>	<u>++?</u>	<u>Depends how well it can weather the significant change implied by relocation.Changes following consultation adjusted the redevelopment priority from 'mainly residential' to mixed use, and this represents a better outcome if it can attract new employment to replace some of that lost with relocation of the hospital.</u>
Summary of assessment: It is essential to distinguish between the impacts of relocating the hospital and the proposal in this policy for how the newly available land should be re-used. Relocation will have a huge impact on a small settlement largely based on the hospital and its associated facilities, and the policy attempts to compensate this to some degree by providing for additional employment and for amenities which will help to retain a coherent community during a period of change. The policy itself provides for sensitive redevelopment of the land occupied by the hospital, which represents a significant proportion of the southern half of the village framework, and to enable the settlement to re-establish itself after a significant change.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: The key mitigation requirement will be the phasing of the redevelopment of the area to minimise its impact on traffic, noise, etc. (all of which would be addressed in more detail in subsequent development guidance and in an EIA) and to provide for a period of transition. Much of the redevelopment occurs in the southern half of the settlement and plans would also need to address construction traffic impacts.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: The primary secondary effect appears to be the impact of relocating the hospital on commuting patterns if those working in the facility choose to remain in Papworth Everard. This would clearly have an impact on traffic levels at a time when there may be additional traffic into the village as redevelopment begins.				

SP/12 – Duxford Imperial War Museum

Identifies the Museum as a heritage asset of at least national significance (it has US associations) which should be treated as a special case, though controls on displays and both temporary and permanent development will persist.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	~	~	
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	

7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~
Summary of assessment: Principally a procedural policy which cannot be assessed using these objectives. The policy protects its status while maintaining controls on activity on the site. We assume that the traffic impacts of events would continue to be managed and monitored by existing processes (as they are scheduled and advertised well in advance and therefore a known impact), while many of the on-site safety issues are the domain of the Civil Aviation Authority or the responsibility of the Museum's management and trustees. We assume non-display use of the airfield would be subject to policy TR/7.			
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.			
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.			

SP/13 – New road infrastructure				
The policy proposes to safeguard land for a western bypass for Papworth Everard and a bridge to replace the level crossing at Foxton. It also proposes to seek developer contributions for a bypass to the northwest of Longstanton which is partially linked to a planning application for a residential extension to the village.				
Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	---	---	---	All three proposals involve the loss of land currently under agricultural use (the bridge at Foxton is assumed to be aligned to the west of the level crossing). The relative sustainability of these proposals therefore depends on the extent to which they mitigate other local problems of congestion on the A10, and in the centre of the other two villages.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	?	?	?	Neutral impact provided that improving traffic flow does not result in increased traffic levels and/or compromise other initiatives to promote more sustainable transport. This is a particular issue at Longstanton due to its proximity to the Northstowe settlement and the proposed Rapid Transit route.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	None of the proposed sites is in the vicinity of local or more significant nature designations.
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	-	-	-	All three developments are linear and therefore potentially create barriers to wildlife which will require some mitigation measures.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	All features will use areas that appear to have little open access.
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	?	?	?	No scheduled monuments evident but further investigation (using the SMR) would be needed of whether there are important artefacts recorded along the route.

3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	?	?	?	Again, three linear features will have landscape impacts, particularly the Foxton bridge, although that of the two bypasses must be weighed against compensating improvements in the village centres where the intrusion of the road as a barrier to movement will be eased.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	?	?	?	As for 3.2.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	---	---	---	In isolation the features do nothing to encourage reduced use of cars. However there will be compensating benefits from reduced congestion resulting from the bypasses (air quality and noise impacts), and very localised air quality improvements from freer flowing traffic at Foxton. However the two bypasses will shift some impacts and may affect one side of each village without appropriate mitigation. This is a particular issue at Papworth where the route (presumably taken around the west to avoid the ultra-sensitive receptor of the hospital appears to lie within 200m of a conservation area). Mitigation would involve lighting or bunds, both of which are artificial features in these settings. Moreover we assume both bypasses would be unlit to prevent light spill into currently unlit areas, and the elevated ramps and bridge at Foxton may result in similar localised problems.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~/ -	~/ -	~/ -	Not an issue at Foxton or Papworth, but the northern part of the Longstanton bypass would cross fluvial floodplain.
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	?	?	?	Does not appear to encourage alternative and more health forms of transport, although there are localised compensating air quality benefits.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	

7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy ~ ~ ~

Summary of assessment: All three developments have clear adverse impacts in terms of sustainability. A particular concern is that in mitigating congestion the schemes would transfer impacts, such as noise, air quality and light pollution, to adjacent sites. For example, at Papworth the bypass would pass close to a conservation area that is currently some way from the main road through the village. All three schemes present potential problems because mitigation could introduce unnatural features into the landscape. The proposals do little to encourage sustainable transport although this does not mean that the plan should ignore congested areas where traffic measures are essential, and we also acknowledge two of the developments reflect Structure Plan policies, though it is not evident whether any form of sustainability assessment / appraisal was conducted. However development at Papworth will address congestion that is exacerbated by problems on the A14 to the east, and that at Foxton will overcome an obstruction on the A10.

