# Site Assessments of Rejected Green Belt Sites for Broad Location 2

#### **Cambridge City Council / South Cambridgeshire District Council**

## Green Belt Site and Sustainability Appraisal Assessment Proforma


Site Information Broad Location 2 Playing Fields off Grantchester Road Newnham

Site reference number(s): CC897

Site name/address: St. Catherines Playing Field Grantchester Road

Functional area (taken from SA Scoping Report): West Cambridge

#### Map:



## Site description:

This is one of a number of college playing fields located to the south of Newnham off Granchester Road. The area is relatively level with views into open countryside to the south towards Grantchester and along the River Cam immediately east. The land is slightly elevated above the land to the east that forms part of the Cam river valley and Grantchester Meadows. The southern section of the Pembroke playing field to the south is located in South Cambridgeshire.

Current use(s): Sports Pavilion

Proposed use(s): Residential

Site size (ha): 2.71 South Cambridgeshire:0.00ha Cambridge: 2.71ha Assumed net developable area: 1.35-2.03 (assuming 50%net or 75% net )

Assumed residential density: 45dph Potential residential capacity: 61-91

Site owner/promoter: Owner known

Landowner has agreed to promote site for development?: No

Site origin: Site submitted by member of the public

Relevant planning history: No relevant planning applications for residential use.		
Level 1 Part A: Strategic Considerations		
	il's Sustainable Development	t Strategy (SDS)
Criteria	Performance (fill with relevant colour R G B or RR R A G GG etc and retain only chosen score text)	Comments
Is the site within an area that has been identified as suitable for development in the SDS?	R = No G = Yes	
Flood Risk		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
Is site within a flood zone?	G = Flood risk zone 1	Green: The location lies entirely within Flood Risk Zone 1 (the lowest level of river flood risk).
Is site at risk from surface water flooding?	G = Low risk	Green:No surface water issues.
Green Belt		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
What effect would the development of this site have on Green Belt purposes, and other matters important to the special character of Cambridge and setting?	See below	Site is immediately adjacent to a Defining Character Area and Green corridor (River Cam)
To preserve the unique character of Cambridge as a compact and dynamic City with a thriving historic core	Distance from edge of the defined City Centre in Kilometres to approximate centre of site is under 2.5Km RR = Very high and high impacts.	Green: The west edge of Cambridge is important because it demonstrates compactness. However development in this location would do little to increase distance from edge to centre.
To prevent communities in the environs of Cambridge from merging into one another and with the City.	A = Some impact, but capable of mitigation	Amber: Development would decrease distance between City and Grantchester but could be mitigated.
To maintain and enhance the quality of the setting of Cambridge	RR = Very high and high impacts	Red, red: The setting of the City and edge of Newnham/Grantchester Meadows would be significantly negatively affected by developing close to the River Cam corridor.
Key views of Cambridge / Important views	R = Significant negative impact from loss or	Red: Significant negative impact on views from

	degradation of views	Grantchester Meadows
	degradation of views.	footpath and Grantchester
		Road.
Soft green edge to the City	R = Existing high quality	Red: There would be
Soft green eage to the Oity	edge, significant negative	significant negative impact
	impacts incapable of	on the soft green edge. It
	mitigation.	would be unlikely that the
	······································	boundary with Grantchester
		Meadows could be
		mitigated satisfactorily.
Distinctive urban edge	R = Existing high quality	Red: Grantchester
	edge, significant negative	Meadows is a distinctive
	impacts incapable of	City edge with high historic,
	mitigation.	cultural and environmental
		value. Development would
		have a significant negative
		impact.
Green corridors penetrating	R = Significant negative	Red: Significant negative
into the City	impact from loss of land	impact on Green (river)
	forming part of a green	Corridor.
	corridor, incapable of mitigation	
	miligation	
The distribution, physical	A = Negative impacts but	Amber: Any development
separation, setting, scale	capable of partial mitigation	would decrease the
and character of Green Belt		distance between the City
villages (SCDC only)		and Grantchester but could
		be mitigated.
A landscape which has a	R = Significant negative	Red: The strongly rural
strongly rural character	impacts incapable of	landscape would be
	satisfactory mitigation	negatively impacted.
Overall conclusion on	RR = Very high and high	Red, Red: Development
Green Belt	impacts	would be highly damaging
		to the setting of the city and
		have a negative impact on
		the Green corridor, Defining
		Character Area and quality
		landscape of Grantchester Meadows.
Impact on national Nature (	Conservation Designations	ivicadows.
Criteria	Performance	Comments
Would allocation impact	G = Site is not near to an	Green: No
upon a Site of Special	SSSI with no or negligible	
Scientific Interest (SSSI)?	impacts	
Impact on National Heritage		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
Will allocation impact upon	G = Site is not on or	Green: No
a Scheduled Ancient	adjacent to a SAM	
Monument (SAM)?	0 00	
Would development impact	G = Site does not contain or	Green: No

upon Listed Buildings?	adjoin such buildings, and	
	there is no impact to the setting of such buildings	
Part B: Deliverability and Vi		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
Is the site allocated or safeguarded in the Minerals and Waste LDF?	G = Site is not within an allocated or safeguarded area.	Green: Site is not allocated / identified or a mineral or waste management use through the adopted Minerals and Waste Core Strategy or Site Specific Proposals Plan. It does not fall within a Minerals Safeguarding Area; a Waste Water Treatment Works or Transport Zone Safeguarding Area; or a Minerals or Waste Consultation Area.
Is the site located within the Cambridge Airport Public Safety Zone (PSZ) or Safeguarding Zone?	A = Site or part of site within the SZ	Amber: Air Safeguarding Area – Half of site no buildings, structures and works exceeding 15m and a constraint of 45m in height on the remainder of site.
Is there a suitable access to the site?	R = No	Red: The site has no direct access to the adopted public highway; South Green Road is private and unsuitable for intensification in its current form.
Would allocation of the site have a significant impact on the local highway capacity?	A = Insufficient capacity.  Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.	Amber: Insufficient capacity. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.  This site is of a scale that would trigger the need for a Transportation Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan (TP), regardless of the need for a full Environmental Impact Assessment.  S106 contributions and mitigation measures will be required where appropriate. Any Cambridge Area
		Transport Strategy or other plans will also need to be taken into account.  This site is of a scale that

		would trigger the need for a Transportation Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan (TP), regardless of the need for a full Environmental Impact Assessment.  The site should only be considered in conjunction with Sites 895 and 896 to mitigate access problems.  The size of development would require modifications to Granchester Road and would result in the nature of the road changing significantly.
Would allocation of the site have a significant impact on the strategic road network capacity?	A = Insufficient capacity. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.	Amber: Insufficient capacity. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.  With regard to the A14 the Department for Transport announced in July that the A14 improvement scheme has been added to the national roads programme. Design work is underway on a scheme that will incorporate a Huntingdon Southern Bypass, capacity enhancements along the length of the route between Milton Interchange to the North of Cambridge and Huntingdon, and the construction of parallel local access roads to enable the closure of minor junctions onto the A14. The main impact, in relation to Grange Farm and other potential Local Plan sites, is that existing capacity constraints on the A14 between Cambridge and Huntingdon will be removed. The funding package and delivery programme for the scheme is still to be confirmed, and major development in the Cambridge area, which will

		benefit from the enhanced capacity, will undoubtedly be required to contribute towards the scheme costs, either directly or through the Community Infrastructure Levy. The earliest construction start would be 2018, with delivery by the mid-2020s being possible.
Is the site part of a larger site and could it prejudice development of any strategic sites?	A = Some impact	Amber: Yes, the site is part of a group of playing field sites.
Are there any known legal issues/covenants that could constrain development of the site?	R = Yes	Red: Yes, promoter is not landowner.
Timeframe for bringing the site forward for development?	R = Beyond 2031 (beyond plan period)	Red: No evidence of landowner intentions.
Would development of the site require significant new / upgraded utility infrastructure?	A = Yes, significant upgrades likely to be required, constraints capable of appropriate mitigation	Amber: Improved utilities required. The developer will need to liaise with the relevant service provider/s to determine the appropriate utility infrastructure provision.
Would development of the site be likely to require new education provision?	A = School capacity not sufficient, constraints can be appropriately mitigated	Amber: County Education comments awaited. Expect appropriate education provision to be made. For smaller sites this is likely to be off site.

Level 2			
Accessibility to existing centres and services			
Criteria	Performance	Comments	
How far is the site from the nearest District or Local centre?	A = 400-800m	Amber: Approximately 60% of the site is within 400m and the remainder within 400-800m (as the crow flies) of the Local Centre Grantchester Street, Newnham.	
How far is the nearest health centre or GP service in Cambridge?	R = >800m	Red: Site is over 800m from nearest health centre or GP service.	
Would development lead to	G = Development would not	Green: No	

a loss of community	lead to the loss of any	
facilities?	community facilities or	
	appropriate mitigation	
	possible	
How well would the	A = Adequate scope for	Amber: Adequate scope to
development on the site	integration with existing	·
•		integrate with existing
integrate with existing	communities	communities through good
communities?		design
How far is the nearest	A = 1-3km	Amber: Site is between 1
secondary school?		and 3km from nearest
,		secondary school.
How far is the nearest	City preference:	Amber: Site is between 400
primary school?	Oity proforonoo.	and 800m from nearest
primary schoor:	A 400 000m	
	A = 400-800m	primary school, Newnham
	0000	Croft.
	SCDC:	
	G = <1 km or non housing	
Would development protect	G = No effect or would	Green: The site is too small
the shopping hierarchy,	support the vitality and	to support a new Local
supporting the vitality and	viability of existing centres	Centre. The nearest Local
viability of Cambridge,	Training or training contact	Centre is Grantchester
Town, District and Local		Street, Newnham.
Centres?		The state of the s
Centres?		Additional population at this
		site may help to further
•		
		support this relatively small
		support this relatively small Local Centre.
Accessibility to outdoor fac	cilities and green spaces	
Accessibility to outdoor fac	cilities and green spaces Performance	
Criteria	Performance	Local Centre.  Comments
Criteria Would development result		Comments Red: Identified in City
Criteria Would development result in the loss of land protected	Performance	Comments Red: Identified in City Council Open Space &
Criteria Would development result in the loss of land protected by Cambridge Local Plan	Performance	Comments Red: Identified in City Council Open Space & Recreation Strategy and
Criteria Would development result in the loss of land protected by Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/2 or South	Performance	Comments Red: Identified in City Council Open Space & Recreation Strategy and 2006 Local Plan as
Criteria Would development result in the loss of land protected by Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/2 or South Cambridgeshire	Performance	Comments Red: Identified in City Council Open Space & Recreation Strategy and 2006 Local Plan as protected open space and
Criteria Would development result in the loss of land protected by Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/2 or South Cambridgeshire Development Control policy	Performance	Comments  Red: Identified in City Council Open Space & Recreation Strategy and 2006 Local Plan as protected open space and of environmental
Criteria  Would development result in the loss of land protected by Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/2 or South Cambridgeshire  Development Control policy SF/9? (excluding land which	Performance	Comments  Red: Identified in City Council Open Space & Recreation Strategy and 2006 Local Plan as protected open space and
Criteria Would development result in the loss of land protected by Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/2 or South Cambridgeshire Development Control policy	Performance	Comments  Red: Identified in City Council Open Space & Recreation Strategy and 2006 Local Plan as protected open space and of environmental
Criteria  Would development result in the loss of land protected by Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/2 or South Cambridgeshire  Development Control policy SF/9? (excluding land which	Performance	Comments  Red: Identified in City Council Open Space & Recreation Strategy and 2006 Local Plan as protected open space and of environmental
Criteria  Would development result in the loss of land protected by Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/2 or South Cambridgeshire Development Control policy SF/9? (excluding land which is protected only because of its Green Belt status).	Performance	Comments Red: Identified in City Council Open Space & Recreation Strategy and 2006 Local Plan as protected open space and of environmental importance
Criteria  Would development result in the loss of land protected by Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/2 or South Cambridgeshire  Development Control policy SF/9? (excluding land which is protected only because of its Green Belt status).  If the site is protected open	Performance R=Yes	Comments Red: Identified in City Council Open Space & Recreation Strategy and 2006 Local Plan as protected open space and of environmental importance  Red: Any future
Criteria  Would development result in the loss of land protected by Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/2 or South Cambridgeshire Development Control policy SF/9? (excluding land which is protected only because of its Green Belt status).  If the site is protected open space can the open space be	Performance R=Yes	Comments  Red: Identified in City Council Open Space & Recreation Strategy and 2006 Local Plan as protected open space and of environmental importance  Red: Any future development would need to
Criteria  Would development result in the loss of land protected by Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/2 or South Cambridgeshire  Development Control policy SF/9? (excluding land which is protected only because of its Green Belt status).  If the site is protected open	Performance R=Yes	Comments  Red: Identified in City Council Open Space & Recreation Strategy and 2006 Local Plan as protected open space and of environmental importance  Red: Any future development would need to satisfactorily incorporate the
Criteria  Would development result in the loss of land protected by Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/2 or South Cambridgeshire  Development Control policy SF/9? (excluding land which is protected only because of its Green Belt status).  If the site is protected open space can the open space be replaced according to CLP Local Plan policy 4/2	Performance R=Yes	Comments  Red: Identified in City Council Open Space & Recreation Strategy and 2006 Local Plan as protected open space and of environmental importance  Red: Any future development would need to satisfactorily incorporate the environmentally sensitive
Criteria  Would development result in the loss of land protected by Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/2 or South Cambridgeshire Development Control policy SF/9? (excluding land which is protected only because of its Green Belt status).  If the site is protected open space can the open space be replaced according to CLP Local Plan policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space or	Performance R=Yes	Comments  Red: Identified in City Council Open Space & Recreation Strategy and 2006 Local Plan as protected open space and of environmental importance  Red: Any future development would need to satisfactorily incorporate the environmentally sensitive protected open space or
Criteria  Would development result in the loss of land protected by Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/2 or South Cambridgeshire Development Control policy SF/9? (excluding land which is protected only because of its Green Belt status).  If the site is protected open space can the open space be replaced according to CLP Local Plan policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space or South Cambridgeshire	Performance R=Yes	Comments  Red: Identified in City Council Open Space & Recreation Strategy and 2006 Local Plan as protected open space and of environmental importance  Red: Any future development would need to satisfactorily incorporate the environmentally sensitive protected open space or demonstrate it can be
Criteria  Would development result in the loss of land protected by Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/2 or South Cambridgeshire  Development Control policy SF/9? (excluding land which is protected only because of its Green Belt status).  If the site is protected open space can the open space be replaced according to CLP Local Plan policy 4/2  Protection of Open Space or South Cambridgeshire Development Control policy	Performance R=Yes	Comments  Red: Identified in City Council Open Space & Recreation Strategy and 2006 Local Plan as protected open space and of environmental importance  Red: Any future development would need to satisfactorily incorporate the environmentally sensitive protected open space or demonstrate it can be reprovided elsewhere in an
Criteria  Would development result in the loss of land protected by Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/2 or South Cambridgeshire  Development Control policy SF/9? (excluding land which is protected only because of its Green Belt status).  If the site is protected open space can the open space be replaced according to CLP Local Plan policy 4/2  Protection of Open Space or South Cambridgeshire  Development Control policy SF/9 (for land in South	Performance R=Yes	Comments  Red: Identified in City Council Open Space & Recreation Strategy and 2006 Local Plan as protected open space and of environmental importance  Red: Any future development would need to satisfactorily incorporate the environmentally sensitive protected open space or demonstrate it can be
Criteria  Would development result in the loss of land protected by Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/2 or South Cambridgeshire  Development Control policy SF/9? (excluding land which is protected only because of its Green Belt status).  If the site is protected open space can the open space be replaced according to CLP Local Plan policy 4/2  Protection of Open Space or South Cambridgeshire  Development Control policy SF/9 (for land in South Cambridgeshire)?	R=Yes  R=No	Comments  Red: Identified in City Council Open Space & Recreation Strategy and 2006 Local Plan as protected open space and of environmental importance  Red: Any future development would need to satisfactorily incorporate the environmentally sensitive protected open space or demonstrate it can be reprovided elsewhere in an appropriate manner.
Criteria  Would development result in the loss of land protected by Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/2 or South Cambridgeshire Development Control policy SF/9? (excluding land which is protected only because of its Green Belt status).  If the site is protected open space can the open space be replaced according to CLP Local Plan policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space or South Cambridgeshire Development Control policy SF/9 (for land in South Cambridgeshire)?  If the site does not involve any	R=No  R= No, the site by virtue of	Comments  Red: Identified in City Council Open Space & Recreation Strategy and 2006 Local Plan as protected open space and of environmental importance  Red: Any future development would need to satisfactorily incorporate the environmentally sensitive protected open space or demonstrate it can be reprovided elsewhere in an appropriate manner.  Loss of Protected Open
Criteria  Would development result in the loss of land protected by Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/2 or South Cambridgeshire  Development Control policy SF/9? (excluding land which is protected only because of its Green Belt status).  If the site is protected open space can the open space be replaced according to CLP Local Plan policy 4/2  Protection of Open Space or South Cambridgeshire  Development Control policy SF/9 (for land in South Cambridgeshire)?  If the site does not involve any protected open space would	R=No  R= No, the site by virtue of its size is not able to	Comments  Red: Identified in City Council Open Space & Recreation Strategy and 2006 Local Plan as protected open space and of environmental importance  Red: Any future development would need to satisfactorily incorporate the environmentally sensitive protected open space or demonstrate it can be reprovided elsewhere in an appropriate manner.  Loss of Protected Open Space (land protected by
Criteria  Would development result in the loss of land protected by Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/2 or South Cambridgeshire  Development Control policy SF/9? (excluding land which is protected only because of its Green Belt status).  If the site is protected open space can the open space be replaced according to CLP Local Plan policy 4/2  Protection of Open Space or South Cambridgeshire  Development Control policy SF/9 (for land in South Cambridgeshire)?  If the site does not involve any protected open space would development of the site be	R=No  R=No, the site by virtue of its size is not able to provide the minimum	Comments  Red: Identified in City Council Open Space & Recreation Strategy and 2006 Local Plan as protected open space and of environmental importance  Red: Any future development would need to satisfactorily incorporate the environmentally sensitive protected open space or demonstrate it can be reprovided elsewhere in an appropriate manner.  Loss of Protected Open
Criteria  Would development result in the loss of land protected by Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/2 or South Cambridgeshire Development Control policy SF/9? (excluding land which is protected only because of its Green Belt status).  If the site is protected open space can the open space be replaced according to CLP Local Plan policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space or South Cambridgeshire Development Control policy SF/9 (for land in South Cambridgeshire)?  If the site does not involve any protected open space would development of the site be able to increase the quantity	R=No  R= No, the site by virtue of its size is not able to	Comments  Red: Identified in City Council Open Space & Recreation Strategy and 2006 Local Plan as protected open space and of environmental importance  Red: Any future development would need to satisfactorily incorporate the environmentally sensitive protected open space or demonstrate it can be reprovided elsewhere in an appropriate manner.  Loss of Protected Open Space (land protected by
Criteria  Would development result in the loss of land protected by Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/2 or South Cambridgeshire Development Control policy SF/9? (excluding land which is protected only because of its Green Belt status).  If the site is protected open space can the open space be replaced according to CLP Local Plan policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space or South Cambridgeshire Development Control policy SF/9 (for land in South Cambridgeshire)?  If the site does not involve any protected open space would development of the site be able to increase the quantity and quality of publically	R=No  R=No, the site by virtue of its size is not able to provide the minimum	Comments  Red: Identified in City Council Open Space & Recreation Strategy and 2006 Local Plan as protected open space and of environmental importance  Red: Any future development would need to satisfactorily incorporate the environmentally sensitive protected open space or demonstrate it can be reprovided elsewhere in an appropriate manner.  Loss of Protected Open Space (land protected by
Criteria  Would development result in the loss of land protected by Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/2 or South Cambridgeshire Development Control policy SF/9? (excluding land which is protected only because of its Green Belt status).  If the site is protected open space can the open space be replaced according to CLP Local Plan policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space or South Cambridgeshire Development Control policy SF/9 (for land in South Cambridgeshire)?  If the site does not involve any protected open space would development of the site be able to increase the quantity	R=No  R=No, the site by virtue of its size is not able to provide the minimum	Comments  Red: Identified in City Council Open Space & Recreation Strategy and 2006 Local Plan as protected open space and of environmental importance  Red: Any future development would need to satisfactorily incorporate the environmentally sensitive protected open space or demonstrate it can be reprovided elsewhere in an appropriate manner.  Loss of Protected Open Space (land protected by

