

# **Appendix A/1**

## **Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Sustainability Appraisal Report**

**Special Council Meeting 9<sup>th</sup> May**



**South  
Cambridgeshire  
District Council**



**SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE  
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK:  
CORE STRATEGY AND  
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES  
DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT**

**DRAFT FINAL  
SUSTAINABILITY REPORT**

**SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE**  
**LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK:**  
**CORE STRATEGY AND**  
**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES**  
**DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT**

**DRAFT FINAL**  
**SUSTAINABILITY REPORT**

<b>Issue No.</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Prepared By</b>	<b>Reviewed By</b>	<b>Approved for Issue</b>
1	Draft	14/04/05	PK & AW	SS	MB

**MARCH 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**

1	SUMMARY AND OUTCOMES	2
2	BACKGROUND	3
3	APPRAISAL METHODOLOGY	7
4	SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVES, BASELINE & CONTEXT	13
5	PLAN ISSUES AND OPTIONS	24
6.	PLAN POLICIES	28
7	IMPLEMENTATION	55
	APPENDIX 1: BASELINE DATASET	59
	APPENDIX 2: ASSESSMENT OF POLICY ALTERNATIVES	76
	APPENDIX 3: CUMULATIVE, SECONDARY & SYNERGISTIC IMPACTS	78
	APPENDIX 4: SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MATRIX	96
	APPENDIX 5: CROSS-REFERENCING POLICIES AGAINST ISSUES	103
	APPENDIX 6: MITIGATION PROPOSALS	114
	APPENDIX 7: OUTLINE PROVISIONAL MONITORING PLAN	121

## **1 SUMMARY AND OUTCOMES**

### **1.1 NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY**

### **1.2 STATEMENT ON THE DIFFERENCE THE PROCESS HAS MADE**

### **1.3 HOW TO COMMENT ON THE REPORT**

This Report will be made available by South Cambridgeshire District Council in parallel with the draft Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD. The timetable, process and contact point(s) for responding to both documents will be advised separately by the Council.

**REMAINING SECTIONS TO BE COMPLETED AND INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL / SUSTAINABILITY REPORT.**

## 2 BACKGROUND

### 2.1 PURPOSE OF THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL AND THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

Sustainability Appraisal is a requirement under Regulation 39 of the *Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act* (2004) for Local Development Documents and Supplementary Planning Documents that comprise a Local Development Framework (LDF).

The purpose of SA is “to promote sustainable development through better integration of sustainability considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans. [It is] an iterative process that identifies and reports on the likely significant effects of the plan and the extent to which the implementation of the plan will achieve the social, environmental and economic objectives by which sustainable development can be defined.” (ODPM, 2004)

The SA Report is a key output of the process and should reflect and support the draft plan on which formal public consultation is to be carried out. This report has been prepared in support of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD for this purpose, to demonstrate that sustainability considerations have been incorporated into the development of the DPD from an early stage, and to provide a formal statement and audit trail of the assessment.

### 2.2 PLAN OBJECTIVES AND OUTLINE OF CONTENTS

The Core Strategy and Development Control DPD is one of the core documents of the South Cambridgeshire LDF, which will also include three Area Action Plans for developments at Cambridge East, Cambridge South, and Northstowe.

The DPD supports the broader strategic vision for the District, which is that it will “contribute to satisfying the development needs of the Cambridge Sub-Region rather than those generated by pressures to the south while preserving its rich built and natural heritage and distinctive character. The District will continue to provide an attractive rural hinterland and setting for the historic City of Cambridge, much of which will be kept permanently open, those parts closer to Cambridge being protected by a Green Belt. The District will prosper in its own right as a rural district that makes up the largest part of the Cambridge Sub-Region and will continue to develop as part of the home of the largest cluster of research and development activity in Europe whilst maintaining and where possible improving the character, environment, economy and social fabric of its villages and countryside”.

Given its role as the nucleus of the LDF, the objectives of this DPD are those of the Strategic Vision for South Cambridgeshire, namely to:

- Provide an adequate and continuous supply of land for housing and employment, to meet strategic requirements, in sustainable locations.
- Locate development where it will provide the opportunity for people to satisfy their day-to-day needs for employment, shopping, education and

other services locally or in locations which minimise the need to travel and where there are modes of transport available in addition to the car.

- Protect the varied character of the villages of South Cambridgeshire by ensuring that the scale and location of development in each village is in keeping with its size and character and that the buildings and open spaces which create their character are maintained and where possible enhanced.
- Ensure that the District's built and natural heritage is protected and that new development identifies and protects cherished townscape assets of local urban design and conservation importance.
- Ensure that any new development results in an overall net gain in biodiversity as well as enhanced access to the countryside.
- Locate development where it will ensure the maximum use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of countryside and the best and most versatile agricultural land.

The Strategic Vision includes other objectives concerning major new development at specific locations in the District and which are plan objectives for the other components of the LDF identified above.

The Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD contains broad overarching policies, many of which aim to mitigate the possible impacts of land use change. It also defines broad strategic objectives (eg. on good design, affordable housing and settlement hierarchy) as well as prescribing sustainable infrastructure for drainage, water consumption and generating renewable energy. It also contains site-specific allocations for land for housing, employment and other schemes (including two bypasses), and it has absorbed the Rural Centres DPD, which was assessed as a separate document at the initial Sustainability Appraisal stage.

