





South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission Sustainability Appraisal

Appendix 4: Appraisal of Alternatives Site Packages

Prepared for: South Cambridgeshire District Council

Prepared by: ENVIRON Exeter, UK

Date: March 2014

Project or Issue Number: **UK18-18630**



Contract No: UK18-18630

Issue: 3

Author Tim Maiden / V Tanner-Tremaine

(signature):

Project Manager/Director V Tanner-Tremaine

(signature):

Date: March 2014

This report has been prepared by ENVIRON with all reasonable skill, care and diligence, and taking account of the Services and the Terms agreed between ENVIRON and the Client. This report is confidential to the client, and ENVIRON accepts no responsibility whatsoever to third parties to whom this report, or any part thereof, is made known, unless formally agreed by ENVIRON beforehand. Any such party relies upon the report at their own risk.

Jahn In

ENVIRON disclaims any responsibility to the Client and others in respect of any matters outside the agreed scope of the Services.

Versio	on Control Record			
Issue	Description of Status	Date	Reviewer Initials	Author Initials
1	Draft for Cabinet	19/06/13	VTT	TM
2	Final for Consultation with Local Plan Submission Draft	19/07/13	VTT	TM
3	Final for Submission	March 2014	LV	TM/VTT

1 Introduction

This Appendix outlines the results of a sustainability appraisal of a series of options of site packages for the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan. These packages have been identified and selected as the reasonable alternatives which could deliver the additional 4,971 dwellings need to meet the South Cambridgeshire identified housing needs. The preferred package, when chosen following the sustainability appraisal, will contribute to a much larger development strategy for the Cambridge area, involving almost 55 % of development (18,000) houses in and on the edge of Cambridge.

This assessment builds upon work undertaken by South Cambridgeshire District Council for its site assessments.

The purpose of this assessment is to identify, describe and evaluate the likely significant effects on the environment¹ and sustainability, of the reasonable alternative packages of sites. The Council identified nine reasonable alternative packages which have been subject to assessment.

UK18-18630 Issue: 3 Page 3-A117 ENVIRON

¹ As required by Article 5 SEA Directive.

2 Characteristics of the Site Package Options

This section describes each of the site package options which were identified as reasonable alternatives by the Council for Sustainability Appraisal. The descriptions of the packages have been provided by the Council for inclusion in this Appendix.

2.1 Site Package Options for Sustainability Appraisal

In order to compare the sustainability of delivering the remaining housing needs for South Cambridgeshire at different locations, packages of sites have been identified and tested, to compare the cumulative impacts.

Eight different packages were identified, each with a different focus for the remaining development. It would not be reasonable to test every potential combination of options, but the aim has been to providing a good coverage of strategic alternatives that could be delivered with the site options available taking account of the issue and options and initial sustainability appraisal process.

Where new settlements have been considered, the deliverability and potentially longer lead in times have been taken into account. The phasing relative to other options has also been considered, in order to achieve the development needed in the plan period. In some cases different amounts of a site being developed in the plan period have been considered, with the remainder being developed later.

Option 1 - Waterbeach New Town, Cambourne West and Village Focus

This option includes provision from the partial completion by 2031 of a new town at Waterbeach, with the remainder after 2031, the completion of an extension to the existing new settlement at Cambourne and development at a range of villages down to what was subject to consultation as the 'Better Served Group Village' level.

Option 2 - Bourn Airfield New Settlement and Village Focus

This option includes the completion of a new settlement at Bourn Airfield within the plan period, and limited development in Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centre villages to meet the remaining requirement.

Option 3 - Cambourne and Village Focus

This option is a village focused approach. It includes completion of an extension to the existing new settlement at Cambourne, with the remainder of new development focused on other villages. At Waterbeach, there would be no new settlement, but the redevelopment of the barracks themselves would accommodate around 900 dwellings.

Option 4 - Waterbeach New Town, Bourn Airfield New Settlement, and Cambourne West Focus

This option includes provision from the partial completion by 2031 of a new town at Waterbeach, the partial completion of a new settlement at Bourn Airfield, the completion of an extension to the existing new settlement at Cambourne. This would be supported by selected development at Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres.

Option 5 - Waterbeach New Town, Bourn Airfield New Settlement and Village Focus

This option includes provision from the partial completion by 2031 of a new town at Waterbeach, the partial completion of a new settlement at Bourn Airfield (but more than Option 4 assumes), and development at Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres.

Comparing with Green Belt strategies

As detailed earlier, the assessment of 41 individual potential site options highlighted the potential harm to the Green Belt and the setting of the City of significant further development. Only 6 site options were identified, and all have been included within the proposed development strategy.

The sustainability appraisal earlier identified potential benefits on some sustainability objectives of further development in the Green Belt. In order to provide a comparison with other strategies, packages have been tested which include further development in the Green Belt, building on the assessments of tested but rejected sites. Testing has considered the overall impact of identifying the quantum of development in the broad locations available, rather than identifying specific rejected site options.

Option 6 - Cambridge Green Belt and Village Focus

This option assumes 2 or 3 large urban extensions to Cambridge on land currently in the Green Belt. This would accommodate around 4000 dwellings. This would be supported by selected village sites at Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres, with a focus on previously developed land.

Option 7 - Cambridge Green Belt, Waterbeach New Town, Cambourne West and Village Focus

This option assumes 1 or 2 large urban extensions to Cambridge on land currently in the Green Belt, accommodating around 2000 dwellings. The remaining development needs would be accommodated through the partial completion of a new town at Waterbeach, the completion of an extension to the existing new settlement at Cambourne and limited development at villages.

Option 8 - Cambridge Green Belt, Waterbeach New Town, Bourn Airfield New Settlement, Cambourne West and Village Focus

This option assumes delivery of smaller sites on land currently in the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge, provision from the partial completion of a new town at Waterbeach, the completion of an extension to the existing new settlement at Cambourne and selected development at Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres.

Table 2.1 Developmen	nt Packages	for Sustain	ability Apprai	sal – Optic	ons 1-4				
Options by		Opt 1		Opt 2		Opt 3		Opt 4	
Development Sequence (South Cambs only)	Existing Supply	Existing Supply & New Sites	New Sites Only	Existing Supply & New Sites	New Sites	Existing Supply & New Sites	New Sites	Existing Supply & New Sites	New Sites
Cambridge urban area	309	309	0	309	0	309	0	309	0
Cambridge fringe sites	3,902	4,002	100	4,002	100	4,002	100	4,002	100
New settlement(s)	5,965	7,365	1,400	9,465	3,500	5,965	0	9,065	3,100
Rural Centres	1,519	4,009	2,490	2,544	1.025	4,114	2,595	3,304	1,785
Minor Rural Centres	1,304	2,019	715	1,459	155	3,239	1,935	1,509	205
Group Villages	865	865	0	865	0	865	0	865	0
Infill Villages	165	165	0	165	0	165	0	165	0
TOTAL	14,029	18,734	4,705	18,809	4,780	18,659	4,630	19,219	5,190

Table 2.2 Developmen	nt Packages	for Sustaina	bility Apprai	sal – Option	s 5-8				
Options by		Opt 5		Opt 6		Opt 7		Opt 8	
Development Sequence (South Cambs only)	Existing Supply	Existing Supply & New Sites	New Sites	Existing Supply & New Sites	New Sites	Existing Supply & New Sites	New Sites	Existing Supply & New Sites	New Sites
Cambridge urban area	309	309	0	309	0	309	0	309	0
Cambridge fringe sites	3,902	4,002	100	8,002	4,100	6,002	2,100	5,002	1,100
New settlement(s)	5,965	9,665	3,700	5,965	0	7,365	1,400	7,865	1,900

South Cambridgeshire District Council SA Report Part 3: Appendix 4

Table 2.2 Developme	nt Packages	for Sustaina	bility Apprai	sal – Option	s 5-8				
Options by		Opt 5		Opt 6		Opt 7		Opt 8	
Development Sequence (South Cambs only)	Existing Supply	Existing Supply & New Sites	New Sites	Existing Supply & New Sites	New Sites	Existing Supply & New Sites	New Sites	Existing Supply & New Sites	New Sites
Rural Centres	1,519	2,369	850	1,924	405	2,919	1,400	3,299	1,780
Minor Rural Centres	1,304	1,459	155	1,459	155	1,304	0	1,459	155
Group Villages	865	865	0	865	0	865	0	865	0
Infill Villages	165	165	0	165	0	165	0	165	0
TOTAL	14,029	18,834	4,805	18,689	4,660	18,929	4,900	18,964	4,935

Each package of sites has been tested utilising the Sustainability Objectives developed through the South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, by consultants Environ.

2.2 Preferred Approach

Following the testing of packages, the decision was taken to develop a strategy based on package 4, but with some variation, particularly at the village level. The full reasoning for selection of the package is contained elsewhere.

The preferred package (referred to as package option 9), provides the following spatial distribution of development:

Table 2.3 Development Packages (9)	for Sustainability	Appraisal – The F	Preferred Option
		Opt 9	
Options by Development Sequence (South Cambs only)	Existing Supply	Existing Supply & New Sites	New Sites
Cambridge urban area	309	309	0
Cambridge fringe sites	3,902	4,002	100
New settlement(s)	5,965	9,065	3,100
Rural Centres	1,519	3,284	1,765
Minor Rural Centres	1,304	1,599	295
Group Villages	865	865	0
Infill Villages	165	165	0
TOTAL	14,029	19,289	5,260

For completeness this package has been compared alongside the other 8 packages considered through the sustainability appraisal process. The assessment of all these packages is recorded in the following section.

3 SA Results

This next section sets out the assessment. The first nine tables relate to the assessment of each of the nine packages, and the final table shows the cumulative performance of the packages for the SA Objectives and sub-objectives. A comparative commentary explaining how each of the packages performs against the each of the Objectives then follows. Finally, there is a commentary which gives an overview of the packages overall performance.

Key to site names / categories:

WNT = Waterbeach New Town

BA = Bourn Airfield

CW = Cambourne West

GB = Green Belt sites

Within each assessment table the numbers in column 1 of refer to the SA Objectives, whilst the text for each sub-objective is given in column 2.

3.1 Package Option 1 Waterbeach New Town, Cambourne West and Village Focus

Table 3.1 Packa	age Option 1		
Category	Location	SHLAA Site Number	Capacity
Cambridge fringe sites	NIAB 3 Land Between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road Cambridge (I&O2 Site G6) (revised capacity and boundary)	SC298	100
New settlement(s)	Waterbeach New Town (I&O1 Site 2 with amended boundary and capacity)	231	1,400
	Cambourne West (I&O1 Site 17 as amended to smaller site boundary and capacity)	303 & 239	1,200
D. wal Cantura	Dales Manor Business Park, Sawston (I&O2 Site H5) (revised site capacity)	312	200
Rural Centres	Land south of Babraham Road, Sawston (I&O1 Site 8)	258 &178	260
	Land north of Babraham, Sawston (I&O2 Site H6)	313	80

Table 3.1 Page	ckage Option 1		
Category	Location	SHLAA Site Number	Capacity
	Land north of White Field Way, Sawston (I&O2 Site H4)	311	65
	Former Bishops Hardware Store, Histon (I&O2 Site H2)	308	20
	Land at Buxhall Farm, Histon (I&O1 Site 13)	133	190
	Land north of Impington Lane, Impington (I&O1 Site 14, 15)	112 and 114	25
	Land off Cambridge Road, Great Shelford (I&O1 Site 18)	5	90
	Land at Oakington Road, Cottenham (I&O1 Site 22)	260	110
	The Redlands, Oakington Road, Cottenham (I&O1 Site 23)	3	65
	Land at Rampton Road, Cottenham (SHLAA 128)	128	185
	Green End Industrial Estate, Gamlingay (I&O1 Site 33)	117	90
	Land at Mill Road, Gamlingay (I&O1 Site 34)	93	25
	Land east of Station Road, Linton (I&O1 Site 29)	152	35
	36 New Road, Melbourn (I&O1 Site 30)	235	15
	Land rear of Victoria Way, Melbourn (I&O1 Site 31)	130	50
Minor Rural Centres	Land east of New Road, Melbourn (I&O2 Site H7)	320	205
	Orchard and land at East Farm, Melbourn (I&O2 H8)	331	65
	Land east of Rockmill End, Willingham (I&O1 Site 46)	45	50
	Bennell Farm, Comberton (I&O2 H10)	326	90
	Land south of Whitton Close & west of Boxworth End, Swavesey (I&O1 Site 36)	83	75
	Land at Cockerton Road, Girton (I&O1 Site 40)	143	15

Table 3.1 Packa	age Option 1		
Category	Location	SHLAA Site Number	Capacity
	TOTAL		4,705

Table 3	.2 SA of F	ack	age C	ptio	n 1																						
Site No.	(SHLAA)	SC298	231	239	312	178 & 258	313	311	308	133	112 & 114	5	260	3	128	117	93	152	235	130	320	331	45	326	83	143	Overall
No of he 2031	omes to	100	1400	1200	200	760	80	9	20	190	25	06	110	65	185	06	25	35	15	50	205	65	20	06	52	15	4.705
Site nan	egory 3 W														Mi	inor F	Rural	Centr	es								
	Previou sly develop ed land	0	+++	0	+ + +	0	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++
1	Agricult ural land	1			0	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	
	Mineral reserves , soils	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
	Air quality	1	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-/0	0	0	0	0	0/-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
2	Noise, light pollution , odour & vibration	0	0	0/-	+ + +	0	0	0	-	0	0	0/-	-	-	-	++	0		0	0	0	0	-	0	-	0	-