achieve the minimum standards of onsite public open space provision?  Supporting Economic Grov		
Criteria How far is the nearest main	Performance G = <1km or allocation is for	Comments Green: Site is within 1km of
employment centre?	or includes a significant element of employment or is for another non-residential use	an employment centre
Would development result	G = No loss of employment	Green: Development would
in the loss of employment	land / allocation is for	not lead to the loss of
land identified in the Employment Land Review?	employment development	employment land identified in the Employment Land Review
Would allocation result in	A = Not within or adjacent	Amber: Site in Newnham
development in deprived	to the 40% most deprived	LSOA 7984: 4.61 and
areas of Cambridge?	Super Output Areas within Cambridge according to the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010.	adjacent to Newnham LSOA 7985: 5.07
Sustainable Transport		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
What type of public	R = Service does not meet	Red: No high quality bus
transport service is accessible at the edge of	the requirements of a high quality public transport	services within 400m, so the site does not meet the
the site?	(HQPT)	Local Plan (Policy 8/7)
		definition of high quality
	D 000	public transport.
How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?	R = >800m	Red: More than 800m.
What type of cycle routes	G = Quiet residential street	Green: Links to quiet
are accessible near to the site?	speed below 30mph, cycle lane with 1.5m minimum	residential streets
SILC!	width, high quality off-road	
	path e.g. cycleway adjacent	
	to guided busway.	
SCDC Would development	GG = Score 19-24 from 4	Total Score = 20
reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable	criteria below	
transport choices:		
SCDC Sub-indicator:	Within 400m (6)	Newnham, Selwyn Road
Distance to a bus stop / rail		