Summary of mitigation proposals: Appropriate mitigation would be needed for all three developments. Given the more rolling nature of the land around Papworth Everard it might be possible to intersperse low bunds with fencing, but this does not appear to be an option at Longstanton where both features would appear alien. In all three cases there appears to be a case for leaving the new layout unlit, although the impact of this would need further consideration on road safety grounds.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: The main potential impacts come from any knock-on effect of reduced congestion (or blocking in the case of Foxton) on traffic levels.

SP/14 – Rapid Transit
States the intention to safeguard land for a guided bus way using part of the former Cambridge to St Ives railway. The policy also states the intention to seek developer contributions to fund developments of parts of this infrastructure.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	+	+	+	Supportive since it represents re-use of derelict land.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	+	++	No impact immediately but once built the facility offers opportunity for modal switching for Northstowe and other local communities so this policy is implicitly supportive.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	(-)	(-)	(-)	Not possible to assess from the data available to a desk study. This depends on the extent to which this feature has been partly recolonised by wildlife, and its extent as a corridor. Appropriate mitigation measures (crossings, and tunnels) would need to be considered as part of the scheme.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	No evidence available of impacts.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	~	~	The line was once used for normal rail so does a return to this use represent a return to 'business as usual'? Given restrictions on the use of the route it is probable that visual impact of vehicles using it will be negligible, and the guiding infrastructure can be hidden.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	?	?	?	Largely depends on public reaction to the Rapid Transit system, although this policy is concerned with land allocations only.

4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	+	++	Clearly offers the potential to reduce emission levels by diverting commuters living along the route away from private cars.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	-	-	-	Given its route the link will cross several floodplains and some protective measures will be necessary to minimise the risk of disruption to very low frequency events.
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	?	Possible long term impacts on air quality if modal shift occurs.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	The assessment assumes there is no public right of way along the current route, although clearly this would be a negative impact if this is not the case.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	+	++	Improves accessibility of public transport, and the Transit system should also make it easier to reach the centre of Cambridge.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	It could be argued the system will provide benefits for communities along the route which are denied to others, but this is not consistent with its obvious sustainable transport benefits.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	+	++	Clearly positive if it improves the accessibility of employment in northern Cambridge and the city centre (see also policy SP/3).
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	+	+	Supports appropriate investment in new infrastructure that conforms to sustainability principles.
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	?	?	Economic impact is difficult to judge at this stage.
Summary of assessment: The assessment markings are perhaps a little generous since they reflect the benefits of the Rapid Transit system itself (as a mechanism for modal shift and as a sustainable form of transport), whereas the plan policy merely safeguards land for this purpose. The only potential concern is the extent to which Section 46106 contributions can be obtained since we assume that this mechanism will be already used extensively to fund other infrastructure in the Northstowe area.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: Once work begins on the design of the system, consideration will need to be given to minimising the visual impact of the guide barriers, and to providing habitat mitigation or artificial movement corridors for wildlife in those areas where the existing line has been at least partially recolonised. However the policy in this plan does not require change. We understand these issues would be addressed by Cambridgeshire County Council which is responsible for taking forward the scheme.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified (aside from cumulative transport impacts (benefits) of the system itself.				

SP/15 – Rail infrastructure

Proposes to safeguard land at Chesterton Sidings for a railway station and interchange facility.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	+	++	Brownfield development. Development not yet at the master planning stage so benefits would take time to build.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	(+)	+	Potential benefit from supporting sustainable transport objectives and travel choices, although this policy deals with a single site.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	~	~	See assessment for policy SP/2.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	See assessment for policy SP/2.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	See assessment for policy SP/2.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	?	?	?	Potential benefits if improved transport encourages more walking or cycling though it is not clear whether this is the case from the detail in the current supporting text.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	+	++	Will support objectives of improved accessibility, travel choice and communal transport once completed.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	+	+	+	Implicitly beneficial if it delivers better travel choice, especially for those without a car.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	See assessment for policy SP/2.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	(+)	+	Some potential benefit from mixed land development (see policy SP/2 for more detail).
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	

7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	(+)	(+)	(+)	Assumed to support Cambridge city centre's position in the sub-regional hierarchy.
Summary of assessment: A companion policy to SP/3 which deals specifically with the intention to develop a rail interchange that is integrated with other land uses proposed in the other policy. As such it clearly supports sustainable transport policy and the favoured mixed land use proposals of PPS1 and PPG13, as well as contributing to brownfield land utilisation targets.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: See the assessment for SP/3.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: See the assessment for SP/3.				