Table 3	.2 SA of F	ack	age C	ptio	n 1																						
Site No.	(SHLAA)	SC298	231	239	312	178 & 258	313	311	308	133	112 & 114	5	260	ဗ	128	117	93	152	235	130	320	331	45	326	83	143	Overall
No of he 2031	omes to	100	1400	1200	200	260	80	65	20	190	25	06	110	65	185	06	25	35	15	50	205	65	50	06	75	15	4.705
Site nan		NI A B 3	WN T	C W			F	Rural	Cent	res								М	inor F	Rural	Centr	es					
	Land contami nation	+	+	0	+	0	+/	0	+	0	+	0	0	+	+	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	+
	Water environ ment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	Nature conserv ation interest & geodiver sity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Habitat fragmen tation, native species, habitat	+	+++	+/ 0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+

Table 3	3.2 SA of F	ack	age C	ptio	n 1																						
Site No.	. (SHLAA)	SC298	231	239	312	178 & 258	313	311	308	133	112 & 114	2	260	က	128	117	93	152	235	130	320	331	45	326	83	143	Overall
No of he 2031	omes to	100	1400	1200	200	260	80	65	20	190	25	06	110	65	185	06	25	35	15	50	205	65	50	06	k	15	4.705
Site nar		NI A B	WN T	C W			R	Rural	Cent	res								Mi	inor R	Rural	Centr	es					
	restorati on																										
6	Access to wildlife & green spaces	0	+++	+/+++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+
	Landsca pe characte r	-	-	0	+	0/+	0/+	0	0	-	-	-	-	0	/-	0	0	0/-	0	0	0/-	0/-	-	0		-	
7	Townsc ape characte r	-	0	0	0 / +	0	0	0	++	-/0	-	-	-	-	 /-	+	0	-/0	0	0	0	0	-	0		-	-
	Historica I,	0	-	0	0	0/-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	+/	0/-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-		-

Table 3	3.2 SA of F	Pack	age C	ptio	n 1																						
Site No.	(SHLAA)	SC298	231	239	312	178 & 258	313	311	308	133	112 & 114	5	260	3	128	117	93	152	235	130	320	331	45	326	83	143	Overall
No of he 2031	omes to	100	1400	1200	200	260	80	65	20	190	25	06	110	65	185	06	25	35	15	50	205	65	50	06	ž.	15	4.705
Site nar		NI A B	WN T	C W			R	Rural	Cent	res								Mi	inor F	Rural	Centr	es			•		
	archaeol ogical, cultural																										
10	Renewa ble energy resourc es	0	+++	0/+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+
11	Flooding , SUDS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	Open space	++	+++	+/ ++ +	0	+	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	++
16	Accessi bility to local services / facilities	++	+++ /+	+	+	+	+	+	++	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	++ +/+

Table 3	.2 SA of F	Pack	age C	ptio	n 1																						
Site No.	(SHLAA)	SC298	231	239	312	178 & 258	313	311	308	133	112 & 114	5	260	3	128	117	93	152	235	130	320	331	45	326	83	143	Overall
No of he 2031	omes to	100	1400	1200	200	260	80	65	20	190	25	06	110	65	185	06	25	35	15	50	205	65	50	06	75	12	4.705
Site nar		NI A B	WN T	C W			R	Rural	Cent	res				ı			1	M	inor R	Rural	Centr	es			1		
	Distanc e to centre	+	0		-	-				-	+				-	++	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0		+++	
	Quality & range of local services & facilities	0	+++	+	0	+	0	0	0/-	+	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++
17	Ability of people to influenc e decision s	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18	Engage ment with	0	+++	+	0	+/	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	++

Table 3	3.2 SA of F	Pack	age C	ptio	n 1																						
Site No.	(SHLAA)	SC298	231	239	312	178 & 258	313	311	308	133	112 & 114	5	260	3	128	117	93	152	235	130	320	331	45	326	83	143	Overall
No of he 2031	omes to	100	1400	1200	200	260	80	65	20	190	25	06	110	65	185	06	25	35	15	50	205	65	50	06	4	15	4.705
Site nan		NI A B 3	WN T	C W			F	Rural	Cent	res								Mi	inor R	lural (Centro	es			·	·	
	commun ity activities																										
19	Busines s develop ment & competit iveness	+	+++	+/+++	- / 0	0	0	0	0/-	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++
	Shoppin g hierarch y	0	0	0/+	0	0	0	0	0/-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20	Employ ment opportu nities in accessi ble location	++	0/+++	0	+	+	+	0	++	++	++	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	++	++ +	++	++	+	+	+	+++	+

Table 3	3.2 SA of F	Pack	age C	ptio	n 1																						
Site No.	(SHLAA)	SC298	231	239	312	178 & 258	313	311	308	133	112 & 114	5	260	3	128	117	93	152	235	130	320	331	45	326	83	143	Overall
No of he 2031	omes to	100	1400	1200	200	260	80	65	20	190	25	06	110	65	185	06	25	35	15	50	205	65	50	06	¥	15	4.705
Site nar		NI A B 3	WN T	C W			R	tural	Cent	res								M	inor R	tural (Centre	es					
	S																										
21	Investm ent in key commun ity services & infrastru cture	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+++++/+	++ +/+	+	+	+	+	++ +/+	++ +/+	++ +/+	++	+++	+	-	+	-
21	Access to educatio n & training, & provisio n of	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	-	++	++	++ +	++	-	+	 /-	-	-

Table 3	.2 SA of F	ack	age C	ptio	n 1																						
Site No.	(SHLAA)	SC298	231	239	312	178 & 258	313	311	308	133	112 & 114	5	260	3	128	117	93	152	235	130	320	331	45	326	83	143	Overall
No of he 2031	omes to	100	1400	1200	200	260	80	65	20	190	25	06	110	65	185	06	25	35	15	50	205	65	50	06	75	15	4.705
Site nar		NI A B 3	WN T	C W			R	lural	Cent	res								M	inor F	Rural	Centr	es					
	skilled employe es																										
22	Shorter journeys , improve modal choice & integrati on modes	++	+	0	0	0	0	0	++	+	++	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+++	+
	Distanc e to bus stop / rail station	++	0	0	0	0	-	0	++	++	++	++	++	+	+	++	++	++	+	+	0	+	+	++	++	+++	+

Table 3	3.2 SA of F	Pack	age C	ptio	n 1																						
Site No.	. (SHLAA)	SC298	231	239	312	178 & 258	313	311	308	133	112 & 114	2	260	3	128	117	93	152	235	130	320	331	45	326	83	143	Overall
No of he 2031	omes to	100	1400	1200	200	260	80	65	20	190	25	06	110	65	185	06	25	35	15	50	205	65	50	06	7.	15	4.705
Site nar		NI A B 3	WN T	C W			F	Rural	Cent	res								М	inor R	Rural	Centro	es					
	Frequen cy of Public Transpo rt	+	+/?	+	+	+	+	+	++	+	+	+	+	+	+			0	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+
	Typical Public Transpo rt Journey Time to City Centre or Market Town	++	+/?	0	-	0	-	0	++	+	++	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	++ +	++ +	++	++ +	0	+	+	+++	+
	Distanc e for cycling to City	++	+	0	+	0	+	+	++	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	++	++	++	+	+	+	+	+++	+

Table 3	.2 SA of F	ack	age C	ptio	n 1																						
Site No.	(SHLAA)	SC298	231	239	312	178 & 258	313	311	308	133	112 & 114	5	260	3	128	117	93	152	235	130	320	331	45	326	83	143	Overall
No of he 2031	omes to	100	1400	1200	200	260	80	65	20	190	25	06	110	65	185	06	25	35	15	50	205	65	50	06	75	15	4.705
Site nan		NI A B 3	WN T	C W			F	Rural	Cent	res								M	inor F	Rural	Centr	es					
	Centre or Market Town																										
23	Safe access to the highway network	-		0/-	0	0/-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	/-	0	0/-	0	
	Safer transpor t network & promote use of non- motorise d modes	+	+++	+	+	0	0	0	++	+	+	+	+	+	+/+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	+	++

3.2 Package Option 2 Bourn Airfield New Settlement and Village Focus

	Category	Location	SHLAA Site Number	Capacity
	Cambridge fringe sites	NIAB 3 Land Between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road Cambridge (I&O2 Site G6) (revised capacity and boundary)	SC298	100
	New settlement(s)	Bourn Airfield New Village (I&O1 Site 5)	57 & 238	3,500
		Dales Manor Business Park, Sawston (I&O2 Site H5) (revised site capacity)	312	200
		Land south of Babraham Road, Sawston (I&O1 Site 8)	258	105
		Land east of Sawston (I&O1 Site 9)	178	260
_	Rural	Land north of Babraham, Sawston (I&O2 Site H6)	313	80
Opt 2	Centres	Former Bishops Hardware Store, Histon (I&O2 Site H2)	308	20
		Land at Oakington Road, Cottenham (I&O1 Site 22)	260	110
		The Redlands, Oakington Road, Cottenham (I&O1 Site 23)	3	65
		Land at Rampton Road, Cottenham (SHLAA 128)	128	185
		Green End Industrial Estate, Gamlingay (I&O1 Site 33)	117	90
	Minor Rural Centres	36 New Road, Melbourn (I&O1 Site 30)	235	15
		Land rear of Victoria Way, Melbourn (I&O1 Site 31)	130	50
		TOTAL		4,780

Tab	ole 3.4 SA of Packaç	ge Option	2												
	Site No. (SHLAA)	SC298	238	312	258	178	313	308	260	3	128	117	235	130	Overall
	No of homes to 2031	100	3500	200	105	260	80	20	110	65	185	90	15	50	4780
	Site name/category	NIAB3	ВА	Rural	Centres				Minor F	Rural Cen	tres		•		
	Previously developed land	0	+	+++	0	0	0	+++	0	0	0	+++	0	0	+
1	Agricultural land	-		0	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	0	-	-	
	Mineral reserves, soils	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Air quality	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0/-	0	0	0	-
3	Noise, light pollution, odour & vibration	0	-	+++	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	+++	0	0	-
	Land contamination	+	+	+	0	0	+/0	+	0	+	+	+	0	+	+
	Water environment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	Nature conservation interest & geodiversity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Habitat fragmentation, native species, habitat restoration	+	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+
6	Access to wildlife &	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+

Tab	le 3.4 SA of Packaç	ge Option	2												
	Site No. (SHLAA)	SC298	238	312	258	178	313	308	260	3	128	117	235	130	Overall
	No of homes to 2031	100	3500	200	105	260	80	20	110	65	185	90	15	50	4780
	Site name/category	NIAB3	ВА	Rural	Centres				Minor F	Rural Cen	tres				
	green spaces														
7	Landscape character	-	0	+	0/+	0/+	0/+	0	-	0	/-	0	0	0	-
,	Townscape character	-	0	0/+	0	0	0	+++	-	-	/-	+	0	0	-
8	Historical, archaeological, cultural	0	0/-	0	0	0/-	0	0	0	0	0	+/0	0	0	0
10	Renewable energy resources	0	+/+++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+
11	Flooding, SUDS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	Open space	+++	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+
	Accessibility to local services/ facilities	+++	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+
16	Distance to centre	+	0			-					-	+++	-	-	-
	Quality & range of local services & facilities	0	+++/+	0	+	+	0	0/-	0	0	+	0	0	0	+++

Tab	le 3.4 SA of Packag	e Option	2												
	Site No. (SHLAA)	SC298	238	312	258	178	313	308	260	3	128	117	235	130	Overall
	No of homes to 2031	100	3500	200	105	260	80	20	110	65	185	90	15	50	4780
	Site name/category	NIAB3	ВА	Rural	Centres				Minor R	Rural Cen	tres				
17	Ability of people to influence decisions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18	Engagement with community activities	0	+++	0	+/0	+/0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+++
19	Business development & competitiveness	+	+++	-/0	0	0	0	0/-	0	0	0	0	0	0	+++
	Shopping hierarchy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0/-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20	Employment opportunities in accessible locations	+++	+/+++	+	+	+	+	+++	+	+	+	0	+++	+++	+
	Investment in key community services & infrastructure	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+++/+	+++/+	+	+	+++/+	+++/+	-
21	Access to education & training, & provision of skilled employees	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+	+++	+++	-

	le 3.4 SA of Packag	<u> </u>	1	240	050	470	242	200	000		400	447	005	400	0
	Site No. (SHLAA)	SC298	238	312	258	178	313	308	260	3	128	117	235	130	Overall
	No of homes to 2031	100	3500	200	105	260	80	20	110	65	185	90	15	50	4780
	Site name/category	NIAB3	ВА	Rural	Centres	•	•		Minor F	Rural Cen	tres				
	Shorter journeys, improve modal choice & integration modes	+++	0	0	0	0	0	+++	+	+	+	0	+	+	+
	Distance to bus stop / rail station	+++	0	0	-	0	-	+++	+++	+	+	+++	+	+	+
22	Frequency of Public Transport	+	+	+	+	+	+	+++	+	+	+		-	-	+
	Typical Public Transport Journey Time to City Centre or Market Town	+++	0	-	0	0	-	+++	0	0	0	+	+++	+++	+
	Distance for cycling to City Centre or Market Town	+++	0	+	+	0	+	+++	+	+	+	+	+++	+++	+
23	Safe access to the highway network	-	0/-	0	0	0/-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
	Safer transport network & promote use of non- motorised modes	+	+++	+	0	0	0	+++	+	+	+/+++	+	+	+	+++