Policies are presented under 10 headings:

- |                                  |                              |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| • Strategy (ST)                  | • Economy & Tourism (ET)     |
| • Green Belt (GB)                | • Services & Facilities (SF) |
| • Development Principles (DP)    | • Natural Environment (NE)   |
| • Housing (HG)                   | • Cultural Heritage (CH)     |
| • Site-Specific Allocations (SP) | • Travel (TR)                |

## 2.3 COMPLIANCE WITH THE SEA DIRECTIVE/REGULATIONS

In summer 2001, the European Union legislated for Strategic Environmental Assessment with the adoption of Directive 2001/42/EC on the *Assessment of the Effects of Certain Plans and Programmes on the Environment* (the 'SEA Directive'). Article 13 of the Directive states that SEA must be undertaken for a range of UK plans and programmes whose preparation began after 21<sup>st</sup> July 2004, or whose formal adoption is not complete by 21<sup>st</sup> July 2006.

An Environmental Report on these environmental effects is a requirement of the Directive but this report can be incorporated into other reports required for similar purposes. This report is referred to as the draft Final Environmental / Sustainability Report, as it also meets the requirements of the Environmental Report as defined by the Directive and corresponding UK Regulations.

Annex 1 of the SEA Directive identifies the information to be provided in the Environmental Report as required by Article 5(1) of the Directive. The location of the corresponding material in this Report is summarised in Table 1 below.

## **2.4 COMPLIANCE WITH GUIDANCE ON UNDERTAKING SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL**

Appraisal began in the period preceding the passage of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act in late Spring 2004 and continued into early 2005. Over this period, government guidance on undertaking SA that also meets the requirement of the SEA Directive evolved and the appraisal was undertaken according to the guidance in force at the time of each task.

- Consultation draft guidance issued in October 2003 was used for tasks up to consultation in October and November 2004 on the Preferred Options Report and publication of the Initial Sustainability Appraisal Report<sup>1</sup>.
- Consultation draft guidance issued in September 2004 was used for the remaining stages of the process<sup>2</sup>.

## **2.5 EXPLANATION OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS**

Interpretation of current guidance suggests that the draft Final Sustainability Report (and/or its SEA equivalent, the Environmental Report) should provide a comprehensive statement summarising every aspect of the analysis, including those stages that have been described in preceding Reports. In practice this suggests the Final Sustainability Report could become an extremely large document. In order to keep this report to a manageable size it has been considered necessary to cross-refer to other reports detailing earlier stages of the analysis, rather than incorporating large amounts of duplicate text into this one.

Therefore this report should be read in conjunction with the Scoping Report prepared by South Cambridgeshire District Council. Also, Section 5 summarises the initial development of strategic options and we refer to the results of the earlier assessments which were published in the Initial Sustainability Appraisal, and the corresponding detailed assessments were published on the Council's website.

<sup>1</sup> ODPM, Creating Local Development Frameworks, October 2003, consultation draft.

<sup>2</sup> ODPM, Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Frameworks, September 2004, consultation draft.



**Table 1: Locating report contents that comply with requirements of the SEA Directive**

Requirement of SEA Directive	Location in this report
Contents and main objectives of plans and programmes that may affect the plan (DPD)	Provided in the Scoping Report. Table 5 in section 4.1 lists the documents reviewed
Relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and its likely evolution without the implementation of the plan (DPD)	Appendix 1 of this report
The environmental characteristics of the areas likely to be significantly affected	Most plan policies have no spatial expression. Relevant characteristics are identified in detailed assessments of site specific allocations and which are provided in a separate document
Any existing environmental problems (issues) in particular those relating to areas designated under the Habitats and Birds Directives	The principal issues are summarised in section 4.4
The environmental protection objectives which are relevant to the plan or programme, and the way those objectives have been taken into account in its preparation	Identified during the context review and collection of the baseline, and reflected in the plan issues and objectives (see sections 4.4 and 4.5)
The likely significant effects on the environment (and economic and social impacts)	See section 6.1; detailed assessments are provided in a separate document
The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant effects on the environment	Summarised in Appendix 3; more detailed discussion accompanies the detailed assessments in the separate document
An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with ...	Summarised in sections 5.1 and 5.2, and in Table 8
... and a description of how the assessment was undertaken, any problems, etc.	See sections 3, 6.3 and 6.4
A description of the measures envisaged concerning monitoring	Summarised in Appendix 4
A non-technical summary of the above	See section 1 of this report

### 3 APPRAISAL METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1 APPROACH TO THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

The Initial and Final Sustainability Appraisals were based on a common approach which assessed the potential impact or contribution of each policy or policy option to achieving the 22 objectives in the SA Framework (see section 4.5).

##### *Assessing the nature of the plan impacts*

The nature, impact and potential significance of the impacts were assessed using a standard scoping approach which is summarised in Table 2.

**Table 2: Appraisal scoring symbols.**

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
~	1. Policy has no impact 2. 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

Two difficulties were encountered in the assessments:

- Absolute and relative impacts.** The majority of the adverse or negative impacts are in absolute terms and reflect the tension between a planning system that presumes in favour of development, and nationally or internationally mandated policies to safeguard landscape, protect habitats, and reduce consumption of non-renewable natural resources. The LDF defines proposals for major development within the District over the period 1999-2016, most of which reflects the requirements of government housing policy and policies in the adopted Cambridgeshire Structure Plan. These developments will have a negative impact in absolute terms as they will contribute to energy and water consumption and growth in waste arisings. However the assessment also recognises that preparation of the Structure Plan included a sustainability assessment of alternative locations for housing and other land uses, and that those proposed in the LDF represent the most sustainable locations if it is accepted that such development must occur in the wider public interest. Absolute impacts are identified in the assessments, but these are qualified to reflect the points above.

- **Important and significant impacts.** SA and SEA are concerned with identifying significant impacts in order that these can be mitigated or compensated. Many of the policies in the DPD are generic and have no clear spatial expression at this stage of plan development. Those dealing with Development Control Principles will only gain this spatial context when they are applied to specific planning proposals, and this is equally true for a much wider range of policies such as those advocating use of energy efficient technology, design principles, determining provision of open space and advocating sustainable transport policy.

Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) assesses the significance of impacts within a relatively small area, but there are some difficulties in applying significance in the same way to plans covering a much larger area. The impact of Development Control or generic policies on individual sites may be slight to moderate, but with developments occurring across the District over the lifetime of the Plan, their cumulative effect is potentially significant. However the actual impact will not become evident until there is more detail of the pattern, number and type of developments across the District which would be subject to the conditions of each policy.

In this assessment we have used the term 'significant' to distinguish such impacts where they are the result of pervasive development control policies that are likely to have a repetitive and cumulative effect over the lifetime of the Plan, although strictly speaking it may be more apt to describe these as 'important' effects if the impact cannot be quantified.

#### *Assessing cumulative and other impacts*

SA must also consider the cumulative, synergistic and secondary impacts of policies. Detailed assessment of the effects of the proposed policies was based on a template form which included a summary of such effects that were identified on a case-by-case basis. Once the detailed assessment was complete a separate evaluation of these effects was undertaken using a matrix-based approach reflecting the example given in Figure 27 of the current SA guidance. The results of this assessment are summarised in section 6.1.

#### *Assessing site-specific impacts*

The Site-Specific Allocations section of the DPD, and some individual policies in other sections, contain proposals which have a well-defined spatial expression and which make it possible to assess their likely impact on their immediate surroundings to some degree.

However it is not clear from the guidance what level of site-specific evaluation is appropriate for the purposes of SA / SEA, bearing in mind the strategic nature of the assessment. Assessment is seen as a preparatory act for a subsequent Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) for individual developments. However it would be inappropriate for SA / SEA to duplicate or pre-empt the detailed evaluation undertaken during EIA. Ideally SA / SEA should identify the likely significant effects without investigating them in unwarranted detail. As a result SA / SEA should provide a 'pre-scoping' assessment of the development which the Council can refer to when determining if it needs to undergo EIA and, if so, the nature of the impacts that require specific attention.

The approach taken here has been to identify the broad impacts resulting from particular site allocations without descending to a level of detail that is more appropriate to project-level EIA.

The following sources were used in assessing site-specific policies:

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (adopted February 2004) – Part 2: Village Policies and Proposals Maps
- South Cambridgeshire Recreation Study (October 2004) – Annex 1: Village Results (consultation draft)
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposals Map (available via the Planning Portal)
- South Cambridgeshire Urban Capacity Study (October 2004 – consultation draft)
- Study of the Implications of PPG3 Housing on the Local Plan Review (July 2000)<sup>3</sup>
- South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Maps (February 2005).

### **3.2 WHEN THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL WAS CARRIED OUT**

The timetable for the principal components of the full appraisal process is summarised in Table 3 overleaf.

### **3.3 WHO CARRIED OUT THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL?**

South Cambridgeshire District Council collaborated with Cambridgeshire County Council and Huntingdonshire District Council in assembling a common set of context (policy) review material, baseline data, generic key issues and SA Objectives during late 2003 and early 2004. Each authority then adapted these materials to reflect local conditions, and to incorporate local baseline / indicator information.

The initial and final Sustainability Appraisals were undertaken by staff from Scott Wilson, with the assistance of staff in the Council's Planning division, and using the content of the Scoping Report and the SA Framework developed by the Council. Scott Wilson also undertook an initial compliance check on the Scoping Report before beginning the appraisal.

### **3.4 WHO WAS CONSULTED, WHEN AND HOW?**

All consultation was organised by South Cambridgeshire District Council and preceded publication of its Statement of Community Involvement. Three consultation processes have occurred previously.

<sup>3</sup> This document was prepared as an input to the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan review as a means of assessing the potential relative sustainability of development in the District's villages. It contains village assessments detailing frequency of bus and train services to London, Cambridge or other nearby market towns; principal employment sources within the vicinity; landscape, land quality and flood risk classifications; availability of shops, banks, etc.; availability of primary and secondary school places in local schools; and the serving sewerage infrastructure and its spare capacity.

**Table 3: Timetable of the principal appraisal stages.**

Task	When	Comments
Initial consultation on local issues, the scope and objectives of the LDF	Mid / late 2003	The initial preparatory stage for the LDF, although not part of the SA process itself.
A1 to A4: define context, baseline, issues and draft objectives	Late 2003 to early 2004	
A5: cross-check objectives	April 2004 and June 2004	Cross-checking of the SA objectives with one another occurred first. Cross-checking of the SA Framework against Plan Objectives was only introduced in the September 2004 guidance. However the Plan Objectives were included as policies in the Preferred Options Report and the cross-checking of SA and Plan Objectives occurred during Initial Sustainability Appraisal.
A6: consultation on Scoping materials	June 2004 and August to November 2004	The four statutory consultees were invited to comment on the draft Scoping Report in June 2004. Further full public consultation occurred in October and November 2004, following review by Council Members in the preceding two months.
B1: development of options and initial SA	Early 2004 to June 2004	Initial evaluation of relevant and appropriate options was undertaken by the Council during early 2004 as the Preferred Options Report for this DPD was being prepared. The initial SA was undertaken in June 2004.
B2: consultation on initial SA report	August to November 2004	Consultation occurred in parallel with that on the Scoping Report (see A6 above).
C1 to C5: appraising the effects of the plan, defining mitigation measures and preparing the draft final report	February to March 2005	
D1 to D2: consulting on the draft plan and final SA report and reviewing any changes	June to July 2005	Dates indicate the consultation period with the assessment of changes immediately afterwards.
E1 to E2: monitoring effects of the plan	February to March 2005	Initial proposals incorporated in the draft Final SA Report.

