

TRAVEL POLICIES

TR/1 – Planning for more sustainable travel

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

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

well				
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	+	+(+)	++	Clearly supportive of reducing emissions by more efficient use of public transport and non-fuel burning modes.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	+	+(+)	++	Difficult to calibrate benefit, which will clearly be greater if more people cycle, walk or use public transport.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	+	+	+	Addresses physical safety and theft.
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	++	++(+)	+++	Impact depends on level of new development, but this policy is clearly consistent with sequential testing of sites for retail units and the settlement hierarchy proposed in ST/1 and ST/2. Must be marked as strongly positive as this is the core objective of this policy which meets all the supporting criteria.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	+	+(+)	++	Central location near transport ought to benefit the less mobile and disabled and to integrate public and other transport mode provision (eg. for cyclists) benefiting those without a car.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	?	?	?	May be supportive but may also contribute to development pressures particularly in existing centres (as opposed to planned new development at Cambourne, Northstowe, etc.). See comments below on secondary and other impacts.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	++	++	++	Support objective of easier non-car access between homes and jobs.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	(+)	(+)	(+)	Although not explicit, the policy and supporting text appear to imply Section 46 agreements may be used to secure developer contributions to appropriate transport improvements. (This issue

				is covered explicitly by policy TR/3).
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	+	+(+)	+(+)	Impact on the economy should be beneficial but this depends on the volume of land available for development in appropriate locations.
Summary of assessment: Proposes spatial policies for locating new development in the most accessible locations that is consistent with the broader strategic policies on housing and development in general stated in ST/1 and ST/2, and that is also consistent with current planning guidance in PPS1 and PPG13.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: The main issue is that this and other policies focus development towards generally the same locations – readily accessible central sites in the main Rural Centres in the district. This will clearly contribute to development pressure though the impact of this is difficult to judge at this stage. Nevertheless it suggests some principles may need to be defined to help determine whether a particular suitable site close to the centre of one of the district's main settlements is best developed for housing (presumably with affordable housing provision), for employment, or for other amenities.				

TR/2 – Car and cycle parking standards

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

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	+	+	+	In general the policy prevents over-provision of parking (though not specifically to meet this objective), and more stringent standards in central sites will contribute to making the best use of limited brownfield land stock.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	(+)	(+)	(+)	Support is implicit rather than explicit.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of	~	~	~	

characteristic habitats and species				
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+	+	+	Implicitly supportive if it limits the amount of space given over to parking areas, whether for housing or amenities.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	+	+	+	As above.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	+	+	+(+)	Implicit support for sustainable transport objectives although the main benefits would be delivered by other policies (eg. TR/1).
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling				
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	?	?	?	More tenuous benefit than 4.1. Depends on whether it really does encourage more people to walk or cycle.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	+	+	+	Controls on parking space clearly give more flexibility in designing space in new developments.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	+	+	+	Impact may need to be monitored. The rural nature of the district means more people will be reliant on private cars, and parking for amenities, retail areas, etc. Maximum standards should provide flexibility to adjust to local circumstances.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	?	?	?	Could be beneficial if it supports more efficient use of land stock and enables more provision of this type of housing.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	

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

TR/3 – Mitigating travel impact

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

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	+	+(+)	++	Travel Plans are implicitly assumed to optimise transport provision or arrangements for some of those living or working at the new development, and it is also assumed mitigation would involve a greater level of provision and use of public transport than might otherwise occur. Assumed to grow over time as supporting documents mentioned by the plan are mandatory.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	

2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	?	?	?	Depends on proximity of designated sites to new development.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+	+	+	Policy supports objective by preventing traffic congestion.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	+	+	+	As above.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	+	+(+)	++	As for 1.2.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	+	+	+	Assumed to be beneficial if mitigation measures and/or Travel Plans result in more people walking or cycling.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	+	+	+	Overall objective of this policy is optimising the mode and capacity of transport infrastructure, however mitigation will prevent congestion arising from new development which clearly affects accessibility of a wide range of other facilities.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	+	+(+)	++	Supportive if it helps to ensure access for the less mobile but also benefits all travellers if it helps to reduce congestion.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	

6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	+	+	+	Should contribute to non-car access. It is not evident what effect the requirements to produce both a transport assessment and a travel plan will have on developers' willingness to bring forward new land uses, however we must assume the impact is likely to be negligible given the buoyancy of the sub-regional economy.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	+	+(+)	++	Makes clear the possibility using Section 46 agreements to secure private sector funding for transport improvements that are necessitated by new development.
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	+	+	+	As for 7.1.
Summary of assessment: An essential policy to anticipate and where necessary mitigate the impact on the district's heavily used transport network (and particularly the road system) in advance of new development. It is particularly important to understand the transport impacts given the scale of new development that will occur across the district during the life of the plan, although parallel development in different areas may make the assessment of these effects more complex. Mitigation will be needed on a site-by-site basis and therefore directly proportional to trip generation and size of site, so this should be applied on an equitable basis to all scales of development.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: Since the additional planning documents will take time and money to develop, should the policy set a size threshold below which the requirement is not mandatory so that those planning to develop smaller sites are not penalised?				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: Principal synergistic impact should be beneficial because it not only prevents traffic problems in the locality of the development, but also more broadly across the district.				