3.3 Package Option 3 Cambourne and Village Focus

	Category	Location	SHLAA Site Number	Capacity
	Cambridge fringe sites	NIAB 3 Land Between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road Cambridge (I&O2 Site G6) (revised capacity and boundary)	SC298	100
		Cambourne West (I&O1 Site 17 as amended to smaller site boundary and capacity)	303 & 239	1,200
		Dales Manor Business Park, Sawston (I&O2 Site H5) (revised site capacity)	312	200
		Land south of Babraham Road, Sawston (I&O1 Site 8)	258	105
		Land east of Sawston (I&O1 Site 9)	178	260
		Land north of Babraham, Sawston (I&O2 Site H6)	313	80
	Rural	Land north of White Field Way, Sawston (I&O2 Site H4)	311	65
pt 3	Centres	Former Bishops Hardware Store, Histon (I&O2 Site H2)	308	20
ρι σ		Land at Buxhall Farm, Histon (I&O1 Site 13)	133	190
		Land north of Impington Lane, Impington (I&O1 Site 14, 15)	112&114	25
		Land off Cambridge Road, Great Shelford (I&O1 Site 18)	5	90
		Land at Oakington Road, Cottenham (I&O1 Site 22)	260	110
		The Redlands, Oakington Road, Cottenham (I&O1 Site 23)	3	65
		Land at Rampton Road, Cottenham (SHLAA 128)	128	185
		Waterbeach New Town (I&O1 Site 2 with amended boundary and capacity)	231 part	930
	Minor Rural Centres	Bannold Road, Waterbeach (3 sites) (I&O1 Site 49, 50 I&O2 Site H9)	206, 155, 322	140
	2 3	Green End Industrial Estate, Gamlingay (I&O1 Site 33)	117	90

Category	Location	SHLAA Site Number	Capacity
	Land off Grays Road, Gamlingay (I&O1 Site 32)	171	45
	Land at Mill Road, Gamlingay (I&O1 Site 34)	93	25
	Land east of Station Road, Linton (I&O1 Site 29)	152	35
	36 New Road, Melbourn (I&O1 Site 30)	235	15
	Land rear of Victoria Way, Melbourn (I&O1 Site 31)	130	50
	Land east of New Road, Melbourn (I&O2 Site H7)	320	205
	Orchard and land at East Farm, Melbourn (I&O2 H8)	331	65
	Land east of Rockmill End, Willingham (I&O1 Site 46)	45	50
	Bennell Farm, Comberton (I&O2 H10)	326	90
	Land south of Whitton Close & west of Boxworth End, Swavesey (I&O1 Site 36)	83	75
	Land at Cockerton Road, Girton (I&O1 Site 40)	143	15
	Next to Walnut Tree Close, North End, Bassingbourn (I&O1 Site 37)	85	55
	Land between South End & Spring Lane, Bassingbourn (I&O1 Site 39)	78	50
	TOTAL		4,630

Т	able 3.6	SA	of P	ack	age	Ор	tion	3																											
	ite No. SHLAA)	SC298	239	312	258	178	313	311	308	133	112	114	5	260	3	128	231 part	506	155	322	117	171	93	152	235	130	320	331	45	326	83	143	85	78	Overall
h	lo of omes 2031	100	1500	200						190		25	06	110	65	185	930		140		06			35	15	20	205	65	20	90	75	15		20	4930
n	ite ame/ca egory	NI A B 3	c C													Rural		ntres			<u> </u>	. V	<u> </u>	(-)		4,	· ·	.	47	<u> </u>			47	47	4
	Previ ously devel oped land	0	0	+ + +	0	0	0	0	+ + +	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+ + +	0	0	0	+ + +	0	0	+ + +	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+
1	Agric ultura I land	-		0	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	1	-	-	1	1	- 1	0	-	-	-	-
	Miner al reser ves, soils	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Air qualit y	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	- / 0	0	0	0	0	0	0/	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
3	Noise , light polluti on,	0	0/	+ + +	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0 /-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	+ + + +	0	0		0	0	0	0	1	0	-	0	0 /-	0 /-	-

Ta	able 3.6	SA	of Pa	ack	age	Op	tion	3																											
	te No. HLAA)	SC298	239	312	258	178	313	311	308	133	112	114	5	260	က	128	231 part	506	155	322	117	171	93	152	235	130	320	331	45	326	83	143	85	78	Overall
ho	o of omes 2031	100	1500	200		760				190		25	06	110	65	5	930		140		06		25	35	15	50	205		50				55	50	30
	te ime/ca gory	NI A B 3	C W		ral (<u> </u>			Rural		ntres			, <u> </u>			, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,									471	7,	
	odour & vibrati on																																		
	Land conta minati on	+	0	+	0	0	+ / 0	0	+	0	+	+	0	0	+	+	+	0	+/	0	+	0	0	+	0	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	0 / +	+	+
	Water env.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	Natur e conse rvatio n intere st & geodi versit y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Ta	ble 3.6	SA	of P	ack	age	Op	tion	3																											
	te No. HLAA)	SC298	239	312	258	178	313	311	308	133	112	114	9	260	3	128	231 part	902	155	322	117	171	93	152	235	130	320	331	45	326	83	143	85	78	Overall
hc	o of mes 2031	100)	200						190		25	06	110	65	185	930		140		06			35	15	20	205	92	20	06	75	15	55		30
	te me/ca gory	NI A B 3	c C			Cent			N			N	6			Rural		ntres			<u> </u>	1 4	N	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	N	9	40	9 1			()	<u> 40</u>	4
5	Habit at fragm entati on, native speci es, habit at restor ation	+	+/ 0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+
6	Acce ss to wildlif e & green space s	0	+/++++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+
7	Land scape	-	0	+	0 /	0 /	0 /	0	0	1	-	-	-	-	0	 -/-	0	-	-	-	0	+	0	0 /-	0	0	0/ -	0/	1	0		-	-	-	

Ta	able 3.6	SA	of P	ack	age	Op	tion	3																											
	SC 298 312 308 112 308 239 258 258 258 258 258 258 258 258 258 258													260	က	128	231 part	206	155	322	117	171	93	152	235	130	320	331	45	326	83	143	85	78	Overall
ho	o of omes 2031	100	1500	200	105	260				190		25	90	110	65	185	930		140		06		25	35	15	50	205		50		75		55	50	30
na	ite ame/ca gory	A NI A C B W Rural Centres														Rural		ntres			, <u> </u>														
	chara cter				+	+	+																												
	Town scape chara cter	-	0	0 / +	0	0	0	0	+ + +	- / 0	-	_	-	-	-	 -/-	0	-	-	-	+	0	0	- / 0	0	0	0	0	-	0		-	-	-	
8	Histor ical, archa eologi cal, cultur al	0	0	0	0	0 /-	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+ / 0	0	0 /-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-		0	-	-
1 0	Rene wable energ y resou rces	0	0/+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	Flood	0	C W Rural Centres M 0 + + + + -												0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	-

T	able 3.6	SA	of P	ack	age	Op	tion	3																											
	ite No. SHLAA)	SC298	239	312	258	178	313	311	308	133	112	114	9	260	3	128	231 part	206	155	322	117	171	63	152	235	130	320	331	45	326	83	143	85	78	Overall
h	o of omes 2031	100	1500	200						190		25	06	110	65	185			140		06			35	15	50	205		20	06	75	15	55		30
na	ite ame/ca gory	NI A B	c C			Cent		. .	· ·						nor F			ntres			<u> </u>	V	· ·	(7)	~	47	· ·		47	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	~	4,7	4,	4
1	ing, SUD S																																	/-	
1 4	Open space	+++++	+/++++	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	+
1 6	acces sibilit y to local servic es/ faciliti es	+ + +	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+
	Dista nce to centr e	+		 -		-				-	+	0				-		-	0	-	+ + +	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0		+ + +	+	+ + +	

Ta	able 3.6	SA	of P	ack	age	Op	tion	3																											
	te No. HLAA)	SC298	239	312	258	178	313	311	308	133	112	114	9	260	3	128	231 part	206	155	322	117	171	93	152	235	130	320	331	45	326	83	143	85	78	Overall
h	o of omes 2031	100		200						190		25	06	110	65	185			140		06			35	15	50	205	65	20	06	75	15	55	50	4930
	te ame/ca gory	NI A B 3	c c			Cent		. •	<u> </u>				<u> </u>			Rural		ntres			<u> </u>	V	· · ·	(-)		4,	· ·	<u> </u>	47	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	~	4,7	47	
	Qualit y & range of local servic es & faciliti es	0	+	0	+	+	0	0	0 /-	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+
1 7	Ability of peopl e to influe nce decisi ons	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1 8	Enga geme nt with	0	+	0	+ / 0	+ / 0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	+	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	+

T	able 3.6	SA	of P	ack	age	Ор	tion	3																											
	ite No. SHLAA)	SC298	239	312	258	178	313	311	308	133	112	114	5	260	3	128	231 part	206	155	322	117	171	93	152	235	130	320	331	45	326	83	143	85	78	Overall
h	lo of omes 2031	100	1500	200						190		25	06	110	65	185	930		140		06				15	50	205		20	06	75	15	55	50	4930
n	ite ame/ca egory	NI A B 3	C													Rural					, 0,					47			47				47	7	
	com munit y activit ies																																		
1 9	Busin ess devel opme nt & comp etitive ness	+	+/++++	- / 0	0	0	0	0	0 /-	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+
	Shop ping hierar chy	0	0/	0	0	0	0	0	0 /-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 0	Empl oyme nt oppor	++++	0	+	+	+	+	0	+ + +	+ + +	+ + +	+ + +	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+ + + +	+ + + +	+ + + +	+ + +	+	+	+	+ + +	+	+	+

Ta	able 3.6	SA	of P	ack	age	Op	tion	3																											
	te No. HLAA)	SC298	239	312	258	178	313	311	308	133	112	114	5	260	3	128	231 part	206	155	322	117	171	93	152	235	130	320	331	45	326	83	143	85	78	Overall
ho	o of omes 2031	100	1500	200	105	260	80	92	20	190	1	25	06	110	65	185			140		06	45	25	35	15	09	205	5 9	09	06	75	15	55	20	30
	te ame/ca gory	NI A B 3	C		ral (Rural		ntres								٦,				<u> </u>			7,		
	tunitie s in acces sible locati ons																																		
2	Invest ment in key com munit y servic es & infras tructu re	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+ + +/ +	+ + +/ +	+	0	+ + +/ +	+ + +/+	+ + +/+	+	+	+	+	+ + +/ +	+ + +/ +	+ + +/ +	+ + +/ +	+ + +	+	-	+	+	+	?
	Acce ss to educ ation	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	0 /-	-/- 	-/- 	-/- 	+	+	+	-	+ + +	+ + + +	+ + + +	+ + +	-	+	 - /-	-	-	-	-

T	able 3.6	SA	of P	ack	age	Op	tion	3																											
	ite No. SHLAA)	SC298	239	312	258	178	313	311	308	133	112	114	5	260	က	128	231 part	206	155	322	117	171	93	152	235	130	320	331	45	326	83	143	85	78	Overall
h	lo of omes 2031	100	1500	200						190		25	06	110		5			140		06		25	35	15	50	205	65	20		75		55		30
na	ite ame/ca egory	NI A B 3	C W		ıral (, ,			Rural		itres													•				
	& traini ng, & provis ion of skille d empl oyees																																		
2 2	Short er journ eys, impro ve moda I choic e & integration mode	+ + +	0	0	0	0	0	0	+ + +	+	+ + +	+ + +	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+ + +	+	+	+

Tab	le 3.6	SA	of P	ack	age	Op	tion	3																											
Site (SHI	No. LAA)	SC298	239	312	258	178	313	311	308	133	112	114	5	260	က	128	231 part	206	155	322	117	171	93	152	235	130	320	331	45	326	83	143	85	78	Overall
No hom to 2	nes	100	1500	200						190		25	06	110		2			140		90		25	35	15	50	205		50		75		55	09	30
Site nam tego	ne/ca	NI A B	C W		ral ('		, <u> </u>			Rural		ntres			, <u>0,</u>					47			47	, <u>()</u>			47	47	
S	3																																		
r te b s	Dista nce o ous stop / rail statio	+ + +	0	0	-	0	-	0	+ + +	+ + +	+ + +	+ + +	+ + +	+ + +	+	+	+	0	+	+ + +	+ + +	+ + +	+ + +	+ + +	+	+	0	+	+	+ + +	++++	+ + +	+ + +	+ + +	+
E C F C	requency of Publi Crans	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+ + +	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-				0	•	-	-	-	_	+	-	+			+
a	Гуріс al Publi	+ + + +	0	-	0	0	-	0	+ + +	+	+ + + +	+ + + +	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	+ + + +	+ + + +	+ + + +	+ + + +	0	+	+	+ + +	+ + +	+ + +	+