- An initial consultation, based on a series of stakeholder workshops, was undertaken in late 2003 to provide input to identify local concerns, issues and priorities as input both to plan development and the pre-production tasks (SA / SEA Stage A).
- An informal consultation occurred in June 2004 when draft copies of the Scoping Report were emailed to the statutory consultees. Responses were received from all four bodies. Their comments and any resulting amendments were incorporated in the Scoping Report and SA Framework before the Initial Sustainability Appraisal occurred. These changes are recorded in the Scoping Report.
- A formal public and stakeholder consultation was undertaken in October and November 2004 focusing on the Preferred Options Report on the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD and the accompanying Initial Sustainability Appraisal report. The process also included the Rural Centres DPD, which was a separate document at that time. Documents were sent to a wide range of consultees (see Table 4 overleaf), and the consultation was publicised on the Council's website where all the documents could be accessed or downloaded.

**Table 4: List of formal consultees.**

Regional, sub-regional & local authorities	Statutory consultees
Government Office for the East of England	English Nature – Beds, Cambs & Northants
Regional Assembly for the East of England	Environment Agency, Peterborough
Cambridgeshire County Council	English Heritage – East of England Region
Bedfordshire County Council	Countryside Agency
Suffolk County Council	<b>Utilities</b>
Essex County Council	Strategic Rail Authority
Hertfordshire County Council	Anglian Water Services
Cambridge City Council	Three Valleys Water
Peterborough City Council	Veolia Water Partnership
East Cambridgeshire DC	Cambridge Water Company
Huntingdonshire DC	Eastern Energy
Fenland DC	PowerGen
Braintree DC	British Telecom - Mid Anglia District
Forest Heath DC	British Telecom – Network Capacity
Mid Bedfordshire DC	NTL
North Hertfordshire DC	Mobile Operators' Association
St Edmundsbury BC	Transco – Network Planning
Uttlesford DC	<b>Non-governmental organisations &amp; bodies</b>
Cambridgeshire Association of Local Councils	Council for the Protection of Rural England
All parish councils within the District (96 bodies)	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
All town and parish councils adjoining the District (49 bodies)	The Wildlife Trust
MPs for the District (3 individuals)	Centre for Ecology & Hydrology
<b>Other statutory bodies &amp; authorities</b>	Conservators of the River Cam
East of England Development Agency	Cambridge Sub-Regional Infrastructure Partnership
DEFRA	Federation of Master Builders
Ministry of Defence – Defence Estates	The House Builders' Federation
Dept for Transport – Airports Policy Unit	The Housing Corporation
Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service	Cambridgeshire Acre
Police Authority for Eastern England	Renewables East
Highways Agency – South East and East of England	South Cambridgeshire Local Strategic Partnership
HM Health & Safety Inspectorate	Cambridge Sustainable City Reference Group
Health & Safety Executive	Cambridge Ethnic Community Forum
Operational Support Directorate	Cambridge Federation of Tenants, Leaseholders and Residents' Associations
HM Railway Inspectorate	The Gypsy Council
South Cambridgeshire PCT	Cambridge Council for Voluntary Service
Cambridge City PCT	Cambridge Organisation Promoting Disability Awareness
Huntingdonshire PCT	RAVE
East of England Regional Housing Board	
Association of Drainage Boards	
Local Drainage Boards (4 bodies)	



## 4 SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVES, BASELINE & CONTEXT

### 4.1 LINKS TO OTHER STRATEGIES, PLANS AND PROGRAMMES AND SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVES

Links with other plans and programmes are given in the Scoping Report for the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework. These include the plans and programmes listed in Table 5 below.

Table 5: Plans and programmes relevant to the South Cambridgeshire LDF (Source: South Cambridgeshire District Council, 2004).

International Level	
1	The Kyoto Protocol on Climate Change (1992)
2	The Bern Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats (1979)
3	EC Council Directive 79/409/EEC, on the Conservation of Wild Birds (1979)
4	EC Council Directive 92/43/EEC, on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Fauna and Flora (1992)
5	The Bonn Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (1979)
6	EC Council Directive 85/337/EEC & 97/11/EC, on the Assessment of the Effects of certain Public and Private Projects on the Environment (1985)
7	EC Council Directive 1999/31/EC, on the landfill of waste (1999)
8	The Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat (1971)
9	Water Framework Directive (EC 2002)
National Level	
10	A better quality of life, a strategy for sustainable development for the UK (DETR 1999)
11	Working with the Grain of Nature – A Biodiversity Strategy For England (DEFRA 2002)
12	PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development (ODPM 2004)
13	PPG3 Housing (ODPM 2000)
14	PPS6 Town Centres and Retail Development (ODPM 2003, draft)
15	PPS7 Sustainable Development in Rural Areas (ODPM 2004)
16	PPG9 Nature Conservation (DoE 1994)
17	PPG13 Transport (DETR 2001)
18	PPG15 Planning and the Historic Environment (DoE 1994)
19	PPG16 Archaeology and Planning (DoE 1993)
20	PPG17 Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation (ODPM 2002)
21	PPS22 Renewable Energy (ODPM 2004)
22	PPS23 Planning and Pollution Control (ODPM 2004)
23	PPG25 Development and Flood Risk (ODPM 2001)
24	Transport Ten Year Plan (Department of Transport 2000)
25	Energy White Paper: Our energy future – creating a low carbon economy (DTI 2003)
26	Rural White Paper: Our Countryside: The Future - A Fair Deal for Rural England (DETR 2000)
27	Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990
28	The Air Quality Strategy for England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland: Addendum (DEFRA 2003)
29	Planning Policy Statement 1 Delivering Sustainable Development (ODPM 2004)
30	UK Waste Strategy (DEFRA 2000)
31	Saving Lives: Our Healthier Nation White Paper (DoH 1999)
32	Home Office target Delivery Report 2003
33	Strategy for Sustainable Farming and Food (Defra 2002)