SCDC Sub-indicator: Frequency of Public Transport SCDC Sub-Indicator: Typical public transport journey time to Cambridge City Centre SCDC Sub-indicator: SIstance for cycling to City Centre Air Quality, pollution, contamination and noise  Criteria Is the site within or near to an ACMA, the M11 or the A112, or A14  Would the development of the site result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?  Are there potential noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is de	atation		
Frequency of Public Transport SCDC Sub-Indicator: Typical public transport ourney time to Cambridge City Centre SCDC Sub-indicator: Distance for cycling to City Centre Air Quality, pollution, contamination and noise Criteria Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14? Would the development of the site result in an adverse impact worsening of air quality? Are there potential noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Byould development be districted by the problems if the site is developed.  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed the problems if the site is developed.  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed the problems if the site is developed.  Are there potential odour problems	station	CO minute comitee (O)	10 / 10A Comics
Transport SCDC Sub-Indicator: Typical public transport journey time to Cambridge City Centre  Air Quality, pollution, contamination and noise Criteria  Performance AIR Quality, pollution, contamination and noise Criteria  AIR Quality, pollution, contamination and noise Criteria  AIR Quality, pollution, contamination and noise Criteria  AIR Quality, pollution, contamination AIR Quality Assessment due to size. An a Adverse impact AIR A = A		60 minute service (2)	18 / 18A Service
SCDC Sub-Indicator: Typical public transport journey time to Cambridge City Centre  SCDC Sub-indicator: Distance for cycling to City Centre  Air Quality, pollution, contamination and noise Criteria Is the site within or near to A14?  Would the development of the site result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?  Are there potential noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation			
Typical public transport journey time to Cambridge, Drummer Street)  City Centre  SCDC Sub-indicator: Distance for cycling to City Centre  Air Quality, pollution, contamination and noise  Criteria Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?  Would the development of the site result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?  Are there potential noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Be No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation developed, as a receptor or generator?  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation developed, as a receptor or generator?  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigatio		00 minutes and ass (6)	10 maigratus (Navanda ama
Drummer Street		20 minutes or less (6)	`
City Centre  SCDC Sub-indicator: Distance for cycling to City Centre  Air Quality, pollution, contamination and noise Criteria  Performance Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?  Would the development of the site result in an adverse impact worsening of air quality?  Are there potential noise areceptor or generator?  Are there potential ight is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  By the problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  By the problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  By the problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  By the problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Criteria  Criteria  Performance  Comments  Comments  Comments  Comments  Comments  Comments  C			
SCDC Sub-indicator: Distance for cycling to City Centre  Air Quality, pollution, contamination and noise  Criteria  Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?  Would the development of the site result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?  Are there potential noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light pollution problems if the sele is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  By the contamination on the site?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  By the contamination on the site?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  By the contamination on the site?  Criteria  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  By the contamination on the site?  Criteria problems if the site is developed in the residential amenity point o			Drummer Street)
Distance for cycling to City Centre  Air Quality, pollution, contamination and noise  Criteria  Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?  Would the development of the site result in an adverse impact worsening of air quality?  Are there potential light is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light side developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential loght is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light collumination and noise  Are there potential light is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light collumination and noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light collumination and noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed.  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed.  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Green: No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation development would require assessment in the ES			1.00
Air Quality, pollution, contamination and noise  Criteria  Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?  Would the development of the site result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?  Are there potential noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential loght pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential loght pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Green: No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation developed in the impact on public highways.  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and		Up to 5km (6)	1.02km ACF
Air Quality, pollution, contamination and noise  Criteria  Performance  Performance  Comments  Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?  Would the development of the site result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?  Are there potential noise and voice is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential lodour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = Site not within or an area with a history of contamination  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Protecting Groundwater  Criteria  Performance  G = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace  Comments  Green: Site is not within SPZ 1.			
Performance		mination and naise	
Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?  Would the development of the site result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?  Are there potential noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Are there potential lodour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Green: No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Protecting Groundwater  Criteria  Performance  G = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace  Green: Site is not within SPZ1.			Comments
an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?  Would the development of the site result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?  Are there potential light pollution problems if the side is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential loght side developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  B there possible contamination on the site?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  B there possible contamination on the site?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  B there possible contamination on the site?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  B S No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Green: No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Protecting Groundwater  Criteria  Performance  G = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace			
A14?  Would the development of the site result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?  Are there potential noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  B there possible contamination on the site?  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Green: No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Protecting Groundwater  Criteria  Performance  G = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace  Size.  Amber: The development may adversely affect air quality. Amber: Frontage will be the noisiest part of the site from the road. Noise assessment is required.  Amber: Frontage will be the noisiest part of the site from the road. Noise assessment in the Eslite is form the road. Noise assessment in the Eslite is form the road. Noise assessment in the Eslite is form the road. Noise assessment in the Eslite is form the road. Noise assessment in the Eslite is form the road. Noise assessment in the Eslite is developed.  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  G = Not within SPZ1 or al			
Would the development of the site result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?  Are there potential noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light side is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light side is developed, as a receptor or generator?  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Green: From purely the residential amenity point of view the light impact from development would require assessment in the ES but could be fully mitigated.  Other agencies should be consulted regarding impact on public highways.  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Is there possible contamination on the site?  G = Site not within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination  Frotecting Groundwater  Criteria  Performance  G = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace  Mould development be within a source protection zone?	1	IVITI, OF AT4	
Would the development of the site result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?  Are there potential noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential loght pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential loght pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  By the possible contamination on the site?  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation developed, as a receptor or generator?  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation developed, as a receptor or generator?  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation developed, as a receptor or generator?  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation developed, as a receptor or generator?  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation developed, as a receptor or generator?  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation developed, as a receptor or generator?  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation developed, as a receptor or generator?  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Protecting Groundwater  Criteria  Would development be within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace  Green: Site is not within SPZ 1.	A14?		
Would the development of the site result in an adverse impact worsening of air quality?   A = Adverse impact   Amber: Frontage will be the noisiest part of the site from the road. Noise assessment and potential noise mitigation needed.   Amber: Frontage will be the noisiest part of the site from the road. Noise assessment and potential noise mitigation needed.   Green: From purely the residential amenity point of view the light impact from development would require assessment in the ES but could be fully mitigated.   Other agencies should be consulted regarding the impact on wild life, night sky and the County Council regarding impact on public highways.    Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?   Green: No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation   Green: No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation   Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.    Protecting Groundwater   Criteria   Performance   Comments   Comment			
the site result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?  Are there potential noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Green: From purely the residential amenity point of view the light impact from development would require assessment in the ES but could be fully mitigated.  Other agencies should be consulted regarding the impact on wild life, night sky and the Country Council regarding impact on public highways.  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Is there possible contamination on the site?  G = Site not within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination  G = Site not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Green: Site is not within SPZ1.	Would the dovolopment of	A - Adverse impact	
impact/worsening of air quality?  Are there potential noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  By the possible contamination on the site?  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Green: No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Protecting Groundwater  Criteria Performance  G = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace  Green: Site is not within SPZ1.		A = Auverse impact	•
Are there potential odur problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Green: From purely the residential amenity point of view the light impact from development would require assessment in the ES but could be fully mitigated.  Other agencies should be consulted regarding the impact on wild life, night sky and the County Council regarding impact on public highways.  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Is there possible contamination on the site?  G = Site not within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination  G = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace  G = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace  G = Site is not within SPZ1.			
Are there potential noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Green: From purely the residential amenity point of view the light impact from development would require assessment in the ES but could be fully mitigated.  Other agencies should be consulted regarding the impact on wild life, night sky and the County Council regarding impact on public highways.  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there possible contamination on the site?  G = Site not within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination  Protecting Groundwater  Criteria  Performance  G = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace  Green: Site is not within SPZ1.			
and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Gaussian and potential noise mitigation needed.  Gaussian purely the residential amenity point of view the light impact from development would require assessment in the ES but could be fully mitigated.  Other agencies should be consulted regarding impact on public highways.  Gaussian in the County Council regarding impact on public highways.  Gaussian in the ES but could be fully mitigated.  Gaussian in the ES but could be fully mitigated.  Other agencies should be consulted regarding the impact on wild life, night sky and the County Council regarding impact on public highways.  Gaussian in the ES but could be fully mitigated.  Gaussian in the ES but could be fully mitigated.  Gaussian in the ES but could be fully mitigation of view the light impact from development be will he impact on wild life, night sky and the County Council regarding the impact on wild life, night sky and the County Council regarding the impact on wild life, night sky and the County Council regarding the impact on wild life, night sky and the Coun		Δ - Adverse impacts	
the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Is there possible contamination on the site?  Protecting Groundwater  Criteria Performance  Would development be within a source protection zone?  Mitigation  Green: From purely the residential amenity point of view the light impact from development would require assessment in the ES but could be fully mitigated.  Other agencies should be consulted regarding the impact on wild life, night sky and the County Council regarding impact on public highways.  Green: No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Green: No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Performance  Genen: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Comments  Green: Site is not within SPZ 1 or allocation is for greenspace	•		_
Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Is there possible contamination on the site?  Protecting Groundwater  Criteria  Performance  Would development be within a source protection zone?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Green: Comments  Comments  Comments  Green: Site is not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace			
Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Is there possible contamination on the site?  Brotecting Groundwater  Criteria  Performance  Would development be within a source protection zone?  Mitigation needed.  Green: From purely the residential amenity point of view the light impact from developent or eapable of full mitigation  Green: Here potential adentity point of view the light impact from development would require assessment in the ES but could be fully mitigated.  Other agencies should be consulted regarding the impact on wild life, night sky and the County Council regarding impact on public highways.  Green: No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Green: No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Genen: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Genen: Site is not within SPZ 1.	•	mitigation	
Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Is there possible contamination on the site?  By the protecting Groundwater  Criteria  Performance  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Green: From purely the residential amenity point of view the light impact from development would require assessment in the ES but could be fully mitigated.  Other agencies should be consulted regarding the impact on wild life, night sky and the County Council regarding impact on public highways.  Green: No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Protecting Groundwater  Criteria  Performance  G = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace  in the ES but could be fully mitigated.  Other agencies should be consulted regarding the impact on wild life, night sky and the County Council regarding impact on public highways.  Green: No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Protecting Groundwater  G = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace  SPZ 1.	receptor or generator:		•
pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Is there possible contamination on the site?  Protecting Groundwater  Criteria Performance  Would development if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = Site not within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination  Berformance  G = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace  Comments  Green: No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Green: Site is not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace			mingation needed.
pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Is there possible contamination on the site?  Protecting Groundwater  Criteria Performance  Would development if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = Site not within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination  Berformance  G = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace  Comments  Green: No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Green: Site is not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace	Are there potential light	G = No adverse effects or	Green: From purely the
view the light impact from development would require assessment in the ES but could be fully mitigated.  Other agencies should be consulted regarding the impact on wild life, night sky and the County Council regarding impact on public highways.  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Is there possible contamination on the site?  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Protecting Groundwater  Criteria Performance Comments  Would development be within a source protection zone?  View the light impact from development would require assessment in the ES but could be fully mitigated.  Other agencies should be consulted regarding the impact on wild life, night sky and the County Council regarding impact on public highways.  Green: No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = Nite not within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  G = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace  SPZ 1.			
or generator?  development would require assessment in the ES but could be fully mitigated.  Other agencies should be consulted regarding the impact on wild life, night sky and the County Council regarding impact on public highways.  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Is there possible contamination on the site?  G = Site not within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Protecting Groundwater  Criteria  Performance  G = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace  Green: Site is not within SPZ 1.	•	capable of fair finingation	
assessment in the ES but could be fully mitigated.  Other agencies should be consulted regarding the impact on wild life, night sky and the County Council regarding impact on public highways.  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Is there possible contamination on the site?  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Green: No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Protecting Groundwater  Criteria  Performance  G = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace  Green: Site is not within SPZ 1.			
Could be fully mitigated.  Other agencies should be consulted regarding the impact on wild life, night sky and the County Council regarding impact on public highways.  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Is there possible contamination on the site?  G = Site not within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination  Frotecting Groundwater  Criteria  Performance  G = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace  Could be fully mitigated.  Other agencies should be consulted regarding the impact on wild life, night sky and the County Council regarding impact on public highways.  Green: No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Green: Site is not within SPZ 1.	or generaler.		
Other agencies should be consulted regarding the impact on wild life, night sky and the County Council regarding impact on public highways.  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Is there possible contamination on the site?  G = Site not within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination  Green: No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Protecting Groundwater  Criteria  Performance  G = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace  Green: Site is not within SPZ 1.			
consulted regarding the impact on wild life, night sky and the County Council regarding impact on public highways.  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Is there possible contamination on the site?  Is there possible contamination on the site?  Frotecting Groundwater  Criteria  Performance  Would development be within a source protection zone?  Consulted regarding the impact on wild life, night sky and the County Council regarding impact on public highways.  Green: No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Genen: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Figure 1.			Todad 20 fally fillingatod.
consulted regarding the impact on wild life, night sky and the County Council regarding impact on public highways.  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Is there possible contamination on the site?  Is there possible contamination on the site?  Frotecting Groundwater  Criteria  Performance  Would development be within a source protection zone?  Consulted regarding the impact on wild life, night sky and the County Council regarding impact on public highways.  Green: No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Genen: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Figure 1.			Other agencies should be
impact on wild life, night sky and the County Council regarding impact on public highways.  Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Is there possible contamination on the site?  Is there possible contamination on the site?  Frotecting Groundwater  Criteria  Performance  Would development be within a source protection zone?  impact on wild life, night sky and the County Council regarding impact on public highways.  Green: No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  G = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace  SPZ 1.			_
Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Is there possible contamination on the site?  Protecting Groundwater  Criteria Performance  Would development be within a source protection zone?  Are there potential odour regarding impact on public highways.  Green: No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.			• •
Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Is there possible contamination on the site?  Protecting Groundwater  Criteria Performance Comments  Would development be within a source protection zone?  Regarding impact on public highways.  Green: No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  G = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace  For green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  G = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace			
Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Is there possible contamination on the site?  Protecting Groundwater  Criteria  Performance  Would development be within a source protection zone?    highways.			-
Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Is there possible contamination on the site?  Protecting Groundwater  Criteria Performance  Would development be within a source protection zone?  G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Green: No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  G = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace  Green: No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  G = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace  SPZ 1.			
problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  Is there possible contamination on the site?  Protecting Groundwater  Criteria Performance  Would development be within a source protection zone?  Capable of full mitigation or capable of full mitigation  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Generator?  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Generator:  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Generator:  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Generator:  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Generator:  Generator:  Green: Site is not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace	Are there potential odour	G = No adverse effects or	
developed, as a receptor or generator?  Is there possible contamination on the site?  Protecting Groundwater  Criteria  Performance  Would development be within a source protection zone?  G = Site not within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination  Protecting Groundwater  Comments  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Generator?  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Generator?  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Ferformance  Generator:  Adjacent to an area with a history of contamination  Former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Generator:  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Generator:  Generator:  Green: Site is not within SPZ 1.			
Is there possible contamination on the site?  Protecting Groundwater  Criteria  Performance  Would development be within a source protection zone?  G = Site not within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination  A part of the site of	1 .	3	3
Is there possible contamination on the site?  Protecting Groundwater  Criteria  Performance  Would development be within a source protection zone?  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Comments  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Green: There are no known former or current industrial activities on and off the site.  Green: Site is not within sequence of the site of th	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
contamination on the site?  adjacent to an area with a history of contamination  Protecting Groundwater  Criteria  Performance  G = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace zone?  Green: Site is not within SPZ 1.		G = Site not within or	Green: There are no known
Protecting Groundwater  Criteria Performance Comments  Would development be within a source protection zone?  Comments  G = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace SPZ 1.			
Protecting Groundwater  Criteria Performance Comments  Would development be within a source protection zone?  G = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace SPZ 1.		•	
Criteria Performance Comments  Would development be within a source protection zone?  G = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace SPZ 1.	Protecting Groundwater		
within a source protection zone?  allocation is for greenspace SPZ 1.		Performance	Comments
zone?	Would development be	G = Not within SPZ1 or	
zone?	within a source protection	allocation is for greenspace	SPZ 1.
Groundwater sources (e.g.			
	Groundwater sources (e.g.		

wells, boreholes and	
springs) are used for public	
drinking water supply.	
These zones show the risk	
of contamination from any	
activities that might cause	
pollution in the area.	

Protecting the townscape and historic environment (Landscape addressed by Green Belt criteria)		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
Would allocation impact upon a historic park/garden?	G = Site does not contain or adjoin such areas, and there is no impact to the setting of such areas	Green: No
Would development impact upon a Conservation Area?	A = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such an area with potential for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation	Amber: Yes, in the Newnham Croft Conservation Area.
Would development impact upon buildings of local interest (Cambridge only)	G = Site does not contain or adjoin such buildings, and there is no impact to the setting of such buildings	Green: No
Would development impact upon archaeology?	A = Known archaeology on site or in vicinity	Amber: National Grid Reference 543990 257080. River Cam terraces along the Barton Road and Newnham are host to late prehistoric to Saxon settlement (Monuments in Cambridge eg MCB15026, MCB16190). A moated medieval site is loated at Dumpling Farm (MCB11422) and the watercourses from it connect to the Cam. A programme of archaeological works should be undertaken prior to the submission of any planning application.

Making Efficient Use of Land		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
•	G = Neutral. Development	Green: Site on urban land.
the loss of the best and	would not affect grade 1 and	
most versatile agricultural	2 land.	
land?		


Would development make	R = No	Red: No
use of previously developed	H = NO	neu. No
land (PDL)? (CITY)		
Would development make	A=No	Amber: No
use of previously developed	71-110	7111501.140
land (PDL)? (SCDC)		
Biodiversity and Green Infra	astructure	
Criteria	Performance	Comments
Would development impact	A = Contains or is adjacent	Amber: Site opposite
upon a locally designated	to an existing site and	Skater's Meadow Group
wildlife site i.e. (Local	impacts capable of	County Wildlife Site and
Nature Reserve, County	appropriate mitigation	River Cam County Wildlife
Wildlife Site, City Wildlife		Site.
Site)		
Does the site offer	A = No significant	Amber: Site sits in riparian
opportunity for green	opportunities or loss of	habitats running south
infrastructure delivery?	existing green infrastructure	along the River Cam out of
	capable of appropriate	the City centre. Current
	mitigation	playing fields offer a
		transition between the
		urban form and mixed
		arable and pasture
		farmland. Existing public
		footpath to Granchester
		Meadows and Byron's Pool Local Nature Reserve
		could be enhanced.
Would development reduce	A = Development would	Amber: Boundary features
habitat fragmentation,	have a negative impact on	of playing fields often form
enhance native species,	existing features or network	useful corridors for
and help deliver habitat	links but capable of	foraging and dispersing
restoration (helping to	appropriate mitigation	mammals, birds and
achieve Biodiversity Action	3	invertebrates. Proposals
Plan targets?)		should seek to retain
,		mature trees, hedgerows
		and areas of scrub.
Are there trees on site or	G = Site does not contain or	Green: Site does not
immediately adjacent	adjoin any protected trees	contain or adjoin any
protected by a Tree		protected trees
Preservation Order (TPO)?		
Any other information not of	aptured above?	
Complyeigns		
Cross site comparison		
Cross site comparison Level 1 Conclusion (after	D - Significant constraints	Red:
allowing scope for	R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts	- Very significant impact on
mitigation)	or daverse impacts	Green Belt purposes
imaganon <i>j</i>		- No evidence of
		landowner intention to
		develop
		- Inadequate vehicular
		access
Level 2 Conclusion (after	R = Significant constraints	Red:
allowing scope for	or adverse impacts	- Site is further than 800m

mitigation)		from a health centre/GP and its small size would mean it could not provide for new health facilities on site.  - It is not accessible to high quality public transport.  -Development would result in the loss of a playing field designated as public open space. This open space would have to be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere.
Overall Conclusion	R = Site with no significant development potential (significant constraints and adverse impacts)	Red: Site with no significant development potential (significant constraints and adverse impacts)
Viability feedback (from consultants)	R = Unlikely to be viable, A = May be viable G = Likely to be viable	Sites ranked A or G will be taken forward for viability assessment by consultants

#### **Cambridge City Council / South Cambridgeshire District Council**

To be accompanied by a table which identifies how it provides /encompasses both LPA's SA and SHLAA assessments. Text in italics are officer prompts to be deleted on completion.

#### Green Belt Site and Sustainability Appraisal Assessment Proforma



**Site description:** This is one of a number of college playing fields located to the south of Newnham off Granchester Road. The area is relatively level with views into open countryside to the south towards Grantchester and along the River Cam immediately east. The land is slightly elevated above the land to the east that forms part of the Cam river valley and Grantchester Meadows. The southern section of the Pembroke playing field to the south is located in South Cambridgeshire.

Current use(s): Playing Fields
Proposed use(s): Residential

Site size (ha): 3.76 South Cambridgeshire: Further section of the playing field is in SCDC. Area

Cambridge: 3.76

Assumed net developable area: 1.88-2.82ha (assuming 50% net or 75% net)

Assumed residential density: 45dph
Potential residential capacity: 85-127
Site owner/promoter: Owners known

Landowner has agreed to promote site for development?: No

Site origin: Site submitted by member of the public

Relevant planning history: No relevant planning applications for residential use.

Level 1 Part A: Strategic Considerations		
Conformity with the Council's Sustainable Development Strategy (SDS)		
Criteria	Performance (fill with relevant colour R G B or RR R A G GG etc and retain only chosen score text)	Comments
Is the site within an area that has been identified as suitable for development in the SDS?	R = No G = Yes	
Flood Risk		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
Is site within a flood zone?	G = Flood risk zone 1	Green: The location lies entirely within Flood Risk Zone 1 (the lowest level of river flood risk).
Is site at risk from surface water flooding?	G = Low risk	Green: No surface water issues
Green Belt		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
What effect would the development of this site have on Green Belt purposes, and other matters important to the special character of Cambridge and setting?	See below	Site is immediately adjacent to a Defining Character Area and Green corridor (River Cam)
To preserve the unique character of Cambridge as a compact and dynamic City with a thriving historic core	Distance from edge of the defined City Centre in Kilometres to approximate centre of site is under 2.5 Km	Green: The west edge of Cambridge is important because it demonstrates compactness. However development in this location would do little to increase distance from edge to centre.
To prevent communities in the environs of Cambridge from merging into one another and with the City.	R = Significant negative impacts	Red: Development would move the urban edge closer to Grantchester.
To maintain and enhance the quality of the setting of Cambridge	RR = Very high and high impacts	Red, red: The setting of the City and edge of Newnham/Grantchester Meadows would be significantly negatively affected by developing close to the River Cam corridor.
Key views of Cambridge / Important views	R = Significant negative impact from loss or degradation of views.	Red: Significant negative impact on views from Grantchester Meadows footpath and Grantchester Road.