Table 3.6	SA	of P	ack	age	Op	tion	3																											
Site No. (SHLAA)	SC298	239	312	258	178	313	311	308	133	112	114	5	260	3	128	231 part	206	155	322	117	171	93	152	235	130	320	331	45	326	83	143	85	78	Overall
No of homes to 2031	100	1500	200	105	260	08	9	20	190		25	06	110	65	185			140		06	45	25	35	15	50	205	65	50		75	15	55	50	30
Site name/ca tegory	NI A B 3	C W		ral (Rural		itres																	
c Trans port Journ ey Time to City Centr e or Mark et Town																																		
Dista nce for cyclin g to City Centr e or Mark	+ + +	0	+	+	0	+	+	+ + + +	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+ + +	+ + +	+ + +	+	+	+	+	+ + +	+ + +	+ + +	+

Ta	able 3.6	SA	of P	ack	age	Op	tion	3																											
	te No. HLAA)	SC298	239	312	258	178	313	311	308	133	112	114	5	260	က	128	231 part	206	155	322	117	171	93	152	235	130	320	331	45	326	83	143	85	78	Overall
ho	o of omes 2031	100		200						190		25	06	110	65				140		06			35	15	50	205	65	50	06	75	15	55		30
	te ame/ca gory	NI A B 3	C W			Cent							, <u>0,</u>			Rural					, <u> </u>			(-7)		47			47		171		47	47	7
	et Town																																		
2 3	Safe acces s to the highw ay netwo rk	-	0/	0	0	0 /-	0	0	0	0	0	- / 0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	 - /-	0	0 /-	0	0	0	-
	Safer trans port netwo rk & prom ote use of non-motor	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	+ + + +	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/++++	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	+	0	0	+

Tab	le 3.6	SA	of P	acka	age	Opt	ion	3																											
Site (SHI	No. LAA)	SC298	239	312	258	178	313	311	308	133	112	114	5	260	3	128	231 part	206	155	322	117	171	93	152	235	130	320	331	45	326	83	143	85	78	Overall
No hom	nes	100	1500	200	105	260	80	65	20	190		72	06	110	9	185	086		140		06	45	25	35	15	20	205	9	20	06	75	15	55	20	4930
Site nam tego	ne/ca	NI A B	C W	Ru	ral C	Cent	res							Mir	or R	tural	Cen	tres																	
	sed node																																		

3.4 Package Option 4 Waterbeach New Town, Bourn Airfield New Settlement, and Cambourne West Focus

Table	3.7 Package	Option 4		
	Category	Location	SHLAA Site Number	Capacity
	Cambridge fringe sites	NIAB 3 Land Between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road Cambridge (I&O2 Site G6) (revised capacity and boundary)	SC298	100
	New	Waterbeach New Town (I&O1 Site 2 with amended boundary and capacity)	231	1,400
	settlement (s)	Bourn Airfield New Village (I&O1 Site 5)	238	1,700
		Cambourne West (I&O1 Site 17 as amended to smaller site boundary and capacity)	303 & 239	1,200
		Dales Manor Business Park, Sawston (I&O2 Site H5) (revised site capacity)	312	200
2-1-4	Rural	South of Babraham Road (revised capacity)	258 & 178	260
Opt 4	Centres	North of Babraham Road	313	80
		Former Bishops Hardware Store, Histon (I&O2 Site H2)	308	20
		Impington Lane, Impington	112&114	25
		36 New Road, Melbourn (I&O1 Site 30)	235	15
	Minor	Land rear of Victoria Way, Melbourn (I&O1 Site 31)	130	50
	Rural Centres	Land east of Rockmill End, Willingham (I&O1 Site 46)	45	50
		Green End Industrial Estate, Gamlingay (I&O1 Site 33)	117	90
		TOTAL		5,190

Tab	le 3.8 SA of Packa	ige 4														
	Site No. (SHLAA)	SC298	231	238	312	258&178	313	308	112	114	239 & 303	235	130	117	45	Overall
	No of homes to 2031	100	1400	1700	200	260	80	20	25		1200	15	50	90	50	5190
	Site name/category	NIAB3	WNT	ВА	Rural	Centres					cw	Minor R	ural Cen	tres		
	Previously developed land	0	+++	+	+++	0	0	+++	0	0	0	0	0	+++	0	+++
1	Agricultural land	-			0	-	-	0	-	-		-	-	0	-	
	Mineral reserves, soils	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
	Air quality	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
	Noise, light pollution, odour & vibration	0	0	-	+++	0	0	-	0	0	0/-	0	0	+++	-	-
3	Land contamination	+	+	+	+	0	+/0	+	+	+	0	0	+	+	+	+
	Water environment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	Nature conservation interest & geodiversity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Habitat fragmentation, native species, habitat restoration	+	+++	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	+/0	0	0	0	0	+

Tab	le 3.8 SA of Packa	ige 4														
	Site No. (SHLAA)	SC298	231	238	312	258&178	313	308	112	114	239 & 303	235	130	117	45	Overall
	No of homes to 2031	100	1400	1700	200	260	80	20	25		1200	15	50	90	50	5190
	Site name/category	NIAB3	WNT	ВА	Rural	Centres	1	1	1		cw	Minor R	Rural Cen	tres		
6	Access to wildlife & green spaces	0	+++	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+/+++	0	0	0	0	+
7	Landscape character	-	-	0	+	0/+	0/+	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-
/	Townscape character	-	0	0	0/+	0	0	+++	-	-	0	0	0	+	-	-
8	Historical, archaeological, cultural	0	-	0/-	0	0/-	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	+/0	0	-
10	Renewable energy resources	0	+++	+/+++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0/+	0	0	0	0	+
11	Flooding, SUDS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	Open space	+++	+++	+	0	+	0	0	+	+	+/+++	0	0	0	0	+++
	Accessibility to local services/ facilities	+++	+++/+	+	+	+	+	+++	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	+++/+
16	Distance to centre	+	0	0		-			+	0		-	-	+++	-	
	Quality & range of local services & facilities	0	+++	+++/+	0	+	0	0/-	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	+++

Tab	le 3.8 SA of Packa	ige 4														
	Site No. (SHLAA)	SC298	231	238	312	258&178	313	308	112	114	239 & 303	235	130	117	45	Overall
	No of homes to 2031	100	1400	1700	200	260	80	20	25		1200	15	50	90	50	5190
	Site name/category	NIAB3	WNT	ВА	Rural	Centres					cw	Minor R	Rural Cen	tres		
17	Ability of people to influence decisions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18	Engagement with community activities	0	+++	+++	0	+/0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	+++
19	Business development & competitiveness	+	+++	+++	-/0	0	0	0/-	0	0	+/+++	0	0	0	0	+++
	Shopping hierarchy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0/-	0	0	0/+	0	0	0	0	0
20	Employment opportunities in accessible locations	+++	0/+++	+/+++	+	+	+	+++	+++	+++	0	+++	+++	0	+	+
21	Investment in key community services & infrastructure	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+++/+	+++/+	+	+++	-
	Access to education & training, &	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+++	+++	+	-	-

Tab	le 3.8 SA of Packa	age 4														
	Site No. (SHLAA)	SC298	231	238	312	258&178	313	308	112	114	239 & 303	235	130	117	45	Overall
	No of homes to 2031	100	1400	1700	200	260	80	20	25		1200	15	50	90	50	5190
	Site name/category	NIAB3	WNT	ВА	Rural	Centres					cw	Minor R	Rural Cen	tres		
	provision of skilled employees															
	Shorter journeys, improve modal choice & integration modes	+++	+	0	0	0	0	+++	+++	+++	0	+	+	0	0	+
	Distance to bus stop / rail station	+++	0	0	0	0	-	+++	+++	+++	0	+	+	+++	+	+
	Frequency of Public Transport	+	+/?	+	+	+	+	+++	+	+	+	-	-		-	+
22	Typical Public Transport Journey Time to City Centre or Market Town	+++	+/?	0	-	0	-	+++	+++	+++	0	+++	+++	+	0	+
	Distance for cycling to City Centre or Market Town	+++	+	0	+	0	+	+++	+	+	0	+++	+++	+	+	+
23	Safe access to the highway	-		0/-	0	0/-	0	0	0	-/0	0/-	0	0	0	/-	

Tab	le 3.8 SA of Packa	ige 4														
	Site No. (SHLAA)	SC298	231	238	312	258&178	313	308	112	114	239 & 303	235	130	117	45	Overall
	No of homes to 2031	100	1400	1700	200	260	80	20	25		1200	15	50	90	50	5190
	Site name/category	NIAB3	WNT	ВА	Rural	Centres					cw	Minor R	ural Cen	tres		
	network															
	Safer transport network & promote use of non-motorised modes	+	+++	+++	+	0	0	+++	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	+++

3.5 Package Option 5 Waterbeach New Town, Bourn Airfield New Settlement and Village Focus

Table	3.9 Package	Option 5		
	Category	Location	SHLAA Site Number	Capacity
	Cambridge fringe sites	NIAB 3 Land Between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road Cambridge (I&O2 Site G6) (revised capacity and boundary)	SC298	100
	New	Waterbeach New Town (I&O1 Site 2 with amended boundary and capacity)	231	1,400
	settlement(s)	Bourn Airfield New Village (I&O1 Site 5)	238	2,300
		Dales Manor Business Park, Sawston (I&O2 Site H5) (revised site capacity)	312	200
		Land south of Babraham Road, Sawston (I&O1 Site 8)	258	105
Opt 5	Rural	Land east of Sawston (I&O1 Site 9)	178	260
OP! O	Centres	Land north of Babraham, Sawston (I&O2 Site H6)	313	80
		Former Bishops Hardware Store, Histon (I&O2 Site H2)	308	20
		Land at Rampton Road, Cottenham (SHLAA 128)	128	185
		Green End Industrial Estate, Gamlingay (I&O1 Site 33)	117	90
	Minor Rural Centres	36 New Road, Melbourn (I&O1 Site 30)	235	15
		Land rear of Victoria Way, Melbourn (I&O1 Site 31)	130	50
		TOTAL		4,805

Tab	le 3.10 SA of Package	Option 5												
PAC	KAGE 5													
	Site No. (SHLAA)	SC298	231	238	312	258	178	313	308	128	117	235	130	Overall
	No of homes to 2031	100	1400	2300	200	105	260	80	20	185	90	15	50	4805
	Site name/category	NIAB3	WNT	ВА	Rural	Centres	•	1	-1	Minor R	ural Cen	tres	•	
	Previously developed land	0	+++	+	+++	0	0	0	+++	0	+++	0	0	+
1	Agricultural land	-			0	-	-	-	0	-	0	-	-	
	Mineral reserves, soils	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
	Air quality	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0/-	0	0	0	-
3	Noise, light pollution, odour & vibration	0	0	-	+++	0	0	0	-	-	+++	0	0	-
	Land contamination	+	+	+	+	0	0	+/0	+	+	+	0	+	+
	Water environment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	Nature conservation interest & geodiversity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Habitat fragmentation, native species, habitat restoration	+	+++	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	+
6	Access to wildlife & green spaces	0	+++	+	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+
7	Landscape character	-	-	0	+	0/+	0/+	0/+	0	/-	0	0	0	-

Tab	le 3.10 SA of Package	Option 5												
PAC	KAGE 5													
	Site No. (SHLAA)	SC298	231	238	312	258	178	313	308	128	117	235	130	Overall
	No of homes to 2031	100	1400	2300	200	105	260	80	20	185	90	15	50	4805
	Site name/category	NIAB3	WNT	ВА	Rural (Centres	1	1	1	Minor R	ural Cen	tres	1	
	Townscape character	-	0	0	0/+	0	0	0	+++	/-	+	0	0	-
8	Historical, archaeological, cultural	0	-	0/-	0	0	0/-	0	0	0	+/0	0	0	-
10	Renewable energy resources	0	+++	+/+++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+
11	Flooding, SUDS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	Open space	+++	+++	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	+
	Accessibility to local services/ facilities	+++	+++/+	+	+	+	+	+	+++	0	0	0	0	+
16	Distance to centre	+	0	0			-			-	+++	-	-	-
	Quality & range of local services & facilities	0	+++	+++/+	0	+	+	0	0/-	+	0	0	0	+++
17	Ability of people to influence decisions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18	Engagement with community activities	0	+++	+++	0	+/0	+/0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+++

Tab	le 3.10 SA of Package	Option 5												
PAC	KAGE 5													
	Site No. (SHLAA)	SC298	231	238	312	258	178	313	308	128	117	235	130	Overall
	No of homes to 2031	100	1400	2300	200	105	260	80	20	185	90	15	50	4805
	Site name/category	NIAB3	WNT	ВА	Rural	Centres	•	1	-	Minor R	ural Cen	tres	1	
19	Business development & competitiveness	+	+++	+++	-/0	0	0	0	0/-	0	0	0	0	+++
	Shopping hierarchy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0/-	0	0	0	0	0
20	Employment opportunities in accessible locations	+++	0/+++	+/+++	+	+	+	+	+++	+	0	+++	+++	+
	Investment in key community services & infrastructure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+++/+	+++/+	-
21	Access to education & training, & provision of skilled employees	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+++	+++	-
	Shorter journeys, improve modal choice & integration modes	+++	+	0	0	0	0	0	+++	+	0	+	+	+
22	Distance to bus stop / rail station	+++	0	0	0	-	0	-	+++	+	+++	+	+	+
	Frequency of Public Transport	+	+/?	+	+	+	+	+	+++	+		-	-	+

