

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 The Local Plan identifies developments where affordable housing provision will be specifically sought, however it is superseded by policy HG/3 which provides scope to seek contributions at most sites.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 46 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

				<p>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.</p>
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 46 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				
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 DR/4 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				
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	(–)	(–)	(–)	As for 1.2 / 1.3.

recycling				
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 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

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

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

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

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

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	(–)	(–)	(–)	Limited facilities in the village but again offset by small size of the

services and facilities				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

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 46 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

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	~	(-)	(-)	Its impact will depend to some degree on its design but the

and townscape				development represents a potentially large extension to the that 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				
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 holdings	(—)	(—)	(—)	Size of development exceeds the threshold for Group villages, and it is not evident from 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	~	~	~	Impact assumed to be negligible but depends on current land

characteristic habitats and species				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

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	~	?	?	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>
--	---	---	---	---

				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

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	+(+)	+(+)	+(+)	Half of the site is in industrial/commercial use; the rest
--	------	------	------	--

productive agricultural holdings	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

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

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 has 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

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

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 Sewate 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 southwestern 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.
<p>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 to pressure on local education and new residents are more likely to seek work in Cambridge or the market towns to the north.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>				

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

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	~	?	?	Local Plan notes the need for visual mitigation to screen the

and townscape				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 Sewate 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	~	?	?	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	(-)	(---)	<p>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.</p>
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	-	---	<p>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,</p>

				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, although the policy text suggests funding for 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

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 46 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/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	?	?	?	Difficult to judge this as an adverse effect as the presence of the

and townscape				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,	~	+	++	Clearly intended to contribute to this objective when taken

appropriate and affordable housing				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 and 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; 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 infrastructure	~	+	++	Supportive.
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.
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
 Short Med. Long

Comments / Proposed Mitigation

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.
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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
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/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 this 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	~	~	~	
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	+	+	+	Liabile 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.

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	~	~	~	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 Addenbrookes 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.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	

7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	?	?	?	Depends how well it can weather the significant change implied by relocation.
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	—	—	—	In isolation the features do nothing to encourage reduced use of

pollutants				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	~	~	~
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>			

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 46 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,	~	~	~	See assessment for policy SP/2.

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	~	(+)	+	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 Duxton 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 thaty 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.
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 46 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 46 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	Assessment		Comments / Proposed Mitigation	

[abridged in some cases]	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.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				