

**Cambridge City Sites Assessment Pro Forma**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Site Information</b>   |  |
| <b>Site reference number(s):</b> R20 (SHLAA Site CC105)   |  |
| <b>Site name/address:</b> The Abbey Stadium Site, including land fronting Newmarket Road, Cambridge   |  |
| <b>Functional area (taken from Cambridge City SA Scoping Report):</b> North East Cambridge (Abbey)  |  |
| <b>Map</b>  |  |
|   |  |
| <b>Site description:</b>  |  |
| <p>Site of the existing Cambridge United Stadium with ancillary car parking. The stadium itself is set back from the Newmarket Road frontage, by an area of hardstanding used for car and cycle parking, and a number of single storey buildings which includes a car &amp; van hire firm. To the east and north, the site is surrounded by residential development. To the south there is an extensive area of allotments. To the west, there is open space, consisting of grass and scrub, linking to Coldham's Common.</p> <p>This site as well as the allotments to the south are also being consulted on as a possible option for a community stadium. The existing Abbey Stadium site is not sufficient size to accommodate a Community Stadium. The stadium owners are seeking an alternative site. Inclusion of allotment land to the south would make a larger site.</p> |  |
| <b>Current use (s):</b>   |  |
| <p>Football stadium and associated uses. Abbey Stadium is the home of Cambridge United Football Club. To the Newmarket Road end of the site, part of the land is used as a vehicle rental site.</p>   |  |
| <b>Proposed use(s):</b> Residential   |  |
| <b>Site size (ha):</b> 2.88   |  |
| <b>Assumed net developable area:</b> -  |  |
| <b>Assumed residential density:</b> -   |  |
| <b>Potential residential capacity:</b> 154  |  |

|  |
|--|
| <b>Site owner/promoter:</b> Grosvenor Estates (with South Stand area owned by Cambridge City Council)  |
| <b>Landowner has agreed to promote site for development?</b> Yes, Grosvenor Estates promoting site for residential development.  |
| <b>Site origin:</b> SHLAA Site, May 2012   |
| <b>Relevant planning history:</b><br><br>1932 - Original football ground inaugurated.<br>1934 - First stand opened<br>2002 - Redevelopment of South Stand completed<br>2006 - The 2006 Local Plan designated the Stadium pitch as protected open space.<br>2006 - The site was not allocated for housing. The 2006 Local Plan Inspector's report concluded that in the absence of a suitable relocation site for the Stadium it should not be allocated for housing.<br>2011 - Open Space and Recreation Strategy (Oct 2011) retained the Stadium pitch as protected open space for recreational purposes.<br>2012 – Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment determined this site suitable for 154 residential units, developable in approximately 2018 to 2022.<br>2012 - The Cambridge Local Plan – Towards 2031 - Issues and Options Report 2012 sought comments on the future of the current stadium site in terms of whether or not it should be retained or redeveloped and if redeveloped what it should be redeveloped for. |

| <b>Level 1</b>  |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <b>Part A: Strategic Considerations</b>   |   |  |
| <b>Flood Risk</b>   |   |  |
| Criteria  | Performance   | Comments   |
| <p>Is site within a flood zone?</p> <p><i>The assessment will address whether the proposed use is considered suitable for the flood zone with reference to the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</i></p> <p><i>In line with the requirements of the NPPF a sequential test will be applied when determining the allocation of new development in order to steer development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding (Zone 1).</i></p> <p><i>Sites that fall within Flood Zone 3 will only be considered where there are no reasonably available sites in Flood Zones 1 or 2, taking into account the flood risk vulnerability of land uses and applying the Exceptions Test as required.</i></p>              | <p><b>R</b> = Flood risk zone 3<br/> <b>A</b> = Flood risk zone 2<br/> <b>G</b> = Flood risk zone 1</p> | <p>Green: Flood zone 1, lowest risk of fluvial flooding.</p>                               |
| <p>Is site at risk from surface water flooding?</p> <p><i>In addition to identifying whether site is in a high risk flood zone, consideration needs to be given to the risk of surface water flooding on the site. The Surface Water Management Plan for Cambridge (2011) shows that the majority of the City is at high risk of surface water flooding. Development, if not undertaken with due consideration of the risk to the development and the existing built environment, will further increase the risk. Consideration should also be given to the scope for appropriate mitigation, which could reduce the level of risk on site and potentially reduce flood risk elsewhere (for example from site run-off).</i></p> | <p><b>R</b> = High risk,<br/> <b>A</b> = Medium risk<br/> <b>G</b> = Low risk</p>                       | <p>Green: Minor surface water issues that can be mitigated against through good design</p> |
| <b>Land Use / Green Belt</b>  |   |  |
| Criteria  | Performance   | Comments   |
| <p>Will allocation make use of previously developed land (PDL)?</p> <p><i>The NPPF promotes the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed, provided it is not of high environmental value.</i></p>   | <p><b>R</b> = Not on PDL<br/> <b>A</b> = Partially on PDL<br/> <b>G</b> = Entirely on PDL</p>           | <p>Green: 100% on PDL</p>  |