Tab	le 3.10 SA of Package	Option 5												
PAC	KAGE 5													
	Site No. (SHLAA)	SC298	231	238	312	258	178	313	308	128	117	235	130	Overall
	No of homes to 2031	100	1400	2300	200	105	260	80	20	185	90	15	50	4805
	Site name/category	NIAB3	WNT	ВА	Rural (Centres	1	1	II.	Minor R	ural Cen	tres	ı	
	Typical Public Transport Journey Time to City Centre or Market Town	+++	+/?	0	-	0	0	-	+++	0	+	+++	+++	+
	Distance for cycling to City Centre or Market Town	+++	+	0	+	+	0	+	+++	+	+	+++	+++	+
23	Safe access to the highway network	-		0/-	0	0	0/-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
	Safer transport network & promote use of non-motorised modes	+	+++	+++	+	0	0	0	+++	+/+++	+	+	+	+++

3.6 Package Option 6 Cambridge Green Belt and Village Focus

	Category	Location	SHLAA Site Number	Capacity
	Cambridge	NIAB 3 Land Between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road Cambridge (I&O2 Site G6) (revised capacity and boundary)	SC298	100
	fringe sites	Large Green Belt sites		4,000
		Dales Manor Business Park, Sawston (I&O2 Site H5) (revised site capacity)	312	200
	Rural Centres	Former Bishops Hardware Store, Histon (I&O2 Site H2)	308	20
Opt 6		Land at Rampton Road, Cottenham (SHLAA 128)	128	185
		Green End Industrial Estate, Gamlingay (I&O1 Site 33)	117	90
	Minor Rural Centres	36 New Road, Melbourn (I&O1 Site 30)	235	15
		Land rear of Victoria Way, Melbourn (I&O1 Site 31)	130	50
		TOTAL		4,660

Table	3.11 SA of Package 6									
	Site No. (SHLAA)	SC298	GB4000	312	308	128	117	235	130	Overall
	No of homes to 2031	100	4000	200	20	185	90	15	50	4660
	Site name/category	NIAB3	GB	Rural Ce	entres	Minor Rura	l Centres			
	Previously developed land	0	0	+++	+++	0	+++	0	0	+
1	Agricultural land	-		0	0	-	0	-	-	
	Mineral reserves, soils	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Air quality	-		0	0	0/-	0	0	0	
3	Noise, light pollution, odour & vibration	0	0	+++	-	-	+++	0	0	+
	Land contamination	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+
	Water environment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	Nature conservation interest & geodiversity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Habitat fragmentation, native species, habitat restoration	+	0/+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+
6	Access to wildlife & green spaces	0	+++	0	0	+	0	0	0	+++
_	Landscape character	-		+	0	/-	0	0	0	
7	Townscape character	-		0/+	+++	/-	+	0	0	

Table	e 3.11 SA of Package 6									
	Site No. (SHLAA)	SC298	GB4000	312	308	128	117	235	130	Overall
	No of homes to 2031	100	4000	200	20	185	90	15	50	4660
	Site name/category	NIAB3	GB	Rural (Centres	Minor R	ural Centres	6	•	
8	Historical, archaeological, cultural	0	0/-	0	0	0	+/0	0	0	0
10	Renewable energy resources	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	Flooding, SUDS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	Open space	+++	+++/?	0	0	+	0	0	0	+++/?
	Accessibility to local services/ facilities	+++	+++	+	+++	0	0	0	0	+++
16	Distance to centre	+	0/+			-	+++	-	-	?
	Quality & range of local services & facilities	0	+++	0	0/-	+	0	0	0	+++
17	Ability of people to influence decisions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18	Engagement with community activities	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	+
19	Business development & competitiveness	+	+/?	-/0	0/-	0	0	0	0	+/?
	Shopping hierarchy	0	0	0	0/-	0	0	0	0	0

Table	3.11 SA of Package 6									
	Site No. (SHLAA)	SC298	GB4000	312	308	128	117	235	130	Overall
	No of homes to 2031	100	4000	200	20	185	90	15	50	4660
	Site name/category	NIAB3	GB	Rural Ce	entres	Minor Rura	l Centres			
20	Employment opportunities in accessible locations	+++	+++	+	+++	+	0	+++	+++	+++
	Investment in key community services & infrastructure	-	-	-	+	+	+	+++/+	+++/+	-
21	Access to education & training, & provision of skilled employees	+	-	-	+	-	+	+++	+++	-
	Shorter journeys, improve modal choice & integration modes	+++	+++	0	+++	+	0	+	+	+++
	Distance to bus stop / rail station	+++	+/+++	0	+++	+	+++	+	+	+
22	Frequency of Public Transport	+	+/+++	+	+++	+		-	-	+
	Typical Public Transport Journey Time to City Centre or Market Town	+++	+/+++	-	+++	0	+	+++	+++	+
	Distance for cycling to City Centre or Market Town	+++	+++	+	+++	+	+	+++	+++	+++

Table	3.11 SA of Package 6									
	Site No. (SHLAA)	SC298	GB4000	312	308	128	117	235	130	Overall
	No of homes to 2031	100	4000	200	20	185	90	15	50	4660
	Site name/category	NIAB3	GB	Rural Ce	ntres	Minor Rura	l Centres			
23	Safe access to the highway network	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
	Safer transport network & promote use of non-motorised modes	+	+++/?	+	+++	+/+++	+	+	+	+++/?

3.7 Package Option 7 Cambridge Green Belt, Waterbeach New Town, Cambourne West and Village Focus

Table 3.12 Package Option 7									
	Category	Location	SHLAA Site Number	Capacity					
	Cambridge	NIAB 3 Land Between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road Cambridge (I&O2 Site G6) (revised capacity and boundary)	SC298	100					
	fringe sites	Large Green Belt sites		2,000					
Opt 7	New settlement(s)	Waterbeach New Town (I&O1 Site 2 with amended boundary and capacity)	231	1,400					
	Rural	Cambourne West (I&O1 Site 17 as amended to smaller site boundary and capacity)	303 & 239	1,200					
	Centres	Dales Manor Business Park, Sawston (I&O2 Site H5) (revised site capacity)	312	200					
		TOTAL		4,900					

Table	3.13 SA of Package Option 7						
	Site No. (SHLAA)	SC298	GB2000	231	239	312	Overall
	No of homes to 2031	100	2000	1400	1500	200	4900
	Site name/category	NIAB3	GB	WNT	cw	Rural Centres	
	Previously developed land	0	0	+++	0	+++	+
1	Agricultural land	-				0	
	Mineral reserves, soils	0	0	-	0	0	-
	Air quality	-	/-	-	0	0	-
3	Noise, light pollution, odour & vibration	0	0	0	0/-	+++	+
	Land contamination	+	+	+	0	+	+
	Water environment	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	Nature conservation interest & geodiversity	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Habitat fragmentation, native species, habitat restoration	+	0/+	+++	+/0	0	+
6	Access to wildlife & green spaces	0	+++	+++	+/+++	0	+++
_	Landscape character	-		-	0	+	
7	Townscape character	-		0	0	0/+	

Table	3.13 SA of Package Option 7						
	Site No. (SHLAA)	SC298	GB2000	231	239	312	Overall
	No of homes to 2031	100	2000	1400	1500	200	4900
	Site name/category	NIAB3	GB	WNT	CW	Rural Centres	
8	Historical, archaeological, cultural	0	0/-	-	0	0	-
10	Renewable energy resources	0	0	+++	0/+	0	+
11	Flooding, SUDS	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	Open space	+++	+++/?	+++	+/+++	0	+
	Accessibility to local services/ facilities	+++	+++	+++/+	+	+	+++
16	Distance to centre	+	0/+	0			-
	Quality & range of local services & facilities	0	+++	+++	+	0	+++
17	Ability of people to influence decisions	0	0	0	0	0	0
18	Engagement with community activities	0	+	+++	+	0	+
19	Business development & competitiveness	+	+/?	+++	+/+++	-/0	+/?
	Shopping hierarchy	0	0	0	0/+	0	0

Table	3.13 SA of Package Option 7						
	Site No. (SHLAA)	SC298	GB2000	231	239	312	Overall
	No of homes to 2031	100	2000	1400	1500	200	4900
	Site name/category	NIAB3	GB	WNT	cw	Rural Centres	
20	Employment opportunities in accessible locations	+++	+++	0/+++	0	+	+
	Investment in key community services & infrastructure	-	-	-	-	-	-
21	Access to education & training, & provision of skilled employees	+	-	-	-	-	-
	Shorter journeys, improve modal choice & integration modes	+++	+++	+	0	0	+
	Distance to bus stop / rail station	+++	+/+++	0	0	0	+
22	Frequency of Public Transport	+	+/+++	+/?	+	+	+
	Typical Public Transport Journey Time to City Centre or Market Town	+++	+/+++	+/?	0	-	+
	Distance for cycling to City Centre or Market Town	+++	+++	+	0	+	+
23	Safe access to the highway network	-	-		0/-	0	-

Table 3	3.13 SA of Package Option 7						
	Site No. (SHLAA)	SC298	GB2000	231	239	312	Overall
	No of homes to 2031	100	2000	1400	1500	200	4900
	Site name/category	NIAB3	GB	WNT	CW	Rural Centres	
	Safer transport network & promote use of non-motorised modes	+	+++/?	+++	+	+	+++

3.8 Package Option 8 Cambridge Green Belt, Waterbeach New Town, Bourn Airfield New Settlement, Cambourne West and Village Focus

Table	3.14 Package	e Option 8		
	Category	Location	SHLAA Site Number	Capacity
	Cambridge	NIAB 3 Land Between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road Cambridge (I&O2 Site G6) (revised capacity and boundary)	SC298	100
	fringe sites	Large Green Belt sites		1,000
	New settlement(s)	Bourn Airfield New Village (I&O1 Site 5)	238	1,900
		Cambourne West (I&O1 Site 17 as amended to smaller site boundary and capacity)	303 & 239	1,200
		Dales Manor Business Park, Sawston (I&O2 Site H5) (revised site capacity)	238 and 303 & 239	200
Opt 8	Rural Centres	Former Bishops Hardware Store, Histon (I&O2 Site H2)	308	20
	Centres	Land at Rampton Road, Cottenham (SHLAA 128)	128	185
		Land at Oakington Road, Cottenham (I&O1 Site 22)	260	110
		The Redlands, Oakington Road, Cottenham (I&O1 Site 23)	3	65
		Green End Industrial Estate, Gamlingay (I&O1 Site 33)	117	90
	Minor Rural Centres	36 New Road, Melbourn (I&O1 Site 30)	235	15
		Land rear of Victoria Way, Melbourn (I&O1 Site 31)	130	50
		TOTAL		4,935

Tab	le 3.15 SA of Packaç	ge Option	8											
PAC	CKAGE 8													
	Site No. (SHLAA)	SC298	GB1000	238	239	312	308	128	260	3	117	235	130	Overall
	No of homes to 2031	100	1000	1900	1200	200	20	185	110	65	90	15	50	4935
	Site name/category	NIAB3	GB	ВА	cw	Rural (Centres	Minor R	ural Cent	tres				
	Previously developed land	0	0	+	0	+++	+++	0	0	0	+++	0	0	+
1	Agricultural land	-				0	0	-	-	-	0	-	-	
	Mineral reserves, soils	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Air quality	-	-	-	0	0	0	0/-	0	0	0	0	0	-
3	Noise, light pollution, odour & vibration	0	0	-	0/-	+++	-	-	-	-	+++	0	0	-
	Land contamination	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+
	Water environment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	Nature conservation interest & geodiversity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Habitat fragmentation, native species, habitat restoration	+	0/+	0	+/0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+
6	Access to wildlife & green spaces	0	+/+++	+	+/+++	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	+

Tab	le 3.15 SA of Packaç	ge Option	8											
PAC	CKAGE 8													
	Site No. (SHLAA)	SC298	GB1000	238	239	312	308	128	260	3	117	235	130	Overall
	No of homes to 2031	100	1000	1900	1200	200	20	185	110	65	90	15	50	4935
	Site name/category	NIAB3	GB	ВА	cw	Rural (Centres	Minor R	ural Cent	res				
	Landscape character	-		0	0	+	0	/-	-	0	0	0	0	
7	Townscape character	-		0	0	0/+	+++	/-	-	-	+	0	0	
8	Historical, archaeological, cultural	0	0/-	0/-	0	0	0	0	0	0	+/0	0	0	0
10	Renewable energy resources	0	0	+/+++	0/+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+
11	Flooding, SUDS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	Open space	+++	+++/?	+	+/+++	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	+
	Accessibility to local services/ facilities	+++	+++	+	+	+	+++	0	0	0	0	0	0	+
16	Distance to centre	+	0/-	0				-			+++	-	-	-
	Quality & range of local services & facilities	0	+/+++	+++/+	+	0	0/-	+	0	0	0	0	0	+
17	Ability of people to influence decisions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Tab	le 3.15 SA of Packaç	ge Option	8											
PAC	CKAGE 8													
	Site No. (SHLAA)	SC298	GB1000	238	239	312	308	128	260	3	117	235	130	Overall
	No of homes to 2031	100	1000	1900	1200	200	20	185	110	65	90	15	50	4935
	Site name/category	NIAB3	GB	ВА	cw	Rural (Centres	Minor R	ural Cent	res				
18	Engagement with community activities	0	+	+++	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	+
19	Business development & competitiveness	+	?	+++	+/+++	-/0	0/-	0	0	0	0	0	0	+/?
	Shopping hierarchy	0	0	0	0/+	0	0/-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20	Employment opportunities in accessible locations	+++	+++	+/+++	0	+	+++	+	+	+	0	+++	+++	+
	Investment in key community services & infrastructure	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+++/+	+++/+	+	+++/+	+++/+	-
21	Access to education & training, & provision of skilled employees	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+++	+++	-
22	Shorter journeys, improve modal choice & integration modes	+++	+++	0	0	0	+++	+	+	+	0	+	+	+
	Distance to bus stop	+++	+/+++	0	0	0	+++	+	+++	+	+++	+	+	+