Regional Level	
34	Sustainable Communities in the East of England (ODPM 2003)
35	A Sustainable Development Framework for the East of England (EERA 2001)
36	Our Environment, Our Future (Regional Environment Strategy, EERA 2003)
37	Culture: A Catalyst for Change. A strategy for cultural development for the East of England (Living East 1999+)
38	Regional Economic Strategy (EEDA, 2001)
39	EEDA Corporate Plan 2003 - 2006
40	RSS14 East of England Plan (EERA 2004, draft)
41	East of England Regional Waste Management Strategy (East of England Region Waste Technical Advisory Body 2002)
42	Sustainable Tourism Strategy for the East of England – Draft (East of England Tourist Board 2003)
43	Framework for Regional Employment and Skills Action (FRESA) (EEDA, 2003)
44	Regional Social Strategy (EERA 2003)
45	Woodland for Life: The Regional Woodland Strategy for the East of England (EERA & the Forestry Commission, 2003)
46	Regional Housing Strategy 2003-2006 (Regional Housing Forum, 2003)
47	Water Resources for the future: A Strategy for Anglian Region (Environment Agency, 2001)
48	Towns and Cities Strategy and Action Plan (EEDA, 2003)
49	Towards Sustainable Construction, A Strategy for the East of England (EP, CE, GO-E, PECT 2003)
50	Living with Climate Change in the East Of England (East of England Sustainable Development Roundtable 2003)
51	East of England Plan For Sport (Sport England East, 2004)
52	Draft RSS 14 East of England Plan (EERA 2004)
County Level	
53	Cambridge and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 (CCC & PCC 2003)
54	Cambridgeshire County Council's Environment Strategy and Action Plan (CCC 2002)
55	Public Library Position Statement 2003 (CCC 2003)
56	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Joint Waste Management Strategy 2002-2022 (CCC & PCC 2002)
57	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Local Plan 2003
58	Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan 2004 – 2011 (CCC 2003)
59	A County of Culture – A Cultural Strategy for Cambridgeshire 2002 – 2005
60	Cambridgeshire Landscape Guidelines (CCC 1991)
61	Cambridgeshire Rural Strategy (CCC 1992)
62	Cambridgeshire Health Improvement and Modernisation Plan 2002 – 2005 (HIMP Partners 2001)
63	Prospects for Learning (CCC 2001)
64	Cambridgeshire Aggregates (Minerals) Local Plan, (CCC 1991)
65	Biodiversity Checklist for land use planners in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (CCC 2001)
66	Cambridgeshire Biodiversity Action Plan (CCC 2004)
67	The Infrastructure Partnership – sustainable development for the Cambridge sub-region(CCC)
District / Local Level	
68	South Cambridgeshire Corporate Strategy 2003/04 – 2007/08
69	South Cambridgeshire Community Strategy 2004
70	South Cambridgeshire Economic Development Strategy 2003
71	Today and Tomorrow – South Cambridgeshire District Council LA21 Community Action Plan 2001
72	LA21 Consultation Results June 2000
73	South Cambridgeshire District Council – Housing Strategy 2002-2005
74	South Cambridgeshire District Council – Community Safety Strategy – 2002 - 2005
75	South Cambridgeshire District Council – Lighting the Way – Arts Strategy 2002 - 2005

76	South Cambridgeshire District Council – Local Strategic Partnership – 20 Year Vision
77	South Cambridgeshire District Council – Sports Development Strategy 2002 - 2004
78	South Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust - Health Improvement and Modernisation Plan 2002 –2005
79	South Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust - South Cambridgeshire Improving Health Plan 2003 – 2006
80	South Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust - Health Matters in South Cambridgeshire 2004
81	South Cambridgeshire District Council - Housing Needs Survey 2002 – June 2003
82	South Cambridgeshire Corporate Strategy 2003/04 – 2007/08

#### 4.2 DESCRIPTION OF THE SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL AND ECONOMIC BASELINE CHARACTERISTICS AND THE PREDICTED FUTURE BASELINE

The description of the social, environmental and economic baseline characteristics and the predicted future baseline can be found in the Scoping Report for the evolving South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework. The current baseline (ie. reflecting recommendations received during consultation) is shown in Appendix 1.

#### 4.3 DIFFICULTIES IN COLLECTING DATA AND LIMITATIONS OF THE DATA

Gaps in the dataset are consistent with problems known to exist in the current availability of data on the sustainability indicators proposed in the SA guidance. The collaboration between the Council, adjacent authorities and the County Council has resulted in a dataset that contains a good degree of local information with sub-regional comparators.

A number of outcome indicators are currently missing, and are acknowledged as priorities for data collection because they measure locally important variables:

- Water consumption rates – dependent on provision by water companies, and granularity of data is not yet known
- Achievement of biodiversity targets – awaiting implementation of software
- Rights of Way – awaiting results of December 2004 survey
- House completions meeting EcoHomes standards
- Infrastructure investment – baseline suggests there is a Structure Plan indicator, although presumably this will not be maintained in the future. Possibly use value of developer contributions as a proxy.

There are also a substantial number of parameters for which there is no trend. In many cases these are socio-economic parameters based on census data or other information only monitored over long timescales. It may be necessary to review the value of these parameters in due course and consider replacing them with others that can be more readily monitored.

#### 4.4 MAIN SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL AND ECONOMIC ISSUES AND PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED

The issues identified in the LDF Scoping Report are summarised below.

##### *Land and water resources*

- Limited stock of brownfield land means new development will inevitably result in the loss of high-quality agricultural land;
- New development may sterilise important local sources of sand and gravel;
- New development could alter natural drainage patterns while also providing scope for contamination of groundwater in areas where rainfall currently percolates directly into the soil;
- Development will make additional demands of water supply (for homes, industry, etc.) in an area where the capacity of natural systems is limited.