Soft green edge to the City	R = Existing high quality	Red: the existing soft green
Soft green eage to the Oily	edge, significant negative	edge would be negatively
	impacts incapable of	impacted by development
	mitigation.	and would be problematic to
	miligation.	mitigate particularly as it is
		a site surrounded by rural
		landscape.
Distinctive urban edge	R = Existing high quality	Red: Grantchester
Distillative disaff edge	edge, significant negative	Meadows is a distinctive
	impacts incapable of	City edge with high historic,
	mitigation.	cultural and environmental
	·····agaile····	value. Development would
		have a significant negative
		impact.
Green corridors penetrating	R = Significant negative	Red: Significant negative
into the City	impact from loss of land	impact on Green (river)
,	forming part of a green	Corridor.
	corridor, incapable of	
	mitigation	
The distribution, physical	R = Significant negative	Red: Development would
separation, setting, scale	impacts incapable of	decrease distance from City
and character of Green Belt	satisfactory mitigation	to Granchester.
villages (SCDC only)		
A landscape which has a	R = Significant negative	Red: The strongly rural
strongly rural character	impacts incapable of	landscape would be
	satisfactory mitigation	negatively impacted.
Overall conclusion on	RR = Very high and high	Red, Red: Development
Green Belt	impacts	would be highly damaging
		would be highly damaging to the setting of the city and
		would be highly damaging to the setting of the city and have a negative impact on
		would be highly damaging to the setting of the city and have a negative impact on the Green corridor, Defining
		would be highly damaging to the setting of the city and have a negative impact on the Green corridor, Defining Character Area and quality
		would be highly damaging to the setting of the city and have a negative impact on the Green corridor, Defining Character Area and quality landscape of Grantchester
Green Belt	impacts	would be highly damaging to the setting of the city and have a negative impact on the Green corridor, Defining Character Area and quality
	impacts	would be highly damaging to the setting of the city and have a negative impact on the Green corridor, Defining Character Area and quality landscape of Grantchester
Green Belt  Impact on national Nature (	impacts  Conservation Designations	would be highly damaging to the setting of the city and have a negative impact on the Green corridor, Defining Character Area and quality landscape of Grantchester Meadows.
Impact on national Nature ( Criteria	impacts  Conservation Designations  Performance	would be highly damaging to the setting of the city and have a negative impact on the Green corridor, Defining Character Area and quality landscape of Grantchester Meadows.  Comments
Impact on national Nature Coriteria Would allocation impact	Conservation Designations Performance G = Site is not near to an	would be highly damaging to the setting of the city and have a negative impact on the Green corridor, Defining Character Area and quality landscape of Grantchester Meadows.  Comments
Impact on national Nature ( Criteria Would allocation impact upon a Site of Special	Conservation Designations Performance G = Site is not near to an SSSI with no or negligible impacts	would be highly damaging to the setting of the city and have a negative impact on the Green corridor, Defining Character Area and quality landscape of Grantchester Meadows.  Comments
Impact on national Nature ( Criteria Would allocation impact upon a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)? Impact on National Heritage Criteria	Conservation Designations Performance G = Site is not near to an SSSI with no or negligible impacts Assets Performance	would be highly damaging to the setting of the city and have a negative impact on the Green corridor, Defining Character Area and quality landscape of Grantchester Meadows.  Comments
Impact on national Nature ( Criteria Would allocation impact upon a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)? Impact on National Heritage Criteria Will allocation impact upon	Conservation Designations Performance G = Site is not near to an SSSI with no or negligible impacts Assets	would be highly damaging to the setting of the city and have a negative impact on the Green corridor, Defining Character Area and quality landscape of Grantchester Meadows.  Comments Green: No
Impact on national Nature ( Criteria Would allocation impact upon a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)? Impact on National Heritage Criteria Will allocation impact upon a Scheduled Ancient	Conservation Designations Performance G = Site is not near to an SSSI with no or negligible impacts Assets Performance	would be highly damaging to the setting of the city and have a negative impact on the Green corridor, Defining Character Area and quality landscape of Grantchester Meadows.  Comments Green: No  Comments
Impact on national Nature ( Criteria Would allocation impact upon a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)? Impact on National Heritage Criteria Will allocation impact upon a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)?	Conservation Designations  Performance  G = Site is not near to an SSSI with no or negligible impacts  Assets  Performance  G = Site is not on or adjacent to a SAM	would be highly damaging to the setting of the city and have a negative impact on the Green corridor, Defining Character Area and quality landscape of Grantchester Meadows.  Comments Green: No  Comments Green: Site is not on or adjacent to a SAM
Impact on national Nature ( Criteria Would allocation impact upon a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)? Impact on National Heritage Criteria Will allocation impact upon a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)? Would development impact	Conservation Designations  Performance  G = Site is not near to an SSSI with no or negligible impacts  Assets  Performance  G = Site is not on or adjacent to a SAM  G = Site does not contain or	would be highly damaging to the setting of the city and have a negative impact on the Green corridor, Defining Character Area and quality landscape of Grantchester Meadows.  Comments Green: No  Comments Green: Site is not on or adjacent to a SAM  Green: Site does not
Impact on national Nature ( Criteria Would allocation impact upon a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)? Impact on National Heritage Criteria Will allocation impact upon a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)?	Conservation Designations Performance G = Site is not near to an SSSI with no or negligible impacts Assets Performance G = Site is not on or adjacent to a SAM  G = Site does not contain or adjoin such buildings, and	would be highly damaging to the setting of the city and have a negative impact on the Green corridor, Defining Character Area and quality landscape of Grantchester Meadows.  Comments Green: No  Comments Green: Site is not on or adjacent to a SAM  Green: Site does not contain or adjoin such
Impact on national Nature ( Criteria Would allocation impact upon a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)? Impact on National Heritage Criteria Will allocation impact upon a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)? Would development impact	Conservation Designations Performance G = Site is not near to an SSSI with no or negligible impacts  Performance G = Site is not on or adjacent to a SAM  G = Site does not contain or adjoin such buildings, and there is no impact to the	would be highly damaging to the setting of the city and have a negative impact on the Green corridor, Defining Character Area and quality landscape of Grantchester Meadows.  Comments Green: No  Comments Green: Site is not on or adjacent to a SAM  Green: Site does not contain or adjoin such buildings, and there is no
Impact on national Nature ( Criteria Would allocation impact upon a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)? Impact on National Heritage Criteria Will allocation impact upon a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)? Would development impact	Conservation Designations Performance G = Site is not near to an SSSI with no or negligible impacts Assets Performance G = Site is not on or adjacent to a SAM  G = Site does not contain or adjoin such buildings, and	would be highly damaging to the setting of the city and have a negative impact on the Green corridor, Defining Character Area and quality landscape of Grantchester Meadows.  Comments Green: No  Comments Green: Site is not on or adjacent to a SAM  Green: Site does not contain or adjoin such buildings, and there is no impact to the setting of such
Impact on national Nature ( Criteria Would allocation impact upon a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)? Impact on National Heritage Criteria Will allocation impact upon a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)? Would development impact upon Listed Buildings?	Conservation Designations  Performance  G = Site is not near to an SSSI with no or negligible impacts  Assets  Performance  G = Site is not on or adjacent to a SAM  G = Site does not contain or adjoin such buildings, and there is no impact to the setting of such buildings	would be highly damaging to the setting of the city and have a negative impact on the Green corridor, Defining Character Area and quality landscape of Grantchester Meadows.  Comments Green: No  Comments Green: Site is not on or adjacent to a SAM  Green: Site does not contain or adjoin such buildings, and there is no
Impact on national Nature ( Criteria Would allocation impact upon a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)? Impact on National Heritage Criteria Will allocation impact upon a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)? Would development impact upon Listed Buildings?  Part B: Deliverability and V	Conservation Designations Performance G = Site is not near to an SSSI with no or negligible impacts Assets Performance G = Site is not on or adjacent to a SAM  G = Site does not contain or adjoin such buildings, and there is no impact to the setting of such buildings	would be highly damaging to the setting of the city and have a negative impact on the Green corridor, Defining Character Area and quality landscape of Grantchester Meadows.  Comments Green: No  Comments Green: Site is not on or adjacent to a SAM  Green: Site does not contain or adjoin such buildings, and there is no impact to the setting of such buildings
Impact on national Nature ( Criteria Would allocation impact upon a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)? Impact on National Heritage Criteria Will allocation impact upon a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)? Would development impact upon Listed Buildings?  Part B: Deliverability and V Criteria	Conservation Designations Performance G = Site is not near to an SSSI with no or negligible impacts Assets Performance G = Site is not on or adjacent to a SAM  G = Site does not contain or adjoin such buildings, and there is no impact to the setting of such buildings  iability Criteria Performance	would be highly damaging to the setting of the city and have a negative impact on the Green corridor, Defining Character Area and quality landscape of Grantchester Meadows.  Comments Green: No  Comments Green: Site is not on or adjacent to a SAM  Green: Site does not contain or adjoin such buildings, and there is no impact to the setting of such buildings  Comments  Comments
Impact on national Nature ( Criteria Would allocation impact upon a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)? Impact on National Heritage Criteria Will allocation impact upon a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)? Would development impact upon Listed Buildings?  Part B: Deliverability and V	Conservation Designations Performance G = Site is not near to an SSSI with no or negligible impacts Assets Performance G = Site is not on or adjacent to a SAM  G = Site does not contain or adjoin such buildings, and there is no impact to the setting of such buildings	would be highly damaging to the setting of the city and have a negative impact on the Green corridor, Defining Character Area and quality landscape of Grantchester Meadows.  Comments Green: No  Comments Green: Site is not on or adjacent to a SAM  Green: Site does not contain or adjoin such buildings, and there is no impact to the setting of such buildings

and Waste LDF?	area.	waste management use
and waste EDI:	aroa.	through the adopted
		Minerals and Waste Core
		Strategy or Site Specific
		Proposals Plan. It does not
		fall within a Minerals
		Safeguarding Area; a
		Waste Water Treatment
		Works (WWTW) or
		Transport Zone
		Safeguarding Area; or a
		Minerals or Waste
		Consultation Area.
Is the site located within the	A = Site or part of site within	Amber: Air Safeguarding
Cambridge Airport Public	the SZ	Area - No erection of
Safety Zone (PSZ) or		buildings, structures and
Safeguarding Zone?		works exceeding 150ft
		(45.7m) in height
Is there a suitable access to	A = Yes, with mitigation	Amber: County Highways:
the site?	, and the second	The size of the proposed
		development would require
		modifications to
		Grantchester Road and
		would result in the nature of
		the road changing
		significantly.
Would allocation of the site	A = Insufficient capacity.	Amber: Insufficient capacity.
have a significant impact on	Negative effects capable of	Negative effects capable of
the local highway capacity?	appropriate mitigation.	appropriate mitigation.
		This site is of a scale that
		would trigger the need for a
		Transportation Assessment
		(TA) and Travel Plan (TP),
		regardless of the need for a
		full Environmental Impact
		Assessment.
		S106 contributions and
		S106 contributions and
		mitigation measures will be
		required where appropriate.
		Any Cambridge Area
		Transport Strategy or other plans will also need to be
		taken into account.
		taken into account.
		The size of the proposed
		development would require
		modifications to
		Grantchester Road and
		would result in the nature of
		the road changing
		significantly.

		The site should only be considered in conjunction with Sites 895 and 897 to mitigate access problems.
Would allocation of the site	A = Insufficient capacity.	Amber: Insufficient capacity.
have a significant impact on the strategic road network	Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.	Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.
capacity?		With regard to the A14 the Department for Transport
		announced in July that the A14 improvement scheme
		has been added to the national roads programme.  Design work is underway on
		a scheme that will incorporate a Huntingdon
		Southern Bypass, capacity enhancements along the length of the route between
		Milton Interchange to the North of Cambridge and
		Huntingdon, and the construction of parallel local access roads to enable the
		closure of minor junctions onto the A14. The main
		impact, in relation to Grange Farm and other potential Local Plan sites, is
		that existing capacity constraints on the A14
		between Cambridge and Huntingdon will be removed. The funding
		package and delivery programme for the scheme
		is still to be confirmed, and major development in the
		Cambridge area, which will benefit from the enhanced capacity, will undoubtedly
		be required to contribute towards the scheme costs,
		either directly or through the Community Infrastructure Levy. The earliest
		construction start would be 2018, with delivery by the mid-2020s being possible.
Is the site part of a larger site and could it prejudice	A = Some impact	Amber: Yes, the site is part of a group of playing field
development of any strategic sites?		sites.

Are there any known legal issues/covenants that could constrain development of the site?	R = Yes	Red: Yes promoter is not landowner
Timeframe for bringing the site forward for development?	R = Beyond 2031 (beyond plan period)	Red: No evidence of landowner intentions
Would development of the site require significant new / upgraded utility infrastructure?	A = Yes, significant upgrades likely to be required, constraints capable of appropriate mitigation	Amber: Improved utilities required. The developer will need to liaise with the relevant service provider/s to determine the appropriate utility infrastructure provision.
Would development of the site be likely to require new education provision?	A = School capacity not sufficient, constraints can be appropriately mitigated	Amber: County Education comments awaited. Expect appropriate education provision to be made. For smaller sites this is likely to be off site.