Tab	le 3.15 SA of Packaç	ge Option	8											
PAC	CKAGE 8													
	Site No. (SHLAA)	SC298	GB1000	238	239	312	308	128	260	3	117	235	130	Overall
	No of homes to 2031	100	1000	1900	1200	200	20	185	110	65	90	15	50	4935
	Site name/category	NIAB3	GB	ВА	CW	Rural (Centres	Minor R	ural Cent	res	•	1	1	
	/ rail station													
	Frequency of Public Transport	+	+/+++	+	+	+	+++	+	+	+		-	-	+
	Typical Public Transport Journey Time to City Centre or Market Town	+++	+/+++	0	0	-	+++	0	0	0	+	+++	+++	+
	Distance for cycling to City Centre or Market Town	+++	+++	0	0	+	+++	+	+	+	+	+++	+++	+
	Safe access to the highway network	-	-	0/-	0/-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
23	Safer transport network & promote use of non- motorised modes	+	+/?	+++	+	+	+++	+/+++	+	+	+	+	+	+++

Package Option 9 (preferred option)

	Category	Location	SHLAA Site Number	Capacity
	Cambridge fringe sites	NIAB 3 Land Between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road Cambridge (I&O2 Site G6) (revised capacity and boundary)	SC298	100
	New	Waterbeach New Town (I&O1 Site 2 with amended boundary and capacity)	238	1,400
	settlement(s)	Bourn Airfield New Village (I&O1 Site 5)	238	1,700
		Cambourne West (I&O1 Site 17 as amended to smaller site boundary and capacity)	239	1,200
	Rural	Dales Manor Business Park, Sawston (I&O2 Site H5) (revised site capacity)	312	200
	Centres	South of Babraham Road (revised capacity)	178&258	260
pt 9		North of Babraham Road (revised capacity)	313	80
		Impington Lane, Impington	112&114	25
		36 New Road, Melbourn (I&O1 Site 30)	235	15
		Land rear of Victoria Way, Melbourn (I&O1 Site 31)	130	50
	Minor Rural Centres	Land east of Rockmill End, Willingham (I&O1 Site 46)	45	50
		Bennell Farm, Comberton (I&O2 H10) (revised capacity)	326	90
		Green End Industrial Estate, Gamlingay (I&O1 Site 33)	117	90
		TOTAL		5,260

Tab	le 3.17 SA of Packa	ge Optio	n 9 (prefe	rred opti	on)										
	Site No. (SHLAA)	SC298	231	238	312	178 &258	313	112 & 114	239	235	130	117	326	45	Overall
	No of homes to 2031	100	1400	1700	200	260	80	25	1200	15	50	90	90	50	5260
	Site name/category	NIAB3	WNT	ВА	Rural	Centres			cw	Minor R	ural Centi	res			
	Previously developed land	0	+++	+	+++	0	0	0	0	0	0	+++	0	0	+++
1	Agricultural land	-			0	-	-	-		-	-	0	-	-	
	Mineral reserves, soils	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
	Air quality	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
3	Noise, light pollution, odour & vibration	0	0	-	+++	0	0	0	0/-	0	0	+++	0	-	-
	Land contamination	+	+	+	+	0	+/0	+	0	0	+	+	0	+	+
	Water environment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	Nature conservation interest & geodiversity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Habitat fragmentation, native species, habitat restoration	+	+++	0	0	+	+	0	+/0	0	0	0	0	0	+

Tab	le 3.17 SA of Packa	ge Optio	n 9 (prefe	rred opti	on)										
	Site No. (SHLAA)	SC298	231	238	312	178 &258	313	112 & 114	239	235	130	117	326	45	Overall
	No of homes to 2031	100	1400	1700	200	260	80	25	1200	15	50	90	90	50	5260
	Site name/category	NIAB3	WNT	ВА	Rural	Centres			cw	Minor R	ural Centi	res	•		
6	Access to wildlife & green spaces	0	+++	+	0	0	0	0	+/+++	0	0	0	0	0	+
7	Landscape character	-	-	0	+	0/+	0/+	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	-
/	Townscape character	-	0	0	0/+	0	0	-	0	0	0	+	0	-	-
8	Historical, archaeological, cultural	0	-	0/-	0	0/-	0	-	0	0	0	+/0	0	0	-
10	Renewable energy resources	0	+++	+/+++	0	0	0	0	0/+	0	0	0	0	0	+
11	Flooding, SUDS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	Open space	+++	+++	+	0	+	0	+	+/+++	0	0	0	+	0	+++
	Accessibility to local services/ facilities	+++	+++/+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	+++/+
16	Distance to centre	+	0	0		-		+		-	-	+++	0	-	
	Quality & range of local services &	0	+++	+++/+	0	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	+++

Tab	le 3.17 SA of Packa	ge Optio	n 9 (prefe	rred opti	on)										
	Site No. (SHLAA)	SC298	231	238	312	178 &258	313	112 & 114	239	235	130	117	326	45	Overall
	No of homes to 2031	100	1400	1700	200	260	80	25	1200	15	50	90	90	50	5260
	Site name/category	NIAB3	WNT	ВА	Rural	Centres			cw	Minor R	ural Centi	res			
	facilities														
17	Ability of people to influence decisions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18	Engagement with community activities	0	+++	+++	0	+/0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	+++
19	Business development & competitiveness	+	+++	+++	-/0	0	0	0	+/+++	0	0	0	0	0	+++
	Shopping hierarchy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0/+	0	0	0	0	0	0
20	Employment opportunities in accessible locations	+++	0/+++	+/+++	+	+	+	+++	0	+++	+++	0	+	+	+
21	Investment in key community services & infrastructure	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+++/+	+++/+	+	+	+++	-

Tab	le 3.17 SA of Packa	ge Optio	n 9 (prefe	rred opti	on)										
	Site No. (SHLAA)	SC298	231	238	312	178 &258	313	112 & 114	239	235	130	117	326	45	Overall
	No of homes to 2031	100	1400	1700	200	260	80	25	1200	15	50	90	90	50	5260
	Site name/category	NIAB3	WNT	ВА	Rural	Centres			cw	Minor R	ural Centr	es			
	Access to education & training, & provision of skilled employees	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+++	+++	+	+	-	-
	Shorter journeys, improve modal choice & integration modes	+++	+	0	0	0	0	+++	0	+	+	0	+	0	+
	Distance to bus stop / rail station	+++	0	0	0	0	-	+++	0	+	+	+++	+++	+	+
22	Frequency of Public Transport	+	+/?	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-		+	-	+
	Typical Public Transport Journey Time to City Centre or Market Town	+++	+/?	0	-	0	-	+++	0	+++	+++	+	+	0	+
	Distance for cycling to City Centre or Market Town	+++	+	0	+	0	+	+	0	+++	+++	+	+	+	+
23	Safe access to the	-		0/-	0	0/-	0	0	0/-	0	0	0	0	/-	

Site No. (SHLAA)	SC298	231	238	312	178 &258	313	112 & 114	239	235	45	Overal			
No of homes to 2031	100	1400	1700	200	260	80	25	1200	15	50	90	90	50	5260
Site name/category	NIAB3	WNT	ВА	Rural Centres				cw	Minor Rural Centres					
highway network														
Safer transport network & promote use of non- motorised modes	+	+++	+++	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	+++

Cumulative sustainability performance of packages

This table presents the cumulative performance for each packages against the SA Objectives and sub-objectives.

Table 3.18 Summary of the cumulative performance of packages										
	Package No.									
SA Sub-objective question	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
Will it use land that has been previously developed?	+++	+	+	+++	+	+	+	+	+++	
Will it protect and enhance the best and most versatile agricultural land?			-							
Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves? Will it minimise the degradation / loss of soils due to new development'?	-	0	0	-	-	0	-	0	-	
Will it maintain or improve air quality?	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	
Minimise, and where possible improve on, unacceptable levels of noise, light pollution, odour and vibration?	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	
Will it minimise, and where possible address, land contamination?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation interest and geodiversity?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Will it reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan Targets)?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Will it improve access to wildlife and green spaces, through delivery and access to green infrastructure?	+	+	+	+	+	+++	+++	+	+	
Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character?		-		-	-				-	
Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character?	-	-		-	-				-	

Table 3.18 Summary of the cumulative performance of packages									
	Package No.								
SA Sub-objective question	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Will it protect or enhance sites, features or areas of historical, archaeological, or cultural interest (including conservation areas, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens and scheduled monuments)?	-	0	-	-	-	0	-	0	-
Will it support the use of renewable energy resources?	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	+
Will it minimise risk to people and property from flooding, and incorporate sustainable drainage measures?	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0
Will it increase the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space?	+++	+	+	+++	+	+++/?	+	+	+++
Will it improve accessibility to key local services and facilities, including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs, sports facilities etc?)	+++/+	+	+	+++/+	+	+++	+++	+	+++/+
Sub-Indicator: Distance to centre		-			-	?	-	-	
Will it improve quality and range of key local services and facilities including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs etc?)	+++	+++	+	+++	+++	+++	+++	+	+++
Will it increase the ability of people to influence decisions, including 'hard to reach' groups?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Will it encourage engagement with community activities?	+++	+++	+	+++	+++	+	+	+	+++
Will it support business development and enhance competitiveness, enabling provision of high-quality employment land in appropriate locations to meet the needs of businesses, and the workforce?	+++	+++	+	+++	+++	+/?	+/?	+/?	+++
Will it protect the shopping hierarchy, supporting the vitality and viability of Cambridge, town, district and local centres?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Will it contribute to providing a range of employment opportunities, in accessible locations?	+	+	+	+	+	+++	+	+	+

Table 3.18 Summary of the cumulative performance of packages										
	Package No.									
SA Sub-objective question	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
Will it improve the level of investment in key community services and infrastructure, including broadband?	-	-	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Will it improve access to education and training, and support provision of skilled employees to the economy?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Will it enable shorter journeys, improve modal choice and integration of transport modes to encourage or facilitate the use of modes such as walking, cycling and public transport?	+	+	+	+	+	+++	+	+	+	
Sub-indicator: Distance to bus stop / rail station	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Sub-indicator: Frequency of Public Transport	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Sub-indicator: Typical Public Transport Journey Time to Cambridge City Centre or Market Town	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Sub-indicator: Distance for cycling to City Centre or Market Town	+	+	+	+	+	+++	+	+	+	
Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity?		-	-		-	-	-	-		
Will it make the transport network safer for and promote use of non-motorised modes?	+++	+++	+	+++	+++	+++/?	+++	+++	+++	

3.9 Comparative Performance of Packages against each SA Objectives SA Objective 1

Will it use land that is previously developed?

There is a limited supply of previously developed land available for development in the district, and this was reflected in the options identified through the plan making process. Therefore, all packages perform positively against this sub-objective because areas within each of the packages perform either neutrally, or have minor positive impacts, leading to a positive cumulative performance. The only packages which could utilise significant areas of previously developed land include either or both of two new settlement options, at Waterbeach and Bourn Airfield. In particular the Waterbeach new town option would involve the redevelopment of the large barracks site. There are options at the village level that would utilise previously developed land, particularly at Sawston and Gamlingay. As a result, packages 1, 4 and 9 offer potentially significant beneficial impacts. This largely stems from the relative reliance in these packages on Waterbeach New Town which scores highly on this sub-objective to deliver a large proportion of their housing allocations. The other packages which include this site are less reliant on it in terms of overall housing provision and include other sites with less positive performance.

Will it protect and enhance the best and most versatile agricultural land?

The scale of development needed in the district means that impact on this objective will be significant, with unavoidable loss of high grade agricultural land. All packages therefore perform poorly in relation to this sub-objective.

The major development site options are all identified as having significant negative impact on the objective, as they would involve large areas of high grade agricultural land. Some smaller villages were identified avoiding the high grade agricultural land, but they would not be sufficient to deliver the total.

Whilst the impact of a number of village sites was indicated as only minor due to their smaller scale, cumulatively packages involving a number of these sites would impacts would still be significant. Package 3 performs slightly better overall because a significant proportion of housing provision, around 34%, in this package comes from rural centres and several minor rural centre sites which have a neutral impact on the best and most versatile agricultural and from the redevelopment of the barracks at Waterbeach, However, the cumulative impact of this package of sites on agricultural land should still be noted, even if it is marginally less significantly adverse than the other packages.

Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves? Will it minimise the degradation / loss of soils due to new development'?

Mineral reserves are identified on the proposals map of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework. Of particular prevalence in the area are reserves of sand and gravel. The most significant site within areas identified is the Waterbeach New Town, therefore packages 1, 4, 5 and 7 conflict with this sub-objective. The other packages have no impact on this sub-objective or the effects are considered to be neutral.