##### *Biodiversity*

- The rural nature of the district means that development may result in the loss or deterioration of local habitats such as hedgerows and verges;
- Development may affect specific areas covered by national and international designations, which are often very sensitive and can be easily affected by impacts from non-adjacent locations.

##### *Landscape, townscape & archaeology*

- Further expansion at the fringes of Cambridge could adversely affect the unique character and setting of the city by hemming it in, affecting the quality of approaches to the City, harming the quality of the landscape, and shutting off key views of its distinctive skyline.
- The pace of growth and infilling around Cambridge means that there is no clear local style or building material and further growth may exacerbate this situation if clear design controls are not imposed;
- Uncontrolled or unsympathetic development could harm local landscape character if it occurs on a large enough scale, or repeatedly through a particular area
- South Cambridgeshire's archaeological heritage could be threatened by development that in effect sterilises known sites, or which harms the setting of sites with important historical or cultural associations;
- Development may encroach on existing areas of open space, amenity and recreation value, or it may harm their setting and tranquillity.

##### *Climate change and pollution*

- Development pressure in the north of the district may result in use of land potentially subject to flooding by the Great Ouse and its tributaries (there is a lower risk in the south of the district);
- Local topography and drainage systems mean that there is an existing flood hazard across parts of the district;
- Adoption of sustainable development objectives that reduce the direct and indirect impacts of climate change, increased use of renewable energy, and more energy-efficient management of homes and business

- properties cannot occur without the support of, and direct action by, employers, homeowners and parents;
- The rural nature of the district makes residents dependent on the private car, resulting in high levels of ownership and usage;
  - The district straddles several important transport arteries, and addressing local transport issues such as encouraging a modal shift to public transport will not solve the whole problem;
  - Dispersal of housing and employment beyond Cambridge city has occurred at different rates and in different directions, contributing to high levels of commuting, particularly that by private car;
  - Despite improvements in composting and recycling, the rate of waste production is still rising;
  - Development through infilling or creation of new communities will contribute to noise and light pollution.

#### *Healthy communities*

- Fear of crime in the district is disproportionate to actual crime rates;
- Dependence on the private car for shopping, commuting and the school run has knock-on effects on people's willingness to use more sustainable forms of transport for these activities, and for recreation;
- Gradual increase in the size of the retired sector of the local population will make increasing demands on provision of appropriate health care, and the need to ensure this part of the community has convenient access to shops, amenities and social facilities;
- Development pressure may result in the loss of open space that has recreational value, which may encourage sports activities, or which benefits the character of the locality.

#### *Inclusive communities*

- House purchase and rental rates in the district are above the national average and continue to rise while salaries do not (particularly in the public sector), with the result that more than half the households in the district could not buy an average-priced home, creating a divided society;
- Lack of facilities in rural communities for young people in particular may contribute to residents' fears about crime;
- Loss of amenities and services in rural centres is likely to occur without positive action to reverse the trend;
- The increasing proportion of aged population will make increasing demands of the need for special access facilities, including community transport schemes;
- The increasing trend for the district's communities to become dormitory or commuting suburbs for Cambridge and London could lead to a loss of community identity, reducing inclusiveness and community involvement;
- The district has a substantial population of travellers whose needs differ from those of the resident population;
- Rural dispersal can make it difficult to justify the business case for regular transport connections to major shopping, employment and entertainment facilities.

### *Economic activity*

- Research and technology are vitally important to the Cambridge sub-regional economy but the district must not become over-dependent on a limited employment base, and people with other skills should not be driven away from the district in search of work;
- Farm diversification or the conversion of farm buildings for other business uses could add to vehicle traffic in rural areas offsetting any employment benefits generated;
- The district's (sub-region's) rapidly growing economy will make substantial demands on infrastructure investment;
- Unplanned growth in tourism and related developments could increase traffic, detract from rural or urban character, and place additional pressure on other resources such as water supply;
- The disproportionate size of Cambridge as a retail centre could have adverse effects for attempts to retain and improve service and amenity provision in smaller centres in the district;
- The predominantly dispersed rural population of the district makes it difficult to justify the cost of installing broadband telecommunications infrastructure which could encourage teleworking and support the dispersal of some businesses.

## **4.5 THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL FRAMEWORK**

The aforementioned issues were used to define a set of appropriate policy responses, which then contributed to definition of a set of objectives, decision-making criteria and relevant indicators, which collectively comprise the SA Framework. The Framework is presented in Table 5.

Following discussion with Cambridge City Council (prompted by use of the South Cambridgeshire Framework to assess the Cambridge East development, which straddles the border between the two authorities), some very minor changes were made to the Framework, to reflect their developing Scoping Report, affecting the definition of Objective 1.2 and the decision-making criteria for Objectives 1.2, 4.1, 6.1, 7.1 and 7.3. The revised Framework was used for the detailed assessment of plan impacts and is that shown in Table 6.