Level 2		
Accessibility to existing centres and services		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
How far is the site from the nearest District or Local centre?	A = 400-800m	Amber: The site is within 400-800m (as the crow flies) of the Local Centre Grantchester Street, Newnham.
How far is the nearest health centre or GP service in Cambridge?	R = >800m	Red: Site is over 800m from nearest health centre or GP service.
Would development lead to a loss of community facilities?	G = Development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities or appropriate mitigation possible	Green: No loss of community facilities
How well would the development on the site integrate with existing communities?	A = Adequate scope for integration with existing communities	Amber: Adequate scope to integrate with existing communities through good design
How far is the nearest secondary school?	A = 1-3km	Amber: Site is between 1 and 3km from nearest secondary school.
How far is the nearest primary school?	City preference:  A = 400-800m  SCDC:	Amber: Site is between 400 and 800m from nearest primary school, Newnham Croft.
	G = <1km or non housing allocation or site large enough to provide new	

	achael	
Would development protect	school G = No effect or would	Green: The site is too small
the shopping hierarchy,	support the vitality and	to support a new Local
supporting the vitality and	viability of existing centres	Centre. The nearest Local
	viability of existing centres	Centre is Grantchester
viability of Cambridge,		
Town, District and Local Centres?		Street, Newnham.
Centres		Additional population at this
		site may help to further
		support this relatively small Local Centre.
Accessibility to outdoor fac	silities and green spaces	Local Certire.
Criteria	Performance	Comments
Would development result	R=Yes	Red: Identified in City
in the loss of land protected	11=103	Council Open Space &
by Cambridge Local Plan		Recreation Strategy and
policy 4/2 or South		2006 Local Plan as
Cambridgeshire		protected open space and
Development Control policy		of environmental
SF/9? (excluding land which		importance
is protected only because of		importance
its Green Belt status).		
If the site is protected open	R=No	Red: Any future
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	n=N0	
space can the open space		development would need to
be replaced according to		satisfactorily incorporate the
CLP Local Plan policy 4/2		environmentally sensitive
Protection of Open Space or South Cambridgeshire		protected open space or demonstrate it can be
_		
Development Control policy SF/9 (for land in South		reprovided elsewhere in an
Cambridgeshire)?		appropriate manner.
If the site does not involve	R= No, the site by virtue of	Red: Loss of Protected
any protected open space	its size is not able to	Open Space (land protected
would development of the	provide the minimum	by Local Plan Policy 4/2)
site be able to increase the	standard of OS.	by Local Flatt Folicy 4/2)
quantity and quality of	Standard of OS.	
publically accessible open		
space /outdoor sports		
facilities and achieve the		
minimum standards of		
onsite public open space		
provision?		
Supporting Economic Grov	/th	
Criteria	Performance	Comments
How far is the nearest main	G = <1km or allocation is for	Green: Site is within 1km of
employment centre?	or includes a significant	an employment centre.
Cimpioyinioni denii e :	element of employment or	an omproyment contro.
	is for another non-	
	residential use	
Would development result	G = No loss of employment	Green: Development would
in the loss of employment	land / allocation is for	not lead to the loss of
l land identified in the	employment development	employment land identified
Employment Land Review?	Chiployment development	in the Employment Land
Employment Land Heview:		Review.
Would allocation result in	A = Not within or adjacent	Amber: Site in Newnham
VVOUID AIIOCALIOIT TESUIL III	A - Not within or adjacent	AIIIDEL DILE III NEWIIIAIII

development in deprived areas of Cambridge?	to the 40% most deprived Super Output Areas within	LSOA 7984: 4.61 and adjacent to Barton LSOA
_	Cambridge according to the	8225: 7.07
	Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010.	
Sustainable Transport	Deprivation 2010.	
Criteria	Performance	Comments
What type of public	R = Service does not meet	Red: No high quality bus
transport service is	the requirements of a high	services within 400m, so
accessible at the edge of	quality public transport	the site does not meet the
the site?	(HQPT)	Local Plan (Policy 8/7)
		definition of high quality
	_	public transport.
How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?	R = >800m	Red: More than 800m.
What type of cycle routes	G = Quiet residential street	Green- links to quiet
are accessible near to the	speed below 30mph, cycle	residential streets, only if
site?	lane with 1.5m minimum	the link to Grantchester
	width, high quality off-road	Meadows through the car
	path e.g. cycleway adjacent to guided busway.	park is significantly improved and future
	to guided busway.	maintenance of the link
		agreed (otherwise Red).
SCDC Would development	GG = Score 19-24 from 4	Total Score = 20
reduce the need to travel	criteria below	
and promote sustainable		
transport choices:		
SCDC Sub-indicator:	Within 400m (6)	Newnham, Selwyn Road
Distance to a bus stop / rail station		
SCDC Sub-indicator:	60 minute service (2)	18 / 18A Service
Frequency of Public	oo minate service (2)	107 TOA GETVICE
Transport		
SCDC Sub-Indicator:	20 minutes or less (6)	10 minutes – (Newnham,
Typical public transport		Selwyn Road – Cambridge,
journey time to Cambridge		Drummer Street)
City Centre		
SCDC Sub-indicator:	Up to 5km (6)	1.16km ACF
Distance for cycling to City Centre		
Air Quality, pollution, conta	mination and noise	
Criteria	Performance	Comments
Is the site within or near to	G = >1000m of an AQMA,	Green: Will require Air
an AQMA, the M11 or the	M11, or A14	Quality Assessment due to
A14?		size.
		More than 1000m from M11 and A14.
Would the development of	A = Adverse impact	Amber: Development may
the site result in an adverse		result in an adverse impact
impact/worsening of air		on the air quality. Further
quality?	A Adverse imposts	assessment is required.
Are there potential noise and vibration problems if	A = Adverse impacts capable of adequate	Amber: Frontage will be the noisiest part of the site from
and vibration problems if	capable of adequate	Holsiest part of the Site HOIII

the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?	mitigation	the road. Noise assessment and potential noise mitigation needed.  EH are unable to answer vibration and/or generator question at this stage. It will depend on development characteristics.
Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?	R = Significant adverse impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation	Green: From purely the residential amenity point of view the light impact from development would require assessment in the ES but could be fully mitigated.
		Other agencies should be consulted regarding the impact on wild life, night sky and the County Council regarding impact on public highways.
Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?	G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation	Green: No adverse effects
Is there possible contamination on the site?	G = Site not within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination	Green: There are no known former or present industrial uses on and off the site.
Protecting Groundwater		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
Would development be within a source protection zone? Groundwater sources (e.g. wells, boreholes and springs) are used for public drinking water supply. These zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area.	G = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace	Green: Not within SPZ1

Protecting the townscape and historic environment (Landscape addressed by Green Belt criteria)		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
Would allocation impact upon a historic park/garden?	G = Site does not contain or adjoin such areas, and there is no impact to the setting of such areas	Green: Site does not contain or adjoin such areas
Would development impact upon a Conservation Area?	A = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such an area with	Amber: The site is partly located within, and adjoins, the Newnham Croft

	not ential for any	Componential Array Ti
	potential for negative	Conservation Area. There
	impacts capable of	will therefore for definite be
	appropriate mitigation	impacts on the character
		and setting of this
		Conservation Area. The
		extent to which such
		impacts can be mitigated
		will be highly dependent on
		where any how any
		development is sites,
		whether any adjoining edge
		of city sites are further
		considered, and on detailed
		building and site design,
		including building height
		and form, as well as
		landscape design including
		buffers.
Would development impact	G = Site does not contain or	Green: Site does not
upon buildings of local	adjoin such buildings, and	contain or adjoin such
interest (Cambridge only)	there is no impact to the	buildings, and there is no
	setting of such buildings	impact to the setting of such
	3	buildings
Would development impact	A = Known archaeology on	Amber: National Grid
upon archaeology?	site or in vicinity	Reference: 543820 257010
	one or an element	R Cam terraces along the
		Barton Road and Newnham
		are host to late prehistoric
		to Saxon settlement.
		(Monuments in Cambridge -
		eg MCB15026,
		MCB16190). A moated
		medieval site is loated at
		Dumpling Farm
		(MCB11422) and the
		watercourses from it
		connect to the Cam.
		National Grid Reference:
		543760 257190 River
		Cam terraces along the
		Barton Road and Newnham
		are host to late prehistoric
		to Saxon settlement
		(Monuments in Cambridge
		eg MCB15026,
		MCB16190). A moated
		medieval site is located at
		Dumpling Farm
		(MCB11422) and the
		watercourses from it
		connect to the Cam. A
		programme of
		archaeological works
		should be undertaken prior
		to the submission of any

planning application. A programme of archaeological works should be undertaken prior to the submission of any
planning application.

Making Efficient Use of Land		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
Would development lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?	G = Neutral. Development would not affect grade 1 and 2 land.	Green: Site on urban land.
Would development make use of previously developed land (PDL)? (CITY)	R = No	Red: No
Would development make use of previously developed land (PDL)? (SCDC)	A=No	Amber: No
Biodiversity and Green Infra	astructure	
Criteria	Performance	Comments
Would development impact upon a locally designated wildlife site i.e. (Local Nature Reserve, County Wildlife Site, City Wildlife Site)	G = Does not contain, is not adjacent to or local area will be developed as greenspace	Green: Does not contain, is not adjacent to locally designated wildlife sites
Does the site offer opportunity for green infrastructure delivery?	A = No significant opportunities or loss of existing green infrastructure capable of appropriate mitigation	Amber: No significant opportunities or loss of existing green infrastructure capable of appropriate mitigation
Would development reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?)	G = Development could have a positive impact by enhancing existing features and adding new features or network links	Green: Boundary features of playing fields often form useful corridors for foraging and dispersing mammals, birds and invertebrates. Proposals should seek to retain mature trees, hedgerows and areas of scrub. Opportunities for small scale woodland planting and creation of wetland features. Habitat links to adjoining countryside should be maintained and enhanced.
Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?	G = Site does not contain or adjoin any protected trees	Green: Site does not contain or adjoin any protected trees

Any other information not captured above?		
Conclusions		
Cross site comparison		
Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)	R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts	Red: - Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes - No evidence of landowner intention to develop
Level 2 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)	R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts	Red: - Site is further than 800m from a health centre/GP and its small size would mean it could not provide for new health facilities on site It is not accessible to high quality public transportDevelopment would result in the loss of a playing field designated as public open space. This open space would have to be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere.
Overall Conclusion	R = Site with no significant development potential (significant constraints and adverse impacts)	Red: Site with no significant development potential (significant constraints and adverse impacts)
Viability feedback (from consultants)	R = Unlikely to be viable, A = May be viable G = Likely to be viable	Sites ranked A or G will be taken forward for viability assessment by consultants

#### **Cambridge City Council / South Cambridgeshire District Council**

To be accompanied by a table which identifies how it provides /encompasses both LPA's SA and SHLAA assessments. Text in italics are officer prompts to be deleted on completion.

## Green Belt Site and Sustainability Appraisal Assessment Proforma


Site Information Broad Location 2 Playing Fields Off Grantchester Road Newnham

Site reference number(s): CC895

Site name/address: Downing Playing Field Grantchester Road

Functional area (taken from SA Scoping Report): West Cambridge

#### Map:



**Site description:** This is one of a number of college playing fields located to the south of Newnham off Grantchester Road. The area is relatively level with views into open countryside to the south towards Grantchester and along the River Cam immediately east. The land is slightly elevated above the land to the east that forms part of the Cam river valley and Grantchester Meadows. The southern section of the Pembroke playing field to the south is located in South Cambridgeshire.

Current use(s): Playing Field

Proposed use(s): Residential

Site size (ha): 4.83 South Cambridgeshire: 0.00 Cambridge: 4.83

Assumed net developable area: 2.42-3.62ha (assuming 50% net or 75% net)

Assumed residential density: 45dph
Potential residential capacity: 109-163
Site owner/promoter: Owners known

Landowner has agreed to promote site for development?: No

Site origin: Site submitted by member of the public

Relevant planning history: None

Level 1 Part A: Strategic Considerations		
Conformity with the Council's Sustainable Development Strategy (SDS)		
Criteria	Performance (fill with relevant colour R G B or RR R A G GG etc and retain only chosen score text)	Comments
Is the site within an area that has been identified as suitable for development in the SDS?	R = No G = Yes	
Flood Risk		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
Is site within a flood zone?	G = Flood risk zone 1	Green: The location lies entirely within Flood Risk Zone 1 (the lowest level of river flood risk).
Is site at risk from surface water flooding?	A = Medium risk	Amber: Fairly significant amount of surface water flooding towards the south east of the site. Careful mitigation required which could impact on achievable site densities as greater level of green infrastructure required
Green Belt		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
What effect would the development of this site have on Green Belt purposes, and other matters important to the special character of Cambridge and setting?	See below	Edge of city site adjacent to low density established development. Area is discreet and could accommodate a low density, 2-storey development. Development would extend the envelop of Newnham to the south and would need a strong landscape buffer along southern and western edges.
To preserve the unique character of Cambridge as a compact and dynamic City with a thriving historic core	Distance from edge of the defined City Centre in Kilometres to approximate centre of site is under 2.5Km	Green: The west edge of Cambridge is important because it demonstrates compactness. However development in this location would do little to increase distance from edge to centre.
To prevent communities in the environs of Cambridge from merging into one another and with the City.	A = Some impact, but capable of mitigation	Amber: Development would decrease distance between City and Grantchester but could be mitigated.

To maintain and enhance the quality of the setting of Cambridge	RR = Very high and high impacts	Red Red: There would be a significant negative impact to the setting of the City.
Key views of Cambridge / Important views	R = Significant negative impact from loss or degradation of views.	Red: There are very important views to the historic centre from the west which would be negatively impact.
Soft green edge to the City	R = Existing high quality edge, significant negative impacts incapable of mitigation.	Red: Development would have negative impact on the soft green edge.
Distinctive urban edge	R = Existing high quality edge, significant negative impacts incapable of mitigation.	Red: The existing urban edge is green and abrupt and is distinctive in the Cambridge context.  Development would have a negative impact.
Green corridors penetrating into the City	G = No loss of land forming part of a green corridor / significant opportunities for enhancement through creation of a new green corridor	Green: No loss of green corridor.
The distribution, physical separation, setting, scale and character of Green Belt villages (SCDC only)	A = Negative impacts but capable of partial mitigation	Amber: Development would decrease distance between City and Grantchester but could be mitigated.
A landscape which has a strongly rural character	R = Significant negative impacts incapable of satisfactory mitigation	Red: Site adjacent to rural hinterland and has a strong rural character. Any new development could have a negative impact, but could be mitigated.
Overall conclusion on Green Belt	RR = Very high and high impacts	Red, Red: This site is on the edge of the city and presents an abrupt suburban/rural edge and is highly visible from the west and south. Any form of development would have a significant negative impact.
Impact on national Nature (	Ţ	
Criteria Waylel allegation impact	Performance	Comments
Would allocation impact upon a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)?	G = Site is not near to an SSSI with no or negligible impacts	Green: No
Impact on National Heritage		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
Will allocation impact upon a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)?	G = Site is not on or adjacent to a SAM	Green: No
Would development impact	G = Site does not contain or	Green: No

upon Listed Buildings?	adjoin such buildings, and	
	there is no impact to the	
Part B: Deliverability and Vi	setting of such buildings	
Criteria	Performance	Comments
Is the site allocated or safeguarded in the Minerals and Waste LDF?	G = Site is not within an allocated or safeguarded area.	Green: Site is not allocated / identified or a mineral or waste management use through the adopted Minerals and Waste Core Strategy or Site Specific Proposals Plan. It does not fall within a Minerals Safeguarding Area; a Waste Water Treatment Works or Transport Zone Safeguarding Area; or a Minerals or Waste Consultation Area.
Is the site located within the Cambridge Airport Public Safety Zone (PSZ) or Safeguarding Zone? Is there a suitable access to the site?	A = Site or part of site within the SZ  A = Yes, with mitigation	Amber: No erection of buildings, structures and works exceeding 150ft (45.7m) in height Amber: The size of the proposed development would require modifications to Grantchester Road and would result in the nature of the road changing significantly.
Would allocation of the site have a significant impact on the local highway capacity?	A = Insufficient capacity.  Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.	Amber: Insufficient capacity. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.  This site is of a scale that would trigger the need for a Transportation Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan (TP), regardless of the need for a full Environmental Impact Assessment.  S106 contributions and mitigation measures will be required where appropriate. Any Cambridge Area Transport Strategy or other plans will also need to be taken into account.  The size of the proposed development would require