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Will the allocation lead to loss of land within the Green Belt?</p> <p><i>There is a small amount of Green Belt within the built up area of the City, such as Stourbridge Common, Coldham's Common and along the River Cam corridor. The Green Belt at the fringe of the City is considered in more detail in the joint pro forma with SCDC which looks at sites on the fringe of the City.</i></p>  | <p><b>R</b> = Site is in the Green Belt<br/> <b>G</b> = Site is not in the Green Belt</p>  | <p>Green: Not in Green Belt</p>   |
| <p><b>Impact on national Nature Conservation Designations</b></p>   |  |   |
| <p>Criteria</p>   | <p>Performance</p>   | <p>Comments</p>   |
| <p>Would allocation impact upon a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)?</p> <p><i>The assessment will take into account the reasons for the SSSI's designation and the potential impacts that development could have on this.</i></p>   | <p><b>R</b> = Site is on or adjacent to an SSSI with negative impacts incapable of mitigation<br/> <b>A</b> = Site is on or adjacent to an SSSI with negative impacts capable of mitigation<br/> <b>G</b> = Site is not near to an SSSI with no or negligible impacts</p>  | <p>Green: Site is not near to an SSSI with no or negligible impacts</p>   |
| <p><b>Impact on National Heritage Assets</b></p>  |  |   |
| <p>Criteria</p>   | <p>Performance</p>   | <p>Comments</p>   |
| <p>Will allocation impact upon a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)?</p> <p><i>Scheduling is the process through which nationally important sites and monuments are given legal protection. National planning policy requires substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, to be wholly exceptional. As such consideration needs to be given to the impact that development could have on any nearby SAMS, taking account of the proposed development use and distance from the centre of the site to it. Development that is likely to have adverse impacts on a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) or its setting should be avoided.</i></p> | <p><b>R</b> = Site is on a SAM or allocation will lead to development adjacent to a SAM with the potential for negative impacts incapable of mitigation<br/> <b>A</b> = Site is adjacent to a SAM that is less sensitive / not likely to be impacted/ or impacts are capable of mitigation<br/> <b>G</b> = Site is not on or adjacent to a SAM</p>                                 | <p>Green: Site is not on or adjacent to a SAM</p>   |
| <p>Would development impact upon Listed Buildings?</p> <p><i>Listed buildings are categorised as either Grade 1 (most important), Grade 2* or Grade 2. Consideration needs to be given to the likely impact of development on the building and its setting taking account of the listing category, the distance from the listed building, the proposed use, and the possibility of</i></p>  | <p><b>R</b> = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such buildings with potential for significant negative impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation<br/> <b>A</b> = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such buildings with potential for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation<br/> <b>G</b> = Site does not contain or</p> | <p>Amber: There are a number of Listed Buildings to the north of the site on Newmarket Road (The Round House and buildings on the corner of Ditton Walk).</p> |

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <i>mitigation.</i>  | adjoin such buildings, and there is no impact to the setting of such buildings   |   |
| <b>Part B: Deliverability and Viability Criteria</b>  |  |   |
| Criteria  | Performance  | Comments  |
| <p>Is the site allocated or safeguarded in the Minerals and Waste LDF?</p> <p><i>Reference needs to be made to the Minerals and Waste LDF in order to determine whether development of the site could prejudice any future Minerals and Waste sites. NB: Land that falls within an 'Area of Search' should be flagged up, but this would not necessarily rule out the allocation of a site.</i></p> | <p><b>R</b> = Site or a significant part of it falls within an allocated or safeguarded area, development would have significant negative impacts</p> <p><b>A</b> = Site or a significant part of it falls within an allocated or safeguarded area, development would have minor negative impacts</p> <p><b>G</b> = Site is not within an allocated or safeguarded area.</p> | Green: Site is not within an allocated or safeguarded area in the Minerals and Waste LDF.   |
| <p>Is the site located within the Cambridge Airport Public Safety Zone (PSZ) or Safeguarding Zone (SZ)?</p>   | <p><b>R</b> = Site is within the PSZ or is designated as an area where no development should occur</p> <p><b>A</b> = Site or part of site within the SZ (add building height restriction in comments)</p> <p><b>G</b> = Site is not within the PSZ or SZ</p>   | Amber: Entire site in SZ (Any Structure greater than 15m AGL)<br>Location within a zone will not in itself prevent development, it depends upon the nature of the development and its height. |
| <p>Is there a suitable access to the site?</p> <p><i>The assessment needs to consider whether the site is capable of achieving appropriate access that meets County Highway standards