**Table 6: Sustainability Appraisal Framework (Source: South Cambridgeshire District Council, 2004, revised 2005).**

Sustainability topic	Sustainability appraisal objectives	Decision-making criteria	Relevant Indicators
Land and water resources	1.1 Minimise the irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	Will it use land that has been previously developed?	% of dwellings completed on previously developed land
		Will it use land efficiently?	
		Will it protect and enhance the best and most versatile agricultural land?	Net density of new dwellings completed
	1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources, including energy sources	Will it reduce emissions of greenhouse gases by reducing energy consumption?	KwH of gas consumed per household per year
		Will it lead to an increased proportion of energy and other resources being met from renewable sources?	Generating potential of renewable energy sources within the District
	1.3 Limit water consumption to levels supportable by natural processes and storage systems	Will it reduce water consumption?	Water consumption per capita (however this data is not currently available)
		Will it conserve ground water resources?	
Biodiversity	2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	Will it protect sites designated for nature conservation interest?	% of SSSIs in favourable or recovering condition
	2.2 Maintain and enhance the range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	Will it conserve species, reversing declines, and help to enhance diversity?	Total area designated as SSSI Progress in achieving BAP targets
		Will it reduce habitat fragmentation?	
		Will it help achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?	
	2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access and appreciate wildlife and wild places	Will it improve access to wildlife, and wild places?	% of rights of way that are open and easy to use Area of strategic open space per 1000 people
		Will it maintain and, where possible, increase the area of high-quality green space in the District?	
		Will it promote understanding and appreciation of wildlife?	



Sustainability topic	Sustainability appraisal objectives	Decision-making criteria	Relevant Indicators
		Will it improve access to the wider countryside through the network of public rights of way?	
Landscape, townscape and archaeology	3.1 Avoid damage to areas and sites designated for their historic interest, and protect their settings.	Will it protect or enhance sites, features of areas of historical, archaeological, or cultural interest (including conservation areas, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens and scheduled monuments)?	% of listed buildings classified as being 'at risk'
	3.2 Maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape character	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape character?	% of built-up area having conservation area status
		Will it protect and enhance open spaces of amenity and recreational value?	
		Will it maintain and enhance the character of settlements?	
	3.3 Create places, spaces and buildings that work well, wear well and look good	Will it improve the satisfaction of people with their neighbourhoods as places to live?	Residents' satisfaction with the quality of the built environment
		Will it lead to developments built to a high standard of design, and good place making?	% of new homes meeting the EcoHomes or similar standard
Climate change and pollution	4.1 Reduce emissions of greenhouse gasses and other pollutants (including air, water, soil, noise, vibration and light)	Will it reduce emissions of greenhouse gases?	CO <sub>2</sub> emissions per household per year
		Will it improve air quality?	Average annual NO <sub>2</sub> concentration
		Will it reduce traffic volumes?	
		Will it support travel by means other than the car?	Days when fine particle levels are in 'moderate' or 'high' bands
		Will it reduce levels of noise or noise concerns?	
		Will it reduce or minimise light pollution?	Vehicle flows across urban boundaries
		Will it improve water quality including by reducing diffuse and point source water pollution?	% of main rivers of good or fair chemical / biological quality

Sustainability topic	Sustainability appraisal objectives	Decision-making criteria	Relevant Indicators
	4.2 Minimise waste production and support the recycling of waste products	Will it reduce household waste?	Household waste collected per person per year
		Will it increase waste recovery and recycling?	% of household waste recycled
	4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to the effects of climate change (including flooding)	Will it minimise risk to people and property from flooding, storm events or subsidence?	No. of properties within flood risk areas
Healthy communities	5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	Will it reduce death rates?	Life expectancy at birth (specified separately for males and females)
		Will it encourage healthy lifestyles, including travel choices?	
	5.2 Reduce and prevent crime, and reduce the fear of crime	Will it reduce actual levels of crime?	Recorded crimes per 1000 people
		Will it reduce fear of crime?	% of residents feeling 'safe' or 'fairly safe' after dark
	5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	Will it increase the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space?	Area of strategic open space per 1000 people No. of sports pitches for public use per 1000 people
Inclusive communities	6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities (e.g. health, transport, education, training, leisure opportunities)	Will it improve the quality and range of services and facilities, including health, education, shopping, sport, leisure, arts and cultural activities?	% of population in categories 1, 2 or 3 for access to primary school, food shop, post office and public transport
		Will it improve accessibility to key local services and facilities, including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs etc)?	
		Will it improve accessibility by means other than the car and improve the attractiveness of environmentally better modes including public transport, cycling and walking?	
		Will it support and improve community and public transport?	



Sustainability topic	Sustainability appraisal objectives	Decision-making criteria	Relevant Indicators
	6.2 Redress inequalities related to age, gender, disability, race, faith, location and income	Will it improve relations between people from different backgrounds or social groups?	% of residents who feel their local area is 'harmonious' Index of multiple deprivation
		Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most affected?	
		Will it promote accessibility for all members of society, including the elderly and disabled?	
	6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	Will it support the provision of a range of housing types and sizes, including affordable and key worker housing, to meet the identified needs of all sectors of the community?	House price / earnings ratio % of all dwellings completed that are provided under affordable purchase or tenancy arrangements
		Will it reduce the number of unfit homes?	
		Will it meet the needs of the travelling community?	
	6.4 Encourage and enable the active involvement of local people in community activities	Will it increase the ability of people to influence decisions?	% of adults who feel they can influence decisions affecting their local area % of adults who have provided support to others in the past year
		Will it encourage engagement with community activities?	
	Economic activity 7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to their skills, potential and place of residence	Will it encourage businesses development?	Unemployment rate % of residents aged 18-74 in employment and working within 5km of home (or at home)
		Will it improve the range of employment opportunities to provide a satisfying job or occupation for everyone who wants one?	
		Will it improve accessibility to local employment by means other than the car?	
		Will it encourage the rural economy and diversification?	