SP/16 – Rail freight				
Proposes safeguarding sidings and other facilities at five locations to ensure their continued availability for redeveloped as interchange facilities should this be required at a future (unspecified) time.				
Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	++	++	++	Clearly supports redevelopment of brownfield land although the impact of possible expansion of some sites (which are compact) may have an adverse impact.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	(+)	(+)	(+)	Potentially supportive if it shifts freight movement off the road.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	?	?	?	Cannot be assessed with the available information. The sidings at Foxton and Duxford lie between / adjacent to open fields and therefore may have some biodiversity impact if redeveloped (especially in terms of the need for improved road access).
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	Impact cannot be assessed at this stage with the available information, and would only occur if the existing curtilage of the sites was extended.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	–	–	–	Potential adverse impacts from site infrastructure and vehicle movements. This appears a particular issue at Foxton and Fulbourn, and could add to vehicle movements at Duxford.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	–	–	–	As for 3.2.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	?	?	?	Overall benefit from reducing HGV movements as a result of redeveloping this land, however there would be some local impacts from increased lorry access to any interchanges.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	?	?	?	Localised impacts of HGV movements around interchanges.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	

6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	?	?	?	Employment / economy benefits cannot be quantified at this early stage as the policy does not imply redevelopment soon or indicate priorities.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	?	?	?	As for 7.1.
Summary of assessment: As with policy SP/14 the markings reflect the sustainability of the concept of providing rail interchange facilities where feasible in order to shift some freight traffic off roads. The policy itself is procedural, requiring only the safeguarding of land at this stage and is therefore clearly sustainable.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: Impacts of increased HGV movements, including noise, light, and other impacts would need to be considered if redevelopment is taken forward, but are not drawbacks of the safeguarding proposal. Moreover in safeguarding this land the Council is providing advanced notice of the possibility of redevelopment.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

SP/17 – Cambridge Airport safety zone

Prevents development within the defined safety zone if it would increase the number of people likely to be within the zone. The exclusion appears to cover housing, employment land and any other land use that would cause people to congregate in the area.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	(++)	(+)	~	Intrinsically supportive. Effect diminishes as the site is redeveloped as the Cambridge East urban quarter.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	+	+	+	Supportive as it maintains the generally open character of much of the area.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	No real impact as much of the area lies within the airport perimeter and is therefore inaccessible to the public.
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	~	~	

3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	+	+	+	Clearly supportive insofar as the zone aims to limit consequences of an aircraft crash or similar incident.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	?	?	~	Might prevent development of employment appropriate to the vicinity of the airport, although its limited commercial use and pending relocation means this is probably irrelevant.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	See 7.1.
Summary of assessment: Largely a procedural policy required by Dept for Transport regulations to ensure a minimum level of safety and protection for activities and land uses within the vicinity of the airport. While it might prevent use of land for employment that it is appropriate to co-locate with an airport, the limited activity and pending re-location of aviation activities means this is largely irrelevant.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

SP/18 – Cambourne

Proposes changing the master plan for the development to reflect higher housing densities required by the latest planning guidance on housing.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	++	++(+)	+++	States that all development remains within the Village Framework and therefore increased density meets this objective while also complying with PPG3. <u>The submission draft of the policy has been amended to make clear the intention to achieve the advised minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare as an average density across the community.</u>

1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	(-)	(--)	Increased density implies additional resource use in absolute terms, although the impact could be considered neutral if this helps to achieve housebuilding targets and limits the loss of other land.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	(-)	(--)	As above.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	?	?	?	Requires changes to master plan and this should not result in the net loss of open space within the village framework.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	?	?	?	As above.
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	?	?	?	Depends on detailed design but effect assumed to be neutral.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	?	?	?	As above.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	?	?	?	Increases housing provision at Cambourne but impact on emissions depends on pattern of employment and quality of public transport links.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	(-)	(--)	As for 1.2 and 1.3.
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	?	?	?	As for 2.2.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	+	++	Proposes Section 46106 agreements to secure funding for additional infrastructure. Effect assumed to build as the changes will affect the later stages of expansion of Cambourne.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	?	?	?	Assumed to be beneficial if it contributes to the stock of affordable housing in a location designed to reflect principles of sustainable development and communities.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	++	++	++	Policy HG/3 ensures additional density will contribute to the stock of affordable housing.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	?	?	?	Not clear that extra housing will be matched by proportional growth in local employment, and this suggests a possible increase in commuting which appears inconsistent with
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	+	+	+	Section 46106 agreements to support infrastructure provision.