		modifications to
		Grantchester Road and would result in the nature of
		the road changing
Mould allocation of the site	A Inquifficient conscity	significantly. Amber: Insufficient
Would allocation of the site have a significant impact on	A = Insufficient capacity.  Negative effects capable of	capacity. Negative effects
the strategic road network	appropriate mitigation.	capable of appropriate
capacity?		mitigation.
		With regard to the A14 the
		Department for Transport announced in July that the
		A14 improvement scheme
		has been added to the national roads programme.
		Design work is underway
		on a scheme that will
		incorporate a Huntingdon Southern Bypass, capacity
		enhancements along the
		length of the route between Milton Interchange to the
		North of Cambridge and
		Huntingdon, and the construction of parallel local
		access roads to enable the
		closure of minor junctions onto the A14. The main
		impact, in relation to
		Grange Farm and other
		potential Local Plan sites, is that existing capacity
		constraints on the A14
		between Cambridge and Huntingdon will be
		removed. The funding
		package and delivery
		programme for the scheme is still to be confirmed, and
		major development in the
		Cambridge area, which will benefit from the enhanced
		capacity, will undoubtedly
		be required to contribute towards the scheme costs,
		either directly or through the
		Community Infrastructure
		Levy. The earliest construction start would be
		2018, with delivery by the
		mid-2020s being possible.
	1	A
Is the site part of a larger	A = Some impact	Amber: Yes, the site is part

site and could it prejudice development of any strategic sites?		of a group of playing field sites.
Are there any known legal issues/covenants that could constrain development of the site?	R = Yes	Red: Yes promoter is not landowner
Timeframe for bringing the site forward for development?	R = Beyond 2031 (beyond plan period)	Red: No evidence of landowner intentions
Would development of the site require significant new / upgraded utility infrastructure?	A = Yes, significant upgrades likely to be required, constraints capable of appropriate mitigation	Amber: Improved utilities required. The developer will need to liaise with the relevant service provider/s to determine the appropriate utility infrastructure provision.
Would development of the site be likely to require new education provision?	A = School capacity not sufficient, constraints can be appropriately mitigated	Amber: County Education comments awaited. Expect appropriate education provision to be made. For smaller sites this is likely to be off site.

Level 2		
Accessibility to existing centres and services		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
How far is the site from the nearest District or Local centre?	A = 400-800m	Amber: The site is within 400-800m (as the crow flies) of the Local Centre Grantchester Street, Newnham.
How far is the nearest health centre or GP service in Cambridge?	R = >800m	Red: Site part within 800m limit and part beyond 800m limit from nearest health centre or GP service
Would development lead to a loss of community facilities?	G = Development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities or appropriate mitigation possible	Green: No loss of community facilities
How well would the development on the site integrate with existing communities?	A = Adequate scope for integration with existing communities	Amber: Adequate scope to integrate with existing communities through good design
How far is the nearest secondary school?	A = 1-3km	Amber: Site is between 1 and 3km from nearest secondary school.
How far is the nearest primary school?	City preference:  A = 400-800m	Amber: Site is between 400 and 800m from nearest primary school.
	SCDC:	

	<del>,</del>	T
	G = <1km or non housing allocation or site large enough to provide new school	
Would development protect the shopping hierarchy, supporting the vitality and viability of Cambridge, Town, District and Local Centres?	R = Significant negative effect A = Negative effect G = No effect or would support the vitality and viability of existing centres	Green: The site is too small to support a new Local Centre. The nearest Local Centre is Grantchester Street, Newnham. Additional population at this site may help to further support this relatively small Local Centre.
Accessibility to outdoor fac	cilities and green spaces	
Criteria	Performance	Comments
Would development result in the loss of land protected by Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/2 or South Cambridgeshire Development Control policy SF/9? (excluding land which is protected only because of its Green Belt status).	R=Yes	Red: Identified in City Council Open Space & Recreation Strategy and 2006 Local Plan as protected open space and of environmental importance.
If the site is protected open space can the open space be replaced according to CLP Local Plan policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space or South Cambridgeshire Development Control policy SF/9 (for land in South Cambridgeshire)?	G=Yes	Red: Any future development would need to satisfactorily incorporate the environmentally sensitive protected open space or demonstrate it can be reprovided elsewhere in an appropriate manner.
If the site does not involve any protected open space would development of the site be able to increase the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space /outdoor sports facilities and achieve the minimum standards of onsite public open space provision?	R= No, the site by virtue of its size is not able to provide the minimum standard of OS.	Red: Loss of Protected Open Space (land protected by Local Plan Policy 4/2)
Criteria	Performance	Comments
How far is the nearest main employment centre?	G = <1km or allocation is for or includes a significant element of employment or is for another non- residential use	Green: Site is within 1km of an employment centre
Would development result in the loss of employment land identified in the	G = No loss of employment land / allocation is for employment development	Green: Development would not lead to the loss of employment land identified

Employment Land Review?		in the Employment Land
		Review
Would allocation result in	A = Not within or adjacent	Amber: Site in Newnham
development in deprived	to the 40% most deprived	LSOA 7984: 4.61 and
areas of Cambridge?	Super Output Areas within	Newnham LSOA 7985: 5.07
	Cambridge according to the	
	Index of Multiple	
0 11 7	Deprivation 2010.	
Sustainable Transport	Df	0
Criteria What type of public	Performance  R = Service does not meet	Comments  Dody No. convice does not
What type of public	the requirements of a high	Red: No, service does not meet the requirements of a
transport service is accessible at the edge of	quality public transport	high quality public transport
the site?	(HQPT)	(HQPT)
the site:	(FIGFT)	(HQFT)
How far is the site from an	R = >800m	Red: Site is greater than
existing or proposed train		800m from either an
station?		existing or proposed train
		station.
What type of cycle routes	A = Medium quality off-road	Amber: Links to quiet
are accessible near to the	path.	residential roads (assuming
site?		the cycle route to Millington
		Rd is maintained and the
		gap widened) but then need
		to link to off road facility on
		Barton Road which is not direct.
SCDC Would development	GG = Score 19-24 from 4	Total Score = 20
reduce the need to travel	criteria below	10tai 3001e = 20
and promote sustainable	Chiena below	
transport choices:		
SCDC Sub-indicator:	Within 400m (6)	Newnham, Selwyn Road
Distance to a bus stop / rail	· ,	
station		
SCDC Sub-indicator:	60 minute service (2)	18 / 18A Service
Frequency of Public		
Transport	00 minutes and a co	40 minutes (Navenham
SCDC Sub-Indicator:	20 minutes or less (6)	10 minutes – (Newnham,
Typical public transport		Selwyn Road – Cambridge,
journey time to Cambridge City Centre		Drummer Street)
SCDC Sub-indicator:	Up to 5km (6)	1.03km ACF
Distance for cycling to City		1.30((117(3)
Centre		
Air Quality, pollution, conta	mination and noise	
Criteria	Performance	Comments
Is the site within or near to	G = >1000m of an AQMA,	Green: Will require Air
an AQMA, the M11 or the	M11, or A14	Quality Assessment due to
A14?		size.
		More than 1000m from M11
Would the day class and of	A Advorse impost	and A14.
Would the development of the site result in an adverse	A = Adverse impact	Amber: The development may have an adverse
impact/worsening of air		impact on air quality.
impact worselling or all		impaction all quality.

quality?		Further assessment is
- quanty		required.
Are there potential noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?	A = Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation	Amber: Frontage will be the noisiest part of the site from the road. Noise assessment and potential noise mitigation needed.
		Unable to answer vibration and/or generator question at this stage. It will depend on development characteristics.
Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?	G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation	Green: From purely the residential amenity point of view the light impact from development would require assessment in the ES but could be fully mitigated.
		Other agencies should be consulted regarding the impact on wild life, night sky and the County Council regarding impact on public highways.
Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?	G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation	Green: No adverse effects for residential use
Is there possible contamination on the site?	G = Site not within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination	Green: There are no known former industrial activities on or in close proximity to the site.
Protecting Groundwater		
Criteria  Would development be	Performance R = Within SPZ 1	Croon: Not within SP71
Would development be within a source protection zone?	G = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace	Green: Not within SPZ1
Groundwater sources (e.g. wells, boreholes and springs) are used for public drinking water supply.  These zones show the risk of contamination from any		
activities that might cause pollution in the area.		

Protecting the townscape and historic environment (Landscape addressed by Green		
Belt criteria)		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
Would allocation impact	G = Site does not contain or	Green: Site does not
upon a historic	adjoin such areas, and	contain or adjoin such
park/garden?	there is no impact to the	areas, and there is no

	setting of such areas	impact to the setting of such areas
Would development impact upon a Conservation Area?	A = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such an area with potential for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation	Amber: This site borders both the Newnham Croft and West Cambridge Conservation Areas which are located immediately east. There are several Buildings of Local Interest on Millington Road (see note below). Careful design would be required in respect of building design, height, landscape and access in order to achieve acceptable mitigation of harmful impacts on these established Conservation Areas.
Would development impact upon buildings of local interest (Cambridge only)	A = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such buildings with potential for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation	Amber: There are six Buildings of Local Interest on Millington Road immediately east of the site. Mitigation of any potential impacts would require a similar approach as that noted above in respect of the Conservation Areas.
Would development impact upon archaeology?	A = Known archaeology on site or in vicinity	Amber: NGR: 543760 257190 River Cam terraces along the Barton Road and Newnham are host to late prehistoric to Saxon settlement.(eg MCB15026, MCB16190). A moated medieval site is located at Dumpling Farm (MCB11422) and the watercourses from it connect to the Cam.

Making Efficient Use of Land		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
Would development lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?	G = Neutral. Development would not affect grade 1 and 2 land.	Green: Small area on urban land with the remainder on Grade 3 land.
Would development make use of previously developed land (PDL)? (CITY)	R = No	Red: No
Would development make use of previously developed land (PDL)? (SCDC)	A=No	Amber: No

Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
Would development impact upon a locally designated wildlife site i.e. (Local Nature Reserve, County Wildlife Site, City Wildlife Site)	G = Does not contain, is not adjacent to or local area will be developed as greenspace	Green: Does not contain, is not adjacent to locally designated wildlife sites
Does the site offer opportunity for green infrastructure delivery?	A = No significant opportunities or loss of existing green infrastructure capable of appropriate mitigation	Amber: No significant opportunities or loss of existing green infrastructure
Would development reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?)	G = Development could have a positive impact by enhancing existing features and adding new features or network links	Green: Boundary features of playing fields often form useful corridors for foraging and dispersing mammals, birds and invertebrates. Proposals should seek to retain mature trees, hedgerows and areas of scrub. Opportunities for small scale woodland planting and creation of wetland features. Habitat links to adjoining countryside should be maintained and enhanced.
Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?	A = Any adverse impact on protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation	Amber: One TPO on the boundary

# Any other information not captured above?

Townscape Comments – Wider Area: The area would require direct access onto Granchester Road, either in the form of a an intersection serving either side of Granchester Road or via other, or additional, access points. Development would need to "back" onto existing development to the north and east, and would require pedestrian/cycle links within/beyond the site. In approaching the lands from Granchester, a new city "edge" would be created.

Townscape Comments - Site Specific: Site 895 backs directly onto properties fronting Selwyn Road and would require a well designed landscaped buffer/setback to those properties.

Conclusions		
Cross site comparison		
Level 1 Conclusion (after	A = Some constraints or	Red:
allowing scope for	adverse impacts	- Very significant impact on
mitigation)		Green Belt purposes
		- No evidence of
		landowner intention to
		develop
Level 2 Conclusion (after	A = Some constraints or	Red:

п		0:1 : ( 11 11 000
allowing scope for	adverse impacts	- Site is further than 800m
mitigation)		from a health centre/GP
		and its small size would
		mean it could not provide
		for new health facilities on
		site.
		- It is not accessible to high
		ı
		quality public transport.
		-Development would result
		in the loss of a playing field
		designated as public open
		space. This open space
		would have to be
		satisfactorily replaced
		elsewhere.
Overall Conclusion	D Cita with no significant	
Overall Conclusion	R = Site with no significant	Red:
	development potential	Site with no significant
	(significant constraints	development potential
	and adverse impacts)	(significant constraints and
		adverse impacts)
Viability feedback (from	R = Unlikely to be viable,	Sites ranked A or G will be
consultants)	A = May be viable	taken forward for viability
,	G = Likely to be viable	assessment by consultants

## **Cambridge City Council / South Cambridgeshire District Council**

## Green Belt Site and Sustainability Appraisal Assessment Proforma


Site Information

Site reference number(s): CC901

Site name/address: Wests Renault RUFC Grantchester Road

Functional area (taken from SA Scoping Report): West Cambridge

Map:



■ District Boundary

Current use(s): Playing fields and sports pavilion

Proposed use(s): Residential

Site size (ha): 8.55 South Cambridgeshire: 0.00 ha Cambridge: 8.55ha

Assumed net developable area: 4.28-6.41ha (assuming 50%net or 75% net )

