

## The Cambridge Local Plan Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report: Errata

The **Option numbers**, as they are listed in the option number (first) column of the Individual Option Appraisal table (below), are correct.



Option Number	Option title	Communities	Economy	Transport	Water	Flood risk / CC adaptation	CC mitigation and RE	Land/townscape/heritage	Biodiversity	City Centre	North Cambridge	South Cambridge	East Cambridge	West Cambridge	Appraisal Discussion
---------------	--------------	-------------	---------	-----------	-------	----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------	--------------	-------------	-----------------	-----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------------

However, within the **Option Title** column, the **Appraisal Discussion** column and the **Summary** boxes there are some typographical errors. The corrections to these are shown in **bold**, below:

Options12's **Appraisal Discussion** column should read:

**On balance this option will contribute positively to community and well being as it has the potential capacity for between 1,000 and 1,500 dwellings within the City Council boundary, which will include affordable houses. The provision of social infrastructure is uncertain and the removal of open space may have a negative impact on existing residents.**

**The development of the site is likely to have significant adverse impacts on wildlife sites and green/blue corridors, including on areas of woodland, and on the landscape and setting of Cambridge. The site currently provides an important and attractive rural setting for the historic core and provides an important green corridor running into the city centre.**

**The development may also impact on the Conservation Area in the northern part of the broad location and therefore have an adverse**

impact on cultural heritage.

The sports ground to the north of the site might have greater potential for development given the fact that it is well screened. However, the negative impacts associated with loss of public open space, biodiversity and green infrastructure may be significant.

In terms of the priorities identified for South Cambridge in the SA Scoping Report, the development is likely to have a negative impact on balance. This is due to the potentially adverse impact on open space and the conservation area.

Option 26's **Option Title column** should read:

**Change the position of some centres within the hierarchy**

Option 60's **Option Title column** should read:

**Delivering High Quality Places**

Options: 72, 73 & 74's **Appraisal Discussion column** should read:

All aesthetic considerations involve some uncertainty. Despite this, the criteria based approach used in options **72** and **73** should offer good protection to the city's townscape. Greater protection would be provided by a limit on the height of buildings. With all options there is an uncertain economic impact. Extensive protection may stifle innovative developments that could contribute positively economically. Alternately, a negative impact on the skyline could hinder economic development, for instance through lost tourism. Option **72** is likely to offer a balanced approach to skyline protection and development opportunity across all areas. Option **73** looks to allocate or protect specific areas, subject to the criteria set out in option **72**. Option **74** may vary height limits by location. The details of how such decisions would be made are not provided and so localised effects cannot be effectively appraised.

Option 75's **Option Title column** should read:

**Cambridge Airport Public Safety and Safeguarding Zone**

Option 79, 80 & 81's **Appraisal Discussion column** should read:

Option 79, 80 and **81** may all result in higher quality green spaces across the City and so could potentially help contribute to providing wider ecosystem services. The extent to which the options contribute to the enhancement of biodiversity varies, with option 79 likely to provide the greatest gains due to its strength as a standalone policy and its recognition of the opportunities for enhancement at all scales of development.

Option 81's **Option Title column** should read:

Include reference to the enhancement of biodiversity within option **64** (The Design of the Public Realm, Landscape and other external spaces)

Option 90, 91 & 92's **Appraisal Discussion column** should read:

Option 90 sets out the same 40% target as is currently found in the Local Plan. This option would continue to support the existing target<sup>1</sup> and subsequently maintain some degree of new affordable housing. Option 91 would support increased delivery whilst Option 92 would support a reduced rate of delivery of new affordable housing. The SHMA projected annual demand for new affordable housing outnumbers recent rates of delivery of all forms of housing. A requirement of 30 or 40% is unlikely to support delivery of meaningful numbers of new affordable housing to help meet the overall need in Cambridge. As such implementing Options **90** or **92** may result in limited positive impacts on community wellbeing due to an under provision of affordable housing. Whilst a lower proportion of affordable housing (30%) may allow other sites, which were not considered by developers to be viable based on 40% affordable housing, to be brought forward, the contribution would be insufficient in relation to the overall need for affordable housing in the City.