7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~
Summary of assessment: Largely a procedural policy necessitated by changes to housing policy that have been enacted since the construction of Cambourne began. It is sustainable insofar as it will provide additional housing within the existing framework (but with some modifications of layout, presumably) and some corresponding growth in communal infrastructure. We understand that the business park has higher employment density than envisaged and this will clearly contribute to reduced commuting.			
Summary of mitigation proposals: The point above suggests improvements in public transport provision or travel choice are needed to support expansion on this scale. Also revision of the master plan should ensure the re-design does not reduce the provision of open space within the settlement, nor should it obstruct green corridors and similar features (this is covered in principle by policy SP/19).			
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: Possible impact of increased commuter traffic on the A428 in particular.			

SP/19 – Cambourne approved master plan and design guide				
States the plan for a settlement comprising three villages connected to a service/amenity core by a 'spinal' road; separated by open space in keeping with local settlement character, which will also be reflected in building design and materials.				
Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	++	++	++	Implicitly ensures no additional loss above that which has been planned in from the outset.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	Not stated explicitly but should be addressed by DP/ policies.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	As above.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	++	++	++	Supporting text clearly states importance of maintaining open space and vegetation. It is assumed these will remain in situ and not be replantings as this will maintain existing habitats.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	+	+	+	Clearly supportive, providing the green separation between the villages incorporated public rights of way.
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	++	++	++	Clearly stated as a requirement in the supporting text.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	+	+	+	Implicit, though policy and supporting text does not state it specifically.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	

5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	++	++	++	Clearly supportive although policy aims to preserve open space within open land that will be partially redeveloped.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	+	+	+	As for 3.3.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	Not mentioned, but is covered by policy SP/18.
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	
Summary of assessment: Another largely procedural policy establishing the primacy of the master plan and the requirement for development to meet the basic principles of design, materials, resource efficiency, etc. that are established by other policies, and the overall layout of the settlement.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

SP/20 – Cambourne School Lane special policy area

Proposes the area as a special case for development at housing densities lower than those prescribed by PPG3 and policy HG/1 in order to provide appropriate layout at the border between part of the settlement and open land.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	–	–	The policy states only the density of housing, not the total to be provided, and this raises the issue of whether redevelopment of this potentially sensitive area is obviated by policy SP/18 which provides for a significant increased in housing provision at Cambourne over the original master plan.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	–	–	Development is occurring in a green wedge, and therefore some loss of vegetation will occur even with lower housing densities.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	–	–	Appears to suggest green wedge land – some of which may be accessible to the public – would be lost.

3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	?	?	?	Acknowledges importance of maintaining green separation but appears to suggest some loss of quality if housing intrudes into an otherwise open area.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	?	?	?	As above.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	-	-	Appears to reduce what might be provided.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	Impact of lower density on housing tenure is not evident, though other policies should ensure affordable housing is provided.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	
Summary of assessment: The policy aims for low density housing to preserve character in a sensitive area of the development. It does not indicate the scale of development (ie. area, no. of homes involved). Information in the text supporting the policy does not clearly support this as a sustainable development since it will occur in an area of local biodiversity value, and the intrusion of housing into the area – even at low densities – will have an impact on character.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: Would require mitigation as specified in policies DP/1 and DP/2.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

SP/21 – Longstanton conservation area at St Michael's

Proposes the area as a special case for development at housing densities lower than those prescribed by PPG3 and policy HG/1 in order to provide appropriate layout at the border between part of the settlement and open land.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural	~	~	~	

holdings				
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	+	+	+	Landscaping proposals include characteristic vegetation patterns which will contribute to this objective.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	++	++	++	Clearly intended to protect conservation area and limit any visual impact from development to the east and south.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	++	++	++	As above.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	+	+	+	Supportive.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	(+)	(+)	(+)	Provides for financing of landscaping from the development which necessitates mitigation measures.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	

Summary of assessment: A straightforward policy that protects the character and limits visual intrusion experienced by properties in the conservation area as a result of the development of Northstowe to the east and south. A post consultation change deletes reference to a 200metres minimum distance from the policy text itself, but this distance is retained in the supporting text, and it is assumed that the change does not reduce the width of the separation.

Summary of mitigation proposals: None.

Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.