Assumed residential density: 45dph

Potential residential capacity: 192-289

Site owner/promoter: Owner known

Landowner has agreed to promote site for development?: No

Site origin: Site submitted by member of the public

Relevant planning history: No relevant planning applications for residential use.		
Level 1 Part A: Strategic Considerations Conformity with the Council's Sustainable Development Strategy (SDS)		
Criteria	Performance (fill with relevant colour R G B or RR R A G GG etc and retain only chosen score text)	Comments
Is the site within an area that has been identified as suitable for development in the SDS?	R = No G = Yes	
Flood Risk		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
Is site within a flood zone?	R = Flood risk zone 3	Red:Significant parts of the site is in functional floodplain (3b) and is therefore unsuitable for development.
Is site at risk from surface water flooding?	R = High risk,	Red: Significant surface water flooding for the majority of the site, mitigation would be difficult due to the high risk.
Green Belt		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
What effect would the development of this site have on Green Belt purposes, and other matters important to the special character of Cambridge and setting?	See below	Site is on the edge of the City with clear, open views from west. Current use as sports pitches with associated lighting visually degrades this area slightly.
To preserve the unique character of Cambridge as a compact and dynamic City with a thriving historic core	Distance from edge of the defined City Centre is under 2.5 Km to approximate centre of site	Green: The west edge of Cambridge is important because it demonstrates compactness. However development in this location would do little to increase distance from edge to centre.
To prevent communities in the environs of Cambridge from merging into one another and with the City.	R = Significant negative impacts	Red: Development would move the urban edge closer to Grantchester.
To maintain and enhance the quality of the setting of Cambridge	RR = Very high and high impacts	Red Red: There would be a significant negative impact to the setting of the City.
Key views of Cambridge / Important views	R = Significant negative impact from loss or degradation of views.	Red: There are very important views to the historic centre from the west which would be negatively

		impact.
Soft green edge to the City  Distinctive urban edge	R = Existing high quality edge, significant negative impacts incapable of mitigation.  R = Existing high quality edge, significant negative	Red: Rugby Ground lighting lessens the quality of the edge slightly, but development would have negative impact.  Red: Rugby Ground and associated lighting lessens
	impacts incapable of mitigation.	the quality of the edge, but distinctive urban edge would be negatively affected.
Green corridors penetrating into the City	G = No loss of land forming part of a green corridor / significant opportunities for enhancement through creation of a new green corridor	Green: No loss of green corridor.
The distribution, physical separation, setting, scale and character of Green Belt villages (SCDC only)	R = Significant negative impacts incapable of satisfactory mitigation	Red: Decreases distance between City and Grantchester
A landscape which has a strongly rural character	R = Significant negative impacts incapable of satisfactory mitigation	Red: the strongly rural character of the area would be negatively impacted.
Overall conclusion on Green Belt	RR = Very high and high impacts	Red, Red: This site is on the edge of the city and presents an abrupt suburban/rural edge and is highly visible from the west and south. Any form of development would have a significant negative impact.
Impact on national Nature C	<del>_</del>	
Criteria	Performance	Comments
Would allocation impact upon a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)?	G = Site is not near to an SSSI with no or negligible impacts	Green: No
Impact on National Heritage		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
Will allocation impact upon a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)?	G = Site is not on or adjacent to a SAM	Green: No
Would development impact upon Listed Buildings?	G = Site does not contain or adjoin such buildings, and there is no impact to the setting of such buildings	Green: No
Part B: Deliverability and Vi		

Criteria	Performance	Comments
Is the site allocated or	G = Site is not within an	Green: Site is not allocated
safeguarded in the Minerals	allocated or safeguarded	/ identified or a mineral or
and Waste LDF?	area.	waste management use
		through the adopted
		Minerals and Waste Core
		Strategy or Site Specific
		Proposals Plan. It does not
		fall within a Minerals
		Safeguarding Area; a
		Waste Water Treatment
		Works or Transport Zone
		Safeguarding Area; or a
		Minerals or Waste
		Consultation Area.
Is the site located within the	A = Site or part of site within	Amber: Site within SZ. No
Cambridge Airport Public	the SZ	erection of buildings,
Safety Zone (PSZ) or		structures or works
Safeguarding Zone?		exceeding 45m in height
Is there a suitable access to	A = Yes, with mitigation	Amber: The size of the
the site?		proposed development
		would require
		modifications to
		Grantchester Road and
		would result in the nature
		of the road changing
		significantly.
Would allocation of the site	A = Insufficient capacity.	Amber:
have a significant impact on	Negative effects capable of	Insufficient capacity.
the local highway capacity?	appropriate mitigation.	Negative effects capable of
		appropriate mitigation.
		This site is of a scale that
		would trigger the need for a
		Transportation Assessment
		(TA) and Travel Plan (TP),
		regardless of the need for a
		full Environmental Impact
		Assessment.
		S106 contributions and
		mitigation measures will be
		required where appropriate.
		Any Cambridge Area
		Transport Strategy or other
		plans will also need to be
		taken into account.
		The size of the proposed
		development would require
		modifications to
		Grantchester Road and
		would result in the nature of
		the road changing

		significantly.
		The proposal will result in a significant loss of existing hedge.
Would allocation of the site have a significant impact on the strategic road network capacity?	A = Insufficient capacity. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.	Amber: Insufficient capacity. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.  With regard to the A14 the Department for Transport announced in July that the A14 improvement scheme has been added to the national roads programme. Design work is underway on a scheme that will incorporate a Huntingdon Southern Bypass, capacity enhancements along the length of the route between Milton Interchange to the North of Cambridge and Huntingdon, and the construction of parallel local access roads to enable the closure of minor junctions onto the A14. The main impact, in relation to Grange Farm and other potential Local Plan sites, is that existing capacity constraints on the A14 between Cambridge and Huntingdon will be removed. The funding package and delivery programme for the scheme is still to be confirmed, and major development in the Cambridge area, which will benefit from the enhanced capacity, will undoubtedly be required to contribute towards the scheme costs,
		either directly or through the Community Infrastructure Levy. The earliest construction start would be 2018, with delivery by the mid-2020s being possible.

Is the site part of a larger site and could it prejudice development of any strategic sites?	A = Some impact	Amber: The site could be developed without prejudicing the development of any other sites. However there could be a cumulative effect with regards to transport on Grantchester Road if the other playing field sites in the area were also developed.
Are there any known legal issues/covenants that could constrain development of the site?	R = Yes	Red: Yes, promoter is not landowner.
Timeframe for bringing the site forward for development?	R = Beyond 2031 (beyond plan period)	Red: No evidence of landowner intentions.
Would development of the site require significant new / upgraded utility infrastructure?	A = Yes, significant upgrades likely to be required, constraints capable of appropriate mitigation	Amber: Utility reinforcements required. The developer will need to liaise with the relevant service provider/s to determine the appropriate utility infrastructure provision.
Would development of the site be likely to require new education provision?	A = School capacity not sufficient, constraints can be appropriately mitigated	Amber: County Education comments awaited. Expect appropriate education provision to be made. For smaller sites this is likely to be off site.

Level 2		
Accessibility to existing centres and services		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
How far is the site from the nearest District or Local centre?	R = >800m	Red: Half of the site is within 400-800m, and half more than 800m (as the crow flies) of the Local Centre Grantchester Street, Newnham.
How far is the nearest health centre or GP service in Cambridge?	R = >800m	Red: Site is over 800m from nearest health centre or GP service.
Would development lead to a loss of community facilities?	G = Development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities or appropriate mitigation possible	Green: No
How well would the development on the site integrate with existing	A = Adequate scope for integration with existing communities	Amber: Adequate scope to integrate with existing communities through good

communities?		design
How far is the nearest secondary school?	A = 1-3km	Amber: Site is between 1 and 3km from nearest secondary school.
How far is the nearest primary school?	City preference:	Red: Site clips 800m limit from nearest primary
	R = >800m	school, Newnham Croft.
	SCDC:	
	G = <1km or non housing allocation or site large enough to provide new school	
Would development protect the shopping hierarchy, supporting the vitality and viability of Cambridge, Town, District and Local Centres?	G = No effect or would support the vitality and viability of existing centres	Green: The site is too small to support a new Local Centre. The nearest Local Centre is Grantchester Street, Newnham. Additional population at this site may help to further support this relatively small Local Centre, although it is further than 800m away.
Accessibility to outdoor fac		0
Criteria Wayld dayslanmant result	Performance R=Yes	Comments  Pade Identified in City
Would development result in the loss of land protected by Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/2 or South Cambridgeshire Development Control policy SF/9? (excluding land which is protected only because of its Green Belt status).	n= res	Red: Identified in City Council Open Space & Recreation Strategy and 2006 Local Plan as protected open space and of environmental importance
If the site is protected open space can the open space be replaced according to CLP Local Plan policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space or South Cambridgeshire Development Control policy SF/9 (for land in South Cambridgeshire)?	R=No	Red: Any future development would need to satisfactorily incorporate the environmentally sensitive protected open space or demonstrate it can be reprovided elsewhere in an appropriate manner.
If the site does not involve any protected open space would development of the site be able to increase the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space /outdoor sports facilities and achieve the minimum standards of	R= No, the site by virtue of its size is not able to provide the minimum standard of OS.	Red: Loss of Protected Open Space (land protected by Local Plan Policy 4/2)

onsite public open space provision?		
Supporting Economic Grow	vth	
Criteria	Performance	Comments
How far is the nearest main employment centre?	G = <1km or allocation is for or includes a significant element of employment or is for another non- residential use	Green: Site is within 1km of an employment centre
Would development result in the loss of employment land identified in the Employment Land Review?	G = No loss of employment land / allocation is for employment development	Green: Development would not lead to the loss of employment land identified in the Employment Land Review
Would allocation result in development in deprived areas of Cambridge?	A = Not within or adjacent to the 40% most deprived Super Output Areas within Cambridge according to the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010.	Amber: Site in Newnham LSOA 7984: 4.61 and adjacent to Barton LSOA 8225: 7.07
Sustainable Transport		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
What type of public transport service is accessible at the edge of the site?	R = Service does not meet the requirements of a high quality public transport (HQPT)	Red: No high quality bus services within 400m, so the site does not meet the Local Plan (Policy 8/7) definition of high quality public transport.
How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?	R = >800m	Red: More than 800m.
What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?	A = Medium quality off-road path.	Amber: If cycle-friendly traffic calming on Grantchester Road provided to make the link to the Barton Road off-road facility safer for cyclists.
SCDC Would development reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable transport choices:	GG = Score 19-24 from 4 criteria below	Total Score = 20
SCDC Sub-indicator: Distance to a bus stop / rail station	Within 400m (6)	Newnham, Selwyn Road
SCDC Sub-indicator: Frequency of Public Transport	60 minute service (2)	18 / 18A Service

SCDC Sub-Indicator: Typical public transport journey time to Cambridge City Centre	20 minutes or less (6)	10 minutes – (Newnham, Selwyn Road – Cambridge, Drummer Street)
SCDC Sub-indicator: Distance for cycling to City Centre	Up to 5km (6)	1.27km ACF
Air Quality, pollution, conta	mination and noise	
Criteria	Performance	Comments
Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?	G = >1000m of an AQMA, M11, or A14	Green: Will require Air Quality Assessment due to size. More than 1000m from M11 and A14.
Would the development of the site result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?	A = Adverse impact	Amber: Development may adversely affect air quality. An air quality assessment is required.
Are there potential noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?	A = Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation	Amber: Frontage will be the noisiest part of the site from the road. Some uses particularly industrial may affect the existing residential. Noise assessment and potential noise mitigation is needed.  Unable to answer the vibration and/or generator
		question at this stage, it will depend on development characteristics.
Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?	G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation	Green: From purely the residential amenity point of view the light impact from development would require assessment in the ES but could be fully mitigated.
		Other agencies should be consulted regarding the impact on wild life, night sky and the County Council regarding impact on public highways.
Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?	G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation	Green: No adverse effects
Is there possible contamination on the site?	G = Site not within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination	Green: There are no known former or current industrial uses on and off the site.
Protecting Groundwater		
Criteria	Performance	Comments

Would development be	G = Not within SPZ1 or	Green: Not within SPZ 1.
within a source protection	allocation is for greenspace	
zone?		
Groundwater sources (e.g.		
wells, boreholes and		
springs) are used for public		
drinking water supply.		
These zones show the risk		
of contamination from any		
activities that might cause		
pollution in the area.		

Protecting the townscape and historic environment (Landscape addressed by Green Belt criteria)		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
Would allocation impact upon a historic park/garden?	G = Site does not contain or adjoin such areas, and there is no impact to the setting of such areas	Green: No
Would development impact upon a Conservation Area?	G = Site does not contain or adjoin such an area, and there is no impact to the setting of such an area	Green: No
Would development impact upon buildings of local interest (Cambridge only)	G = Site does not contain or adjoin such buildings, and there is no impact to the setting of such buildings	Green: No
Would development impact upon archaeology?	A = Known archaeology on site or in vicinity	Amber: National Grid Reference 543550 257110. River Cam terraces along the Barton Road and Newnham are host to late prehistoric to Saxon settlement.(Monuments in Cambridge eg MCB15026, MCB16190). A moated medieval site is loated at Dumpling Farm (MCB11422) and the watercourses from it connect to the Cam. A programme of archaeological works should be undertaken prior to the submission of any planning application.

Making Efficient Use of Land				
Criteria	Performance	Comments		
Would development lead to the loss of the best and most	the contract of the contract o	Green: Small area of		
	would not affect grade 1 and 2 land.	Grade 3 land with the remainder on urban land.		