---

<sup>1</sup> More recent affordable completions were 2006-2007 (18%), 2007-2008 (12%), 2008-2009 (22%), 2009-2010 (38%), 2010-2011 (33%). Source: <http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/7E41D19D-52D6-4FEA-BE92-D3797F3CE854/0/TableH16GrosshousingAffordablecompletions.pdf>

Option 91 sets out a proportion of 50% or more, which, whilst still delivering significantly fewer affordable homes than are needed, could have a more positive effect on communities. This would be through directly addressing the current need for housing evidenced by the 8,204 applicants currently on the Housing Register (April 2012), and indirectly addressing deprivation. The requirement for such a high proportion may render small to medium size developments unviable (for example between 15-25 dwellings). Therefore this option may need to incorporate some flexibility for smaller sites with viability challenges, to be able to negotiate lower rates of affordable housing. This would be to prevent it resulting in fewer overall homes.

The effects on the economy topic are uncertain. Increased affordable housing delivery may reduce housing cost income deprivation, however due to the extreme affordability challenges in Cambridge (in 2010 the ratio or multiplier of average house prices to average incomes in the city was 9.2), it is unlikely to address employment deprivation, which is identified as a key issue under the economy sustainability theme.

Similarly, the effect on climate change mitigation and heritage is uncertain, as it is contingent on the fact that affordable homes are built to the same design standard as market housing, which is not stated in the options text.

Option 95 & 96's **Appraisal Discussion column** should read:

Requiring affordable housing under option 95 would respond to the existing demand and need for increased provision. This would contribute positively to community and wellbeing through the increased delivery of affordable housing, and potential benefits in terms of reducing deprivation. However, there is an important need for student accommodation, as it is key to supporting the university, which helps Cambridge retain its position as one of the UK's most competitive cities. In light of this, Option **95** may have an adverse effect on viability of proposals for student accommodation and in turn lead to fewer proposals for student accommodation. This could exacerbate the existing pressure on the city's housing stock, to house students outside student accommodation.

Option 96 has uncertain effects on wellbeing, as whilst it would not result in an increase in affordable housing provision, it is likely to ensure continued provision for student accommodation with a subsequent release of pressure on the existing housing stock.

Option 114 & 115's **Appraisal Discussion column** should read:

This Option is likely to help increase delivery of much-needed new housing in Cambridge. However, this is likely, depending on location, to be at the cost of biodiversity and green infrastructure, flood risk including climate change adaptation, and landscape. However, in areas of existing low density development or where existing buildings are demolished, this policy could potentially achieve new housing without compromising sustainable communities. Potential adverse effects of this Option would be most acutely felt in areas already experiencing significant pressure on green space within the urban area. This Option is likely to increase pressures on levels of personal car use, including pressures on car parking, This Option should consider requiring any infill developments to be car free and provide adequate provision for cycle parking in line with that proposed in Options **189** and **192**, except in exceptional circumstances (e.g. to enable provision for dedicated car parking for a wheelchair accessible home).

The Option to restrict infill development (115) would potentially restrict the potential delivery of much needed housing, although the wording to require 'very specific local circumstances' suggests this option would be developed to minimise its application. It would help contribute positively to addressing many sustainability issues relating to biodiversity and green infrastructure and maintaining local townscape. This Option would still support development. The extent to which this Option would affect Transport, Flood Risk, Climate Change and particular areas is uncertain due to lack of detail.