TR/4 – Cycling and walking provision

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

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	

1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	+	+(+)	++	Promotes reduced use of private cars. Rate of modal shift cannot be predicted at present so the rating (no change) is assumed to be conservative.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	+	+	+	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	+	+	+	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	+	+	+	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	+	+	+	Aims to encourage recreational cycling and walking and therefore this should support other policies designed to encourage access to the countryside.
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	+	+	+	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	~	~	
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	(+)	(+)	(+)	Longer-term benefit if it results in settlement layout in which the road network has less impact – should contribute to improved satisfaction with one's immediate environment.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	+	+(+)	++	As for 1.2.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	+	++	+++	Clear benefit which should grow so long as infrastructure provision does result in modal shift.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	

5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	+	+	+	Incorporates measures to secure and improve access to rights of way which supports this objective even if the land itself does not count towards open space provisioning targets.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	+	+(+)	++	Supports the objective of improving accessibility of amenities and work using non-car modes. Rate of growth is speculative.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	+	+(+)	++	A range of benefits including general safety measures for cyclists and pedestrians, and needs of less mobile can be catered for in improvements for pedestrian access.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~	
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~	
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~	
Summary of assessment: Little to say other than this is another policy supporting sustainable transport objectives and integrating them with urban design both in new settlements, and also with existing infrastructure such as the National Cycle Network. We understand the broad definition of the first priority reflects the central location of schools as well as local employment, retail and amenities and therefore the policy supports a wide range of potential movement within a community and between adjacent ones.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: Possibly make it clear that infrastructure should be designed to facilitate use by the less mobile – eg. access to footbridges by ramps rather than steps.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.				

TR/5 – Rail freight

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

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives
 [abridged in some cases]

Assessment
 Short Med. Long

Comments / Proposed Mitigation

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

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

TR/6 – Eastern Rapid Transit

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

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives
 [abridged in some cases]

Assessment
 Short Med. Long

Comments / Proposed Mitigation

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

1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	Policy is primarily concerned with financing the link, although the assessment also assumes the link will not take additional land from a development that is almost entirely brownfield.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	+	++	Investment in public transport infrastructure and contributes to reducing traffic congestion in Cambridge.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	~	~	~	
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	+	+	Beneficial if it can reduce congestion or prevent it worsening once Cambridge East is being redeveloped.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	Any benefits subsumed by comments for 3.2.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	+	++	As for 1.2.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	+	+	Potential air quality benefits if it reduces congestion.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	

6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	++	++	Obvious benefits for accessing Cambridge city centre, and will also help to support establishment of the district centre in Cambridge East by making amenities there more accessible for residents in other parts of the city.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	+	+	Expands public transport infrastructure and therefore benefits those unable to afford or use a car.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~	
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	++	++	Improves access to work using non-car modes.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	+	+	Seeks private sector investment in public infrastructure.
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	+(+)	++	Impact difficult to judge at this stage but any reduction in congestion could have at least indirect benefits to the local economy.
Summary of assessment: The policy primarily seeks finance for transport infrastructure from developers, but the assessment highlights the broader benefits that the link would bring, and these are more likely to occur if financial contributions mean the project goes ahead.				
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.				
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: Traffic congestion improvements may spread into other parts of the city. More importantly the link will support the establishment of the district centre at Cambridge East by making it readily accessible from the city centre.				

TR/7 – Aviation-related development proposals

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

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives
 [abridged in some cases]

Assessment
 Short Med. Long

Comments / Proposed Mitigation

1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	~	~	~	Assumed to be neutral, and development would be blocked by other policies in the plan.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	+	+	+	Implied by the policy wording.
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	+	+	+	As above.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	~	~	~	
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	+	+	+	As for 2.1 / 2.2.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	~	~	
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	~	~	~	
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	++	++	++	Clearly addresses issue of noise.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	+	+	+	Planning controls to prevent noise impacts and maintain rights of way, contributing indirectly.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	~	~	~	
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	

6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Summary of assessment: An overarching policy intended to place development controls on aviation-related developments over a potentially wide scale, ranging from larger airfields such as the current Cambridge airport, to small sites used by flying and gliding clubs.			
Summary of mitigation proposals: None.			
Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects: None identified.			