No   No   No   No   No   No   No   No					
A=No   Amber: No   Amber: No		R = No	No		
Sindiversity and Green Infrastructure		A=No	Amber: No		
Performance	of previously developed land		7.11.12.51.7.10		
Performance	Pindiversity and Green Infract	ruoturo			
Mould development impact upon a locally designated wildlife site i.e. (Local Nature Reserve, County Wildlife Site.)   City Wildlife Site   Mould development reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?)  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation order (TPO)?  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation not captured above?  Conclusions  Cross site comparison  Level 1 Conclusions  A = Contains or is adjacent to an existing site and tion and impact to appropriate mitigation  Are Store in the site offer opportunity for green infrastructure capable of appropriate mitigation  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  Are Store in the site offer opportunity of population and protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation of some protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation			Commonts		
upon a locally designated wildlife site i.e. (Local Nature Reserve, County Wildlife Site).  To appropriate mitigation should develop ment reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?)  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation not captured above?  Conclusions  Cross site comparison  Level 1 Conclusions  To a No significant opportunities or loss of existing green infrastructure capable of appropriate mitigation  to an existing site and impacts capable of appropriate mitigation or adjoin any protected trees. Any other information not captured above?  to an existing site and impacts capable of appropriate mitigation or adjoining country features of playing fields often form useful corridors for foraging and dispersing mammals, birds and invertebrates. Proposals should seek to retain mature trees, hedgerows and areas of scrub. Opportunities for small scale woodland planting and creation of wetland features. Habitat links to adjoining countryside should be maintained and enhanced.  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  A = Any adverse impact on protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation or adjoin any protected trees.  Any other information not captured above?  Conclusions  Cross site comparison  Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)  R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  Free Preservation or adjoin any protected trees.  Red:  - Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes - Significant flooding problems					
wildlife site i.e. (Local Nature Reserve, County Wildlife Site, City Wildlife Site)  Does the site offer opportunity for green infrastructure delivery?  Does the site offer opportunity for green infrastructure delivery?  Would development reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?)  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation order (TPO)?  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation order (TPO)?  Any other information not captured above?  Conclusions  Cross site comparison  Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)  Impacts capable of appropriate mitigation and invertebrates. Proposals should seek to retain mature trees, hedgerows and areas of scrub. Opportunities for small scale woodland planting and creation of wetland features. Habitat links to adjoining countryside should be maintained and enhanced.  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  Any other information not captured above?  Conclusions  Cross site comparison  Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)  R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  R = Significant flooding problems		•			
Reserve, County Wildlife Site, City Wildlife Site, City Wildlife Site)  A = No significant opportunity for green infrastructure delivery?  A = No significant opportunities or loss of existing green infrastructure capable of appropriate mitigation  Would development reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?)  A = Any adverse impact on immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  A = Any adverse impact on adjoin any protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation  A = Any adverse impact on order (TPO)?  A = Any adverse impact on adjoin any protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation  A = Any other information not captured above?  Conclusions  Cross site comparison  Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)  A = No significant on ward invertebrates. Proposals should seek to retain mature trees, hedgerows and areas of scrub. Opportunities for small scale woodland planting and creation of wetland features. Habitat links to adjoining countryside should be maintained and enhanced.  Any other information not captured above?  Conclusions  Cross site comparison  Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)  The conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)  R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  Feel:  Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes  Significant flooding problems					
Does the site offer opportunity for green infrastructure delivery?  A = No significant opportunities or loss of existing green infrastructure capable of appropriate mitigation  Would development reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?)  G = Development could have a positive impact by enhancing existing features and adding new features or network links  G = Development could have a positive impact by enhancing existing features and adding new features or network links  Green: Boundary features of playing fields often form useful corridors for foraging and dispersing mammals, birds and invertebrates. Proposals should seek to retain mature trees, hedgerows and areas of scrub.  Opportunities for small scale woodland planting and creation of wetland features. Habitat links to adjoining countryside should be maintained and enhanced.  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected frees capable of appropriate mitigation G = Site does not contain or adjoin any protected trees.  Any other information not captured above?  Conclusions  Cross site comparison  Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)  R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  R = Significant constraints or Green Belt purposes - Significant flooding problems		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.0		
Does the site offer opportunity for green infrastructure delivery?  Mould development reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?)  A = Any adverse impact on protected trees  Any other information not captured allowing scope for mittigation  A = No significant opportunities and areas of scrub.  Amber: No significant opportunities  Arber: No significant opportunities  Features and adding new features of playing fields often form under later and adding new features of playing fields often form under later and adding new features of playing fields often form under later and adding new features of playing fields often form under later and adding new features of playing fields often form under later and adding new features of playing fields often form under later and adding new features of playing fields often form under later and adding new features of playing fields often form under later and adding new features of playing fields often form under later and adding new features of playing fields often form under later and adding new features of playing fields often form under later and adding new features of playing fields often form under later and adding new features of playing fields often form under later and later and adding new features of playing fields often form under later and adding new features of playing fields often form under later and adding new features of playing fields often form under later and adding new features of playing fields often form under later and adding new features of playing fields often form under later and adding new features of playing fields often form	City Wildlife Site)	appropriate imagation			
Should seek to retain mature trees, hedgerows and areas of scrub.  A = No significant opportunities or loss of existing green infrastructure capable of appropriate mitigation  Would development reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver hybriditat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?)  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation order (TPO)?  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation order (TPO)?  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation order (TPO)?  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation order (TPO)?  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation order (TPO)?  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation order (TPO)?  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation order (TPO)?  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation order (TPO)?  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation order (TPO)?  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation order (TPO)?  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation order (TPO)?  Are there trees on site or intensity and order and invertebrates of playing fields often form useful corridors for foraging and dispersing mammals, birds and invertebrates. Proposals should seek to retain mature trees, hedgerows and areas of scrub. Opportunities of playing fields often form useful corridors for foraging and dispersing mammals, birds and invertebrates. Proposals should seek to retain mature trees, hedgerows and areas of scrub. Opportunities of playing fields often form useful corridors for foraging and dispersion for foraging and resorted a			*		
Does the site offer opportunity for green infrastructure delivery?  Would development reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance and adding new features or network links  Would development reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?)  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation order (TPO)?  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation order (TPO)?  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation order (TPO)?  Be a low long ment could have a positive impact by enhancing existing features or possitive impact by enhancing existing features or protey and adding new features or network links  A = Any adverse impact on protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation G = Site does not contain or adjoin any protected trees  Any other information not captured above?  Conclusions  Cross site comparison  Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)  B = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  Red:  - Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes  - Significant flooding problems					
Does the site offer opportunity for green infrastructure delivery?  Would development reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?)  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation not captured above?  Any other information not captured above?  A = No significant opportunities or loss of existing green infrastructure capable of appropriate mitigation  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  Any other information not captured above?  Any other information not captured above?  Any other information (after allowing scope for mitigation)  Are site of papropriate mitigation opportunities or loss of existing green infrastructure capable of appropriate mitigation of papropriate mitigation of adverse impacts or adverse impacts  Any other information not captured above?  Any other information (after allowing scope for mitigation)  Are Significant constraints or adverse impacts  Are Significant fopportunities  Any officant flooding problems			mature trees, hedgerows		
for green infrastructure delivery?  Would development reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?)  Action Plan targets?)  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  Any other information not captured above?  Any other information not captured above?  Conclusions  Cross site comparison  Level 1 Conclusions  Cress is garpropriate mitigation opportunities or loss of existing green infrastructure capable of appropriate mitigation opportunities or loss of existing green infrastructure appropriate mitigation of playing fields often form useful corridors for foraging and dispersing mammals, birds and invertebrates. Proposals should seek to retain mature trees, hedgerows and areas of scrub. Opportunities for small scale woodland planting and creation of wetland features. Habitat links to adjoining countryside should be maintained and enhanced.  A = Any adverse impact on protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation G = Site does not contain or adjoin any protected trees.  Any other information not captured above?  R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  R = Significant constraints or adverse impact on Green Belt purposes - Significant flooding problems			and areas of scrub.		
Would development reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?)  Action Plan targets?)  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation order (TPO)?  Are there information not captured above?  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  Are there information not captured above?  Conclusions  Cross site comparison  Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)  Red:  - Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes - Significant flooding problems			Amber: No significant		
Would development reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?)  Action Plan targets?)  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  Any other information not captured above?  Conclusions  Cross site comparison  R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  Creen: Boundary features of playing fields often form useful corridors for foraging and dispersing mammals, birds and invertebrates. Proposals should seek to retain mature trees, hedgerows and areas of scrub. Opportunities for small scale woodland planting and creation of wetland features. Habitat links to adjoining countryside should be maintained and enhanced.  A = Any adverse impact on protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation  G = Site does not contain or adjoin any protected trees  Any other information not captured above?  R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  Red:  - Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes - Significant flooding problems			opportunities		
Would development reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?)  Action Plan targets?)  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  Any other information not captured above?  Any other information not captured above?  Are Significant constraints or adverse impacts allowing scope for mitigation)  Are Significant constraints or adverse impacts  Are Significant constraints or adverse impacts  Are Conclusions  Creen: Boundary features of playing fields often form useful corridors for foraging and dispersing mammals, birds and invertebrates. Proposals should seek to retain mature trees, hedgerows and areas of scrub. Opportunities for small scale woodland planting and creation of wetland features. Habitat links to adjoining countryside should be maintained and enhanced.  Any other information not captured above?  Conclusions  Cross site comparison  Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)  R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  Red:  - Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes - Significant flooding problems	delivery'?				
Would development reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?)  Action Plan targets?)  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  Any other information not captured above?  Conclusions  Cross site comparison  Level 1 Conclusion (Ambur) Ambur a positive impact by enhancing existing features of playing fields often form useful corridors for foraging and dispersing mammals, birds and invertebrates. Proposals should seek to retain mature trees, hedgerows and areas of scrub. Opportunities for small scale woodland planting and creation of wetland features. Habitat links to adjoining countryside should be maintained and enhanced.  A = Any adverse impact on protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation G = Site does not contain or adjoin any protected trees  Any other information not captured above?  Conclusions  Cross site comparison  Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)  R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  A = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  Red:  - Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes - Significant flooding problems		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?)  Action Plan targets?)  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  Any other information not captured above?  Any other information not captured above?  Are a positive impact by enhancing existing features and adding new features or network links  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  Any other information not captured above?  Any other information not captured above?  Are site comparison  Level 1 Conclusions  Cross site comparison  Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation of adjoin any protected trees  Any other information not captured above?  R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  Rec:  - Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes  - Significant flooding problems		mitigation			
habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?)  Action Plan targets?)  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  Any other information not captured above?  Any other information not captured above?  Are a positive impact by enhancing existing features and adding new features or network links  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  Any other information not captured above?  Conclusions  Cross site comparison  Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation of adjoin any protected trees  Any other information not captured above?  R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  R = Significant constraints or adverse impact on Green Belt purposes - Significant flooding problems	Would dovelopment roduce	C. Davidana antiquid	Over any Daywadawy factower		
native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?)  enhancing existing features or network links  enhancing existing features or network links  useful corridors for foraging and dispersing mammals, birds and invertebrates. Proposals should seek to retain mature trees, hedgerows and areas of scrub. Opportunities for small scale woodland planting and creation of wetland features. Habitat links to adjoining countryside should be maintained and enhanced.  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  Any other information not captured above?  Any other information not captured above?  Conclusions  Cross site comparison  Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)  Fig. 2.  Enter the extrees on site or immediately adjacent protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation or adjoin any protected trees  Any other information not captured above?  R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  Fig. 3.  Red:  Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes - Significant flooding problems					
deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?)  and adding new features or network links  and adding new features or network links  and adding new features or network links  foraging and dispersing mammals, birds and invertebrates. Proposals should seek to retain mature trees, hedgerows and areas of scrub. Opportunities for small scale woodland planting and creation of wetland features. Habitat links to adjoining countryside should be maintained and enhanced.  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  A = Any adverse impact on protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation G = Site does not contain or adjoin any protected trees  Any other information not captured above?  Conclusions  Cross site comparison  Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)  R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  Red:  - Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes - Significant flooding problems		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Action Plan targets?)  network links  nammals, birds and invertebrates. Proposals should seek to retain mature trees, hedgerows and areas of scrub.  Opportunities for small scale woodland planting and creation of wetland features. Habitat links to adjoining countryside should be maintained and enhanced.  Are there trees on site or protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation  G = Site does not contain or adjoin any protected trees  Any other information not captured above?  Conclusions  Cross site comparison  Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)  R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  Red:  - Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes  - Significant flooding problems					
Action Plan targets?)  Invertebrates. Proposals should seek to retain mature trees, hedgerows and areas of scrub. Opportunities for small scale woodland planting and creation of wetland features. Habitat links to adjoining countryside should be maintained and enhanced.  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  A = Any adverse impact on protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation G = Site does not contain or adjoin any protected trees  Any other information not captured above?  Conclusions  Cross site comparison  Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)  R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  Red:  - Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes - Significant flooding problems		<u> </u>			
should seek to retain mature trees, hedgerows and areas of scrub. Opportunities for small scale woodland planting and creation of wetland features. Habitat links to adjoining countryside should be maintained and enhanced.  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  Any other information not captured above?  Conclusions  Cross site comparison  Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)  R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  Red:  - Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes - Significant flooding problems	Action Plan targets?)		The state of the s		
and areas of scrub.  Opportunities for small scale woodland planting and creation of wetland features. Habitat links to adjoining countryside should be maintained and enhanced.  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  A = Any adverse impact on protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation G = Site does not contain or adjoin any protected trees  Any other information not captured above?  Conclusions  Cross site comparison  Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)  B = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  Red:  - Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes - Significant flooding problems			·		
Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  Any other information not captured above?  A = Any adverse impact on protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation G = Site does not contain or adjoin any protected trees  Any other information (after allowing scope for mitigation)  R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  Red:  - Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes  - Significant flooding problems			mature trees, hedgerows		
scale woodland planting and creation of wetland features. Habitat links to adjoining countryside should be maintained and enhanced.  Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  Any other information not captured above?  Any other information not captured above?  Conclusions  Cross site comparison  Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)  R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  Red:  - Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes  - Significant flooding problems					
Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  Any other information not captured above?  A = Any adverse impact on protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation G = Site does not contain or adjoin any protected trees  Any other information not captured above?  Conclusions  Cross site comparison  Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)  R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  Red: - Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes - Significant flooding problems			• •		
Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  Any other information not captured above?  Any other information (after allowing scope for mitigation)  A = Any adverse impact on protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation or adjoin any protected trees  Any other information not captured above?  A = Any adverse impact on protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation or adjoin any protected trees  Any other information not captured above?  Any other information not captured above?  Any other information not captured above?  B = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  A = Any adverse impact on TPOs on the northern periphery.  Amber: A dozen or so TPOs on the northern periphery.  B = Significant constraints or adverse impact on Green Belt purposes  - Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes  - Significant flooding problems					
Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  Any other information not captured above?  Conclusions  Cross site comparison  Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)  R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  Red:  - Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes - Significant flooding problems					
Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  Any other information not captured above?  Conclusions  Cross site comparison  Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)  R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  or adverse impacts  Should be maintained and enhanced.  Amber: A dozen or so TPOs on the northern periphery.  Periphery.  R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  Red:  - Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes - Significant flooding problems					
Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  Any other information not captured above?  Conclusions  Cross site comparison  Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)  R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  Red:  - Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes - Significant flooding problems					
Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  Any other information not captured above?  Conclusions  Cross site comparison  Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)  R = Any adverse impact on protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation  G = Site does not contain or adjoin any protected trees  R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  Red:  - Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes - Significant flooding problems					
immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  Any other information not captured above?  Conclusions  Cross site comparison  Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)  R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  Red:  - Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes - Significant flooding problems	Are there trees on site or	A = Any adverse impact on			
by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  appropriate mitigation G = Site does not contain or adjoin any protected trees  Any other information not captured above?  Conclusions  Cross site comparison  Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)  R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  Red:  - Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes - Significant flooding problems		-	TPOs on the northern		
Any other information not captured above?  Conclusions Cross site comparison Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)  R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  Red: - Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes - Significant flooding problems			periphery.		
Conclusions  Cross site comparison  Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)  R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  Red: - Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes - Significant flooding problems	(120)?				
Conclusions Cross site comparison Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)  R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  Red: - Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes - Significant flooding problems					
Cross site comparison  Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)  R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  Red: - Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes - Significant flooding problems	Any other information not o	Any other information not captured above?			
Cross site comparison  Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)  R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  Red: - Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes - Significant flooding problems	Conclusions				
Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)  R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  Or adverse impacts  Red:  - Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes - Significant flooding problems					
allowing scope for mitigation)  or adverse impacts  - Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes - Significant flooding problems		R = Significant constraints	Red:		
mitigation)  Green Belt purposes -Significant flooding problems	,				
-Significant flooding problems					
problems					
- No evidence of			problems		
			- No evidence of		

Level 2 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)	R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts	landowner intention to develop  Red: -Site is not near to local facilities such as district / local centre, GP surgery and primary school, and due to its size it is less likely to be able to provide for new facilitiesIt is not accessible to high quality public transportDevelopment would result
		in the loss of a playing field designated as public open space. This open space would have to be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere.
Overall Conclusion	R = Site with no significant development potential (significant constraints and adverse impacts)	Red: Site with no significant development potential (significant constraints and adverse impacts)
Viability feedback (from consultants)	R = Unlikely to be viable, A = May be viable G = Likely to be viable	Sites ranked A or G will be taken forward for viability assessment by consultants