The **summary** of the Delivering High Quality Housing Section (below option 120) should read:

**Summary:**

The housing options proposed result in a combination of positive, negative and uncertain effects against the issues highlighted in the sustainability framework. Given that the SHMA projected annual demand for new affordable housing outnumbers recent rates of delivery of all forms of housing, the 50% target, set out under Option **91** for affordable housing provision, is most likely to have a positive effect on communities through addressing housing need. However, to prevent the option resulting in fewer overall homes, it may need to incorporate some flexibility for smaller sites with viability challenges to be able to negotiate lower rates of affordable housing. Similarly, lowering the qualifying threshold for affordable housing provision, as set out under Option **93** could have a positive effect on communities by addressing the current overall need for housing. Although Option **95** would contribute positively to an increased delivery of affordable housing, there is an important need for student accommodation in Cambridge and the Option could have an adverse effect on viability of proposals for student accommodation, leading to fewer proposals for student accommodation. This could exacerbate the existing pressure on the city's housing stock, to house students outside student

accommodation. The appraisal indicates that whilst Option **97** would make the Council's position on tenure requirements clear, it would potentially become out of date as local circumstances change. Under Option **98** the Housing Strategy and Affordable Housing SPD could be used to ensure advice on tenure requirements is clearly set out. The council could also consider including wording to clarify the definition of Affordable Housing, relative to the revised national definition, to include affordable rent. In light of the Options proposed for density, there is potential to combine options **103** and **104** to maximise the resulting benefits, e.g. a positive effect on sustainable transport as journey lengths are minimised. This would include a minimum average density threshold within the City Centre boundary, a minimum threshold within 400m of District and Local Centres (on transport routes) and for areas outside this, proposals would be judged on a case-by-case basis. Applying a blanket minimum density for all new developments resulted in few positive effects against the issues in the sustainability framework.

Option 174's **Option Title column** should read:

Extend the Safeguarding Option (**No. 173**) to former public houses not listed in appendix D

Option 174, 175, 176 & 177's **Appraisal Discussion column** should read:

By extending Option **173** to include former public houses, Option **174** is likely to help protect the vibrancy and vitality of local areas by maintaining community space provision. The protection of such facilities from higher value uses may bring about a beneficial economic effect, for instance through safeguarding tourism. By using the criteria of Option **173** to assess the need for protection against community requirements, this Option should ensure that protective measures are balanced against the need to tackle deprivation through conversion / redevelopment in certain areas of the City.

Option **175** is likely to provide the necessary flexibility for the public housing market to expand as well as contract, resulting in similar effects to Option **174** on community well being and the economy. However, the effect of this Option across the City is uncertain, as it may distort the market by creating too many A-uses and restricting the creation of residential units, which has an uncertain effect on issues such as tackling deprivation.

Support for new and improved community facilities is crucial as demand will increase with population growth. The provision of adequate

community infrastructure where there is local need should contribute significantly to protecting and enhancing community provision particularly in wards anticipated to experience population growth, as well as addressing key issues of deprivation and contributing to local vitality. In addition, this Option should reduce the need to travel helping reduce GHG emissions and improve local air quality.

The impact of Option **176** on key issues relating to landscape and biodiversity is uncertain and would be dependent on a site by site basis.

Enforcing the provision of community facilities through development (Option **177**) may be a more certain method of delivery, as new facilities would be required where development leads to an increased demand for community facilities. However the timeframe for delivery may be longer than Option **176**.

Conversely, provision through development may overlook areas in need that do not attract new development.

The **summary** of the Promoting Successful Communities Section (below option 181) should read:

**Summary:**

The Options set out for promoting healthy communities primarily result in a positive, or significantly positive impacts on a broad range of sustainability topics, in particular on improving the health and well being of Cambridge residents. Maintaining and enhancing the network of open spaces has been identified as an important issue across Cambridge and should be addressed by the Options proposed. Updating the standards for open space and recreation provision is likely to result in increased benefits compared to maintaining the current standards. Where new development is proposed, for example onsite provision of open space or new recreational and leisure facilities, the selection of a suitable location will determine potential resulting impacts on factors such as water, biodiversity and heritage. The Options covering the protection of existing facilities should help mitigate adverse impacts associated with new development while inclusion of a requirement to build to high quality design standards for recreational and cultural facilities would help minimise adverse impacts associated with the provision of these additional facilities. Many of the effects surrounding the Options to protect public houses remain uncertain. However, Option **173** appears preferable as it ensures some protection from higher value uses but offers flexibility where the existing use as a public house is unviable.