Sustainability topic	Sustainability appraisal objectives	Decision-making criteria	Relevant Indicators
	7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and other infrastructure	Will it improve the level of investment in key community services and infrastructure?	% of 15 year old pupils in schools maintained by the local authority achieving 5 or more GCSEs at grades A* to C or equivalent  (Possible indicator measuring the level of Section 46 contributions to infrastructure projects that have an impact on the plan area)
		Will it support provision of key communications infrastructure, including broadband?	
		Will it improve access to education and training, and support provision of skilled employees to the economy?	
	7.3 Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	Will it improve business development and enhance competitiveness?	Annual net change in VAT registered firms  Economic activity rate (% of working age population in full or part-time employment)
		Will it support the Cambridge area's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, higher education and research, particularly through the development and expansion of clusters?	
		Will it support sustainable tourism?	
		Will it protect the shopping hierarchy, supporting the vitality and viability of Cambridge City Centre, town, district, and local centres?	

## 5 PLAN ISSUES AND OPTIONS

### 5.1 MAIN STRATEGIC OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND HOW THEY WERE IDENTIFIED

The range of options was determined by the Council during plan development. The Council identified options where they were considered relevant and appropriate, however the detailed content of the plan and its position in the wider plan structure limited the number of alternatives that were proposed. Specific constraints were:

- Many of the principal over-arching strategic policies derive directly from planning guidance (particularly PPS1, PPG3, PPG6, PPS7, PPG12) and it was considered inappropriate to propose options that deviated from current practice
- Development Control policies, which represent a large proportion of the plan's content, are largely defined by existing practice. The Council has some discretion to vary the thresholds for these controls, for example specifying a minimum number of dwellings or industrial floorspace above which the policy would apply. However the priority attached to preserving the valued character of the District's settlements and landscapes suggests there is an over-riding need to impose controls regardless of the size of the development, thereby removing another opportunity to consider alternative approaches.
- Site-specific policies proposed in the Preferred Options Report of June 2005 are defined to meet Cambridgeshire Structure Plan housing targets, and are based on allocations in the District Local Plan (adopted February 2004). The consultation process provides developers with an opportunity to propose alternative or additional allocations.

The Council considered that these conditions therefore limited the number of policy options for which it was possible to define relevant and appropriate alternative options. In order to provide transparency to this part of the process, the Preferred Options Report contains a number of 'rejected' policy options which enabled consultees to identify a limited number of alternatives that had been considered.

Alternative policy options presented in the Preferred Options Report were as shown in Table 7. Note that the figures in the second column refer to policy numbering adopted in that Report, not in the draft DPD; the corresponding policy in the draft DPD is shown in the final column.

**Table 7: Alternatives presented at Preferred Options Report stage (Source: South Cambridgeshire District Council, 2004).**

Policy area	Policies	Dictated by	Summary of policies
Market housing mix	CS23 to CS26	Housing Needs Survey; other local surveys; Market Housing SPG by Hunts DC	1 preferred option and 3 alternatives which proposed different levels of provision of 1 and 2 bedroom properties ranging from 35% to 40% (preferred) to 65%
Affordable housing target	CS27 to CS29	Housing Needs Survey	1 preferred option (50% provision) and 2 rejected options which proposed lower levels of provision (down to 30%)
Affordable housing funding	CS32 to CS33	Council's discretion	2 alternatives with no preference indicated under which the Council would be prepared to seek reduced levels of contribution
Selective management of employment	CS36 and CS37	Council's discretion and Structure Plan EiP Report	1 preferred option and 1 rejected option which adjusted the area under which this policy would apply
Density of employment allocations	CS38 and CS39	Council's discretion and Structure Plan	1 preferred option and 1 rejected option which proposed a higher level of employment land allocation
Development of Papworth hospital	CS55 to CS58	Council's discretion though largely dependent on objectives of the Hospital's managers	1 preferred option (retain the hospital); two alternatives which proposed changes of use; and a rejected option which proposed redevelopment for housing
Cycle provision priorities	CS82 to CS84	Council's discretion	1 preferred option; 1 alternative option (prioritise safer routes to schools); and rejected option (prioritise leisure routes)

## **5.2 COMPARISON OF THE SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL AND ECONOMIC EFFECTS OF THE OPTIONS**

The evaluation of the initial set of preferred, alternative and rejected options was based on the original SA Framework and involved the assessment of the nature, significance and duration of the effects of the policy on the 22 objectives. The results of the analysis are documented in the Initial Sustainability Appraisal Report, and the detailed assessments are currently accessible for reference on the Council's website.

## **5.3 HOW SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL AND ECONOMIC ISSUES AND CONSULTATION RESPONSES WERE CONSIDERED IN CHOOSING THE PREFERRED OPTIONS**

Table 8 summarises the assessment of options listed in Table 7, indicating the nature of the initial appraisal and consultation responses on each.

## **5.4 MITIGATION MEASURES PROPOSED**

At the Initial Sustainability Appraisal stage mitigation proposals were largely reflected in recommended changes to policy wording. During the initial review of the Appraisal results the Council accepted a substantial number of these recommendations and the nature of the changes are recorded in the Initial Sustainability Appraisal Report.

In summary the changes taken forward were:

- CS2 [strategy objectives] – amend text to make explicit need to limit consumption of undeveloped land, non-renewable energy, water, etc.
- CS14 [sustainable development] – amend text to state sustainability themes explicitly
- CS35 [economy & tourism objectives] – minor wording changes referring to the need to select sustainable locations and prioritise use of brownfield land
- CS43 [loss of rural employment land] – tightening of wording to ensure that development permitted only when all of nominated criteria are met
- CS60 [natural environment objectives] – add definition of what the Council proposes 'climate proofing' should entail
- CS62 [renewable technologies] – amend text to include statement that all development should demonstrate it could achieve a high degree of energy efficiency in new and converted buildings
- CS81 [mitigating travel impact] – minor wording changes to clarify the provisions of the policy.

**FULL DETAILS OF MITIGATION PROPOSALS ARE GIVEN IN THE DETAILED ASSESSMENT SHEETS WHICH CAN BE VIEWED ON THE COUNCIL'S WEBSITE.**