SA Objective 2

This objective was scoped out of the assessment as it is not a location specific issue.

SA Objective 3

Will it maintain or improve air quality?

Growth on the scale envisaged will inherently generate traffic movements, thereby having a negative impact on air pollution regardless of location of new development.

New settlements options identified are located in areas of good air quality, but an increase in traffic and static emissions could potentially affect local air quality.

The individual assessments of large scale development sites needed to deliver this volume of development were identified as having significant negative impacts on air quality. Package 6 could have potentially significant adverse impacts because it incorporates large scale development on the edge of Cambridge (4,000 homes). In addition, sites in locations near to the A14 or the M11 would be near to areas of poor air quality, including the identified Air Quality Management Area.

This objective is intrinsically linked with the transport objectives particularly objective 22 on sustainable travel. Therefore, when considering the impacts on air quality from development of a given package, consideration also needs to be given to the performance of the package against objective 22, positive performance against which can mitigate for potential air quality impacts identified under this objective.

Minimise, and where possible improve on, unacceptable levels of noise, light pollution, odour and vibration?

It is generally possible to avoid light pollution through sensitive lighting design, in all but the darkest of landscapes.

The initial assessment of the Bourn Airfield new settlement site highlighted a potential conflict with the adjoining industrial area. This had historically resulted in noise complaints from nearby residential areas. This site was proposed in representations for redevelopment for employment uses which are more compatible with residential development, and subject to consultation through Issues and Options 2. The issue is therefore now capable of appropriate mitigation and the site's performance against this objective has therefore improved. This is case for packages 2, 4, 5 8and9.

The development packages avoid significant cumulative negative performance overall, but nonetheless there are potential minor adverse impacts. A small number of village sites offered specific opportunities to address issues, such as redevelopment of industrial areas in residential areas.

On the edge of Cambridge, package 6 has the potential to bring development closer to the M11 and A14 and therefore people closer to potential noise pollution. The individual site assessments within the package highlight these issues, but also indicate that impacts are likely to be capable of mitigation and consequently this package performs positively overall.

Package 7 has the potential for a minor positive performance for this objective, because the majority of its sites are considered to have neutral impact on achieving this objective and one has the potential for a major positive performance.

Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment?

All packages have a neutral performance for this objective. Parts of the south east of South Cambridgeshire are identified as groundwater protection zones, associated with the underlying chalk. The majority of development within the packages would avoid these areas.

Some site options around villages in these areas, like Sawston would fall within groundwater protection zones, but appropriate mitigation measures could be included to protect water quality.

SA Objective 4

Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation interest and geodiversity?

All sites are outside protected areas and it has been assumed that mitigation measures could be implemented appropriately for all options, as would be required by law and planning policy.

SA Objective 5

Will it reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan Targets)?

None of the sites included in any of the packages is considered to be in conflict with this subobjective. All packages are considered to have a cumulative positive performance since they all include sites where there are opportunities for positive enhancements to be secured through development.

Major development options identified include opportunities for habitat linkage/enhancement/restoration, and the creation of new Green Infrastructure which would provide net benefits. Waterbeach New Town (included in packages 1, 4, 5, 7 and 9), offers potentially significant beneficial impacts through habitat creation in the north of the site, as part of mitigation measures required to preserve the setting of Denny Abbey. Packages including this site therefore perform well for this sub-objective. Although village sites may offer fewer opportunities for enhancement in terms of overall net gains, the significance of their contribution to ecological coherence of strategic habitat networks is highly dependent upon their location and the type of habitat they could provide.

SA Objective 6

Will it improve access to wildlife and green spaces, through delivery and access to green infrastructure?

The greatest potential to directly deliver new green infrastructure is with major development sites. Larger sites on the edge of Cambridge have potential to include green infrastructure, as do new settlements. Smaller village sites generally offer less potential, although they may still contribute financially to improving green space provision and access through Section 106 agreements or the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), they are less likely to be able to secure increases in provision levels directly.

SA Objective 7

Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character?

All packages include some sites which conflict with the protection of landscape character, and therefore negative performances have been recorded.

Packages involving development on the edge of Cambridge are likely to have a significant negative impact on the landscape Character objective. The review of the Green Belt identified that it would not be possible to deliver significant additional development on the edge of Cambridge without significant detriment to the specific purposes of the Cambridge

Green Belt. These purposes highlight the importance to the historic City of Cambridge of the quality of its setting as well as the usual role of Green Belts in preventing communities from merging with one another.

The scale of the new settlement options mean that they will also impact on this objective, but they are likely to offer greater potential for mitigation, and are located in areas of lower landscape sensitivity. The setting of Denny Abbey is a particular issue for the Waterbeach new town option, and mitigation will be required to maintain its setting.

Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character?

All packages include some sites which conflict with the protection of townscape character, and therefore negative performances have been recorded. Packages which include significant green belt release on the edge of Cambridge (6, 7 and 8) would have significant negative impacts on this objective. The rational for this being that the Green Belt setting of Cambridge is identified as being particularly important to the historic character and setting of the City. The townscape impact of the new settlement options is identified as being less significant as they lie outside the Green Belt, away from Cambridge.

SA Objective 8

Will it protect or enhance sites, features or areas of historical, archaeological, or cultural interest including conservation areas, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens and scheduled monuments)?

Only packages 2, 6 and 8 have a neutral performance for this objective. A number of sites included in the packages have been assessed as being in conflict with this objective. This includes Waterbeach New Town (included in packages 1, 4, 5 and 7), where the key issue is the impact on Denny Abbey. Mitigation measures could be implemented, but there would be likely minor negative residual impacts.

The Green Belt Study 2012 highlights the importance of the Green Belt as part of the setting for the historic City of Cambridge. Packages involving development on the edge of Cambridge could negatively impact on this setting.

SA Objective 9

This objective has been scoped out of this assessment as it is not location specific. All developments will be required to be built to a high standard of design and create good spaces through the plan's policy requirements.

SA Objective 10

Will it support the use of renewable energy resources?

Large developments present potential opportunities for district heating/combined heat and power. New settlements, with a large scale, mixed uses and potentially higher density centres may offer the greatest opportunities. This accounts for the positive performance for most packages in relation to this sub-objective. Large scale development sites on the edge of Cambridge could offer opportunities, but they are not as large as the eventual scale of the potential new settlements, hence package 6 has a neutral performance for this sub-objective. However, the potential for such low carbon energy developments is dependent on factors which are highly site-specific, which means that some caution should be applied in interpreting these performances. The focus of package 3 on smaller scale village development means that this package is the least likely to offer opportunities for district

heating or combined heat and power, meaning that this package is unlikely to positively support this sub-objective and is more likely to have a neutral effect.

Two SA sub-objectives have been scoped out, because all new development will be required to promote energy efficiency, and minimise contributions to climate change through sustainable construction practices. This will be ensured by adherence with building regulations and through policies within the plan.

SA Objective 11

Will it minimise risk to people and property from flooding, and incorporate sustainable drainage measures?

All of the packages are seen to be neutral in relation to this sub-objective apart from package 3, which includes a site which is partially in flood zones 2 and 3.

The SA sub-objective regarding sustainable water use has been scoped out as this development design rather than development location specific and all development will have to be implemented to enable and encourage high levels of water efficiency.

SA Objectives 12 and 13

These two objectives have been scoped out because they relate predominantly to design specific issues rather than locational issues.

SA Objective 14

Will it increase the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space?

No sites within any of the packages have a negative performance for this objective and all packages perform positively for the provision of public open space. General planning policies require provision of open space to meet the needs generated through new development.

Package 3 because of its dispersed approach to development around villages, may give rise to fewer opportunities to deliver more than the minimum open space requirements, and such infrastructure investment will inherently be more dispersed, but in doing so it could achieve a wider spatial distribution of new provision. Specific opportunities will depend on how the developments evolve.

Waterbeach New Town (included in packages 1, 4, 5, 7 and 9), offers potentially significant beneficial impacts because of the new open space which would be provided as part of this development.

SA Objective 15

All the housing sub-objectives have been scoped out of this assessment because they relate primarily to the type and mix of provision which will be controlled though the plan policies are therefore not specific to location of development.

All of the sites were generally assumed to be neutral in relation to the sub-objective for provision of accommodation for gypsies, travellers and travelling show people, because the plan is proposing no specific site allocations.

SA Objective 16

This objective has been scoped out because all developments will be expected to improve social relations.

SA Objective 17

Will it improve accessibility to key local services and facilities, including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs, sports facilities etc?)

Packages 6 and 7, which include the most significant levels of development on the edge of Cambridge, offer potentially the most significant positive performance in relation to this sub-objective because of the proximity of development to the higher order services and facilities available within Cambridge. Development of a new town would include its own town centre and facilities, although in the case of Waterbeach much of this would be delivered beyond the plan period, and so the short and medium term performance for this sub-objective would be less positive than in the longer term.

Other packages include development at the Rural Centre / Minor Rural Centre level, ensuring that new housing would be accessible to local services and facilities. Package 3, which has the most village focus, incorporates the most sites with a negative score against this sub-objective but, on balance, even this package scores positively overall. Because none of the packages include housing provision on new sites beyond the better served group villages, none of the packages is in conflict with this sub-objective overall.

Distance to local centres is one measure of accessibility, and this varies by individual site. Significant major developments would be likely to incorporate new local centres, thereby ensuring services and facilities are accessible to the new population. Smaller developments are more likely to be reliant on existing centres.

Most village level options are located on the edges of villages, meaning that in some cases site score relatively poorly against the objective. In the case of package 7 and 8, which would include some development on the edge of Cambridge, smaller urban extensions may not include new local centres, and site specific appraisals indicated that some sites were a significant distance from existing local centres.

Packages 1, 3, 4 and 9 incorporate a relatively high level of housing provision in villages so are in conflict with this sub-objective and may result in potentially significant adverse impacts as many village sites are at some distance from existing village centres. They also rely on development in Cambourne west, which generally performs poorly against distance to centre, although it does adjoin a new secondary school so its performance for education access is good. There is also a small supermarket nearby in Lower Cambourne. In particular, package 4 and 9 relies on it to deliver over a quarter of its housing provision. The overall performance of Cambourne west depends upon whether it is likely to deliver a local centre, and therefore provision of a local centre should be an integral part of the development delivery.

In contrast, the other packages have a greater reliance on new settlements and/or major development sites and generally these perform better because it is assumed that they would be able to deliver new local centres through masterplanning of these sites. Overall, however, these packages are still in conflict with this sub-objective.

Will it improve quality and range of key local services and facilities including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs etc?)

The assessment of individual sites assumed that larger focused developments have more potential to deliver a range of new services, whilst more scattered village development would reduce the likely impact of investment, and could put additional pressure on existing village services.

Consequently, package 3 performs less positively as it does not include a new settlement and is additionally the most reliant on village development. By comparison, the other packages perform well for this objective.

SA Objective 18

Will it encourage engagement with community activities?

New development is required by plan policies to provide community facilities to me the needs generated, and will therefore contribute to supporting engagement with community activities. The assessment of individual sites assumed that larger more focused developments are more likely to be able to deliver a wider range of new services. On this basis packages 1, 2, 4, 5 and 9, which include new settlements, are more likely to perform well and provide positive support for this sub-objective. Conversely, that scattered village development would be less likely to be able to, and could in some cases put additional pressures on existing village services. On this basis Package 3 does not include a new settlement, performs less positively.

SA Objective 19

Will it support business development and enhance competitiveness, enabling provision of high-quality employment land in appropriate locations to meet the needs of businesses, and the workforce?

New settlements would be mixed use developments incorporating provision of employment land, hence the strongly positive performance for the packages providing new settlements (1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8 and 9) and the less positive performance for package 3, which would not deliver a new settlement. Some development proposals on the edge of Cambridge would also be mixed use. It should be noted, however, that much of the employment at Waterbeach (included in options 1, 4, 5 and 7) may be delivered beyond plan period.

Will it protect the shopping hierarchy, supporting the vitality and viability of Cambridge, town, district and local centres?

The individual site assessments assumed that the plan's policy requirements would mean that new centres may be delivered to meet local needs, but that they would be required not to be of such a scale to harm the shopping hierarchy. Therefore, all packages are deemed to have a neutral performance for this sub-objective.

SA Objective 20

Will it contribute to providing a range of employment opportunities, in accessible locations?

The site assessments focused on accessibility to major employment opportunities, using accession modelling for journey lengths. All of the packages support this objective, with package 6 offering potentially significant beneficial impacts because of the concentration of development on the edge of the most significant existing employment area, that being Cambridge. New settlement sites are currently not as close to major employment areas, but as mixed use used new employment opportunities are likely to lead to increased access to employment in the longer term, and therefore these are likely to perform slightly better than the village focused packages.

SA Objective 21

Will it improve the level of investment in key community services and infrastructure, including broadband?

During the earlier assessment of individual sites it was assumed that larger sites will need investment in infrastructure and that they cannot rely on existing provision. Since all packages include large sites they all record a negative performance against this sub-objective except for package 3. Package 3 incorporates a diversity of sites including sites with significantly positive and minor negative performance for this sub-objective, such that an overall performance is difficult to judge with any level of certainty.

Will it improve access to education and training, and support provision of skilled employees to the economy?

Even after allowing for surplus school places, development on the scale incorporated in each of the packages would require an increase in school planned admission numbers, which would require the expansion of existing schools and/or provision of new schools. All of the packages therefore conflict with this objective and may result in adverse impacts unless new schools were provided.

SA Objective 22

Will it enable shorter journeys, improve modal choice and integration of transport modes to encourage or facilitate the use of modes such as walking, cycling and public transport?

Sub-indicator: Distance to bus stop / rail station

Sub-indicator: Frequency of Public Transport

Sub-indicator: Typical Public Transport Journey Time to Cambridge City

Centre or Market Town

Sub-indicator: Distance for cycling to City Centre or Market Town

All of the packages support this sub-objective and score positively against the sub-indicators.

Development close to the edge of Cambridge would support access opportunities by alternative modes, although access to public transport services is better close to radial routes with good services, and some areas around the City currently have more limited access to high quality public transport. Larger developments could be accessed by new public transport routes. This means that package 6 would perform particularly well against this objective because of the concentration of development on the edge of Cambridge.

New settlements (included in packages 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8 and 9) could incorporate significant public transport routes to Cambridge, and new town and local centres as appropriate, to ensure that residents have convenient access to local services and facilities by walking, cycling and public transport. They have the potential to enable focussed investment in public transport and cycling infrastructure, delivering high quality services to provide a significantly higher modal share of travel by non-car modes than village based growth options. Dispersing development around villages would be more likely to deliver incremental improvements, rather than focused investment. But this could benefit existing communities. Traffic impacts would be spread more around the district, but there would be a higher modal share for car use. Outside the Rural Centres public transport services are generally limited in terms of frequency and journey time. Cycling opportunities would also be lower than other

strategy approaches, as distances to Cambridge or market towns would be greater, and would often rely on rural roads rather than dedicated routes. This would particularly impact on package 3 as the most village based option.

The sub-objective on the movement of freight has been scoped out of this assessment because this assessment is dealing specifically with housing allocations.

SA Objective 23

Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity?

A wide range of sites are in conflict with this sub-objective, which results in a negative performance for all packages. A major negative performance is recorded for packages 1, 4 and 9 because of their reliance on Waterbeach New Town. The site assessment suggests that this development may result in potentially significant adverse impacts because of insufficient capacity on existing roads although mitigation measures are being explored to address this, including improved access to rail, road improvements and bus improvements. It should also be noted that by the end of the plan period, only a small proportion of the new town will be built, reducing the scale of the impacts at that time.

Will it make the transport network safer for and promote use of non-motorised modes?

The site assessments for the new settlements at Waterbeach New Town and Bourn Airfield suggest that they could potentially lead to significant improvement to public transport, walking or cycling facilities. Transport evidence suggests this would increase modal share by sustainable modes compared to more dispersed development strategies.

Similarly, the greenbelt developments are seen to be of a sufficient scale to enable associated improvements to the transport network. This accounts for the strongly positive performances for all packages except package 3, although there is some uncertainty as it would depend on the opportunities provided by specific sites. Nonetheless, package 3 includes a larger number of smaller developments, which would offer less potential to generate significant investment in transport infrastructure.

3.10 Commentary on Sustainability Performance of Packages

This section describes how each package performs across the range of SA objectives and sub-objectives. This section does not seek to describe all the effects, but to highlight the significant sustainability effects of the packages, or those effects which differentiate the packages' performances.

Option 1 - Waterbeach New Town, Cambourne West and Village Focus

This package includes provision from a new town at Waterbeach, the completion of an extension to the existing new settlement at Cambourne and development at a range of villages down to the Better Served Group Village level.

Waterbeach New Town scores strongly against a relatively large number of sub-objectives and, because of its relative reliance on this site, this is reflected in the overall scores for this package. It performs strongly in relation to:

- Use of previously developed land;
- Provision of open space;
- Quality and range of local services and facilities;

- Engagement with community activities;
- Business development and competitiveness; and
- Safety of the transport network and promotion of non-motorised modes

As with all of the packages, it performs poorly in relation to the use of agricultural land. Both Waterbeach New Town and Cambourne West would involve the loss of significant amounts of agricultural land and this would be compounded by cumulatively significant further loss from a large number of village sites.

The inclusion of a large number of village sites which are considered to be sensitive in landscape terms means that the cumulative impact on landscape character is likely to be significant in this package. Significant mitigation measures will be required, particularly when the town would reach its eventual size.

Its inclusion of a large number of village sites, many of which are some distance from existing centres, also means it scores poorly in relation to the 'distance to centre' sub-indicator. The issues with highway capacity for the Waterbeach New Town site also result in this package performing poorly in terms of providing safe access to the highway network.

In relation to the infrastructure objectives, there is a contrast between the more positive scores for the sites in minor village centre and the more negative scores for the new settlements and larger village sites, where investment in infrastructure would be required. In spite of the inclusion of a significant number of smaller village sites, we have assessed the balance overall as being negative.

Option 2 - Bourn Airfield New Settlement and Village Focus

This package includes the completion of a new settlement at Bourn Airfield within the plan period, and limited development in Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centre villages to meet the remaining requirement.

Unlike Waterbeach New Town, only approximately one third of the Bourn Airfield site is previously developed land and it also scores less strongly in relation to the provision of open space. Because of its heavy reliance on the Bourn Airfield site, this is reflected in the overall scores for this package, with fewer strongly positive scores than package 1.

However, it performs slightly better than package 1 in relation to the distance to centre sub-indicator because so much of the provision in this package would be served by a new centre on the Bourn Airfield site, with less provision on village sites. The absence of significant capacity constraints on the highway network for the Bourn Airfield site also means it performs better than package 1 in relation to the sub-indicator for safe access to the highway network.

Option 3 - Cambourne and Village Focus

This package adopts a village-focused approach. It includes completion of an extension to the existing new settlement at Cambourne, with the remainder of new development focused on other villages. At Waterbeach, there would be no new settlement, but the redevelopment of the barracks themselves would accommodate around 900 dwellings.

Overall, this package does not strongly support any of the sub-objectives.

Although the Waterbeach barracks development would not result in the loss of agricultural land, the cumulative loss of agricultural land across a large number of village sites means

that there is still conflict with this sub-objective, albeit to a lesser degree than the other packages as it could deliver the largest number of houses without using agricultural land.

Although individual site impacts may be relatively minor, the cumulative impacts on landscape and townscape character from this package are likely to be significant, although some impacts may be capable of partial mitigation through design and siting.

As with the other packages with a strong reliance on village development, it scores poorly in relation to access to services and facilities, placing larger amounts of development in lower order centres than any other package.

Larger scale developments are more likely to incorporate new provision of services, facilities, employment space and transport facilities. The reliance on smaller sites in this package therefore results in this package performing less positively in relation to:

- · Quality and range of local services and facilities;
- Engagement with community activities;
- Business development and competitiveness; and
- Safety of the transport network and promotion of non-motorised modes.

Option 4 - Waterbeach New Town, Bourn Airfield New Settlement, and Cambourne West Focus

This package includes provision from the partial completion by 2031 of a new town at Waterbeach, the partial completion of a new settlement at Bourn Airfield, the completion of an extension to the existing new settlement at Cambourne. This would be supported by selected development at Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres.

The overall scores for this package largely mirror the scores for package 1, with strongly positive scores for:

- Use of previously developed land;
- Provision of open space;
- Quality and range of local services and facilities;
- Engagement with community activities;
- Business development and competitiveness; and
- Safety of the transport network and promotion of non-motorised modes.

It has strongly negative scores for use of agricultural land, distance to centre and (because of the highways issues relating to Waterbeach New Town) provision of safe access to the highway network.

It does, however, represent a lower level of landscape impact than package 1 in terms of landscape character because the large number of sensitive village sites in option 1 are largely replaced in this package with the Bourn Airfield site, which is not considered to be sensitive. It is probably also marginally less sensitive in terms of townscape character, although the differences are too subtle to be picked up in terms of the overall performance of the packages at this level of assessment.

Option 5 - Waterbeach New Town, Bourn Airfield New Settlement and Village Focus

This package includes provision from the partial completion by 2031 of a new town at Waterbeach, the partial completion of a new settlement at Bourn Airfield (but more than Option 4 or 9 assumes, which is offset by less reliance on development at Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres).

Its relative reliance on the Bourn Airfield site means that its scores largely mirror the scores for package 2. The focus on new settlements means that it is likely to result in provision of new services, facilities, employment space and transport facilities, meaning it performs strongly in relation to:

- Quality and range of local services and facilities;
- Engagement with community activities;
- Business development and competitiveness; and
- Safety of the transport network and promotion of non-motorised modes.

The relatively low provision in villages also means that this package is likely to have less cumulative impact on landscape and townscape character than those with a strong reliance on village development or on other sensitive sites.

Option 6 - Cambridge Green Belt and Village Focus

This package assumes 2 or 3 large urban extensions to Cambridge on land currently in the Green Belt. This would accommodate around 4000 dwellings. This would be supported by selected village sites at Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres, with a focus on previously developed land.

Delivering this scale of development on the edge of Cambridge would require sites which would have a significant negative impact on the landscape and townscape character objectives and on air quality. The review of the Green Belt identified that it would not be possible to deliver significant additional development on the edge of Cambridge without significant detriment to the specific purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt. These purposes highlight the importance to the historic City of Cambridge of the quality of its setting as well as the usual role of Green Belts in preventing communities from merging with one another.

The major Green Belt sites could offer significant potential for the provision of green infrastructure, which results in this package and package 7 performing strongly in relation to this sub-objective. Because of the proximity of much of the development to Cambridge, these packages also strongly support the sub-objective of improving accessibility to key local services and facilities. In addition, the provision of new services and facilities which would be required as part of the urban extensions included in this package mean that this package would improve the quality and range of key local services and facilities.

The edge of Cambridge focus of this package also results in strongly positive scores for a number of the sustainable travel and transport infrastructure sub-objectives, including: contributing to provision of employment opportunities in accessible locations; and enabling shorter journeys, improving modal choice and integration of transport modes. It also performs well against the sub-indicator for 'distance for cycling to city centre'.

Option 7 - Cambridge Green Belt, Waterbeach New Town, Cambourne West and Village Focus

This option assumes 1 or 2 large urban extensions to Cambridge on land currently in the Green Belt, accommodating around 2000 dwellings. The remaining development needs would be accommodated through the partial completion of a new town at Waterbeach, the completion of an extension to the existing new settlement at Cambourne and development at 1 village.

Delivering this scale of development on the edge of Cambridge would require sites which would have a significant negative impact on the landscape and townscape character objectives. The review of the Green Belt identified that it would not be possible to deliver significant additional development on the edge of Cambridge without significant detriment to the specific purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt. These purposes highlight the importance to the historic City of Cambridge of the quality of its setting as well as the usual role of Green Belts in preventing communities from merging with one another.

The major Green Belt sites could offer significant potential for the provision of green infrastructure, which results in this package and package 6 performing strongly in relation to this sub-objective. Because of the proximity of much of the development to Cambridge, these packages also strongly support the sub-objective of improving accessibility to key local services and facilities. It performs less well than package 6 for access to employment opportunities, although still positively. In addition, the provision of new services and facilities which would be required as part of the urban extensions included in this package mean that this package would improve the quality and range of key local services and facilities.

As with all the packages this one would lead to loss of high grade agricultural land. As above the scale of development on the edge of Cambridge would result in significant negative impact on the landscape and townscape objective.

There are fewer strongly positive scores, for example regarding sustainable travel and transport infrastructure sub-objectives.

Option 8 - Cambridge Green Belt, Bourn Airfield New Settlement, Cambourne West and Village Focus

This option assumes delivery of smaller sites on land currently in the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge, the partial completion of a new settlement at Bourn Airfield, the completion of an extension to the existing new settlement at Cambourne and selected development at Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres.

Delivering this scale of development on the edge of Cambridge would require sites which would have a significant negative impact on the landscape and townscape character objectives. The review of the Green Belt identified that it would not be possible to deliver significant additional development on the edge of Cambridge without significant detriment to the specific purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt. These purposes highlight the importance to the historic City of Cambridge of the quality of its setting as well as the usual role of Green Belts in preventing communities from merging with one another.

As with all the packages this one would lead to significant loss of high grade agricultural land. This package would result in significant harm to landscape and townscape character on the edge of Cambridge. There are some larger sites in the package which have negative or uncertain performances for safe highway access.

The package performs less well than package 6 for access to employment opportunities, although still positively.

The only strongly positive performance is for this package is for objective 23, relating to the sub-objective of transport network safety and promoting the use of non-motorise transport modes.

Option 9 - Waterbeach New Town, Bourn Airfield New Settlement, and Cambourne West Focus (Preferred Option)

This option is very similar to package 4 and represents a refinement to that package. The majority of growth remains at the three new settlements of Waterbeach New Town, Bourn Airfield and the completion of the settlement at Cambourne. This would be supported by selected development at Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres. The differences to package 4 are at the village level, with the inclusion of the site at Bennell Farm in Comberton, and the removal of a small site in Histon and Impington.

The overall scores for this package largely mirror the scores for packages 1 and 4, with strongly positive scores for:

- Use of previously developed land;
- Provision of open space;
- Quality and range of local services and facilities;
- Engagement with community activities;
- Business development and competitiveness; and
- Safety of the transport network and promotion of non-motorised modes.

The only strongly negative scores are for use of agricultural land, and (because of the highways issues relating to Waterbeach New Town) provision of safe access to the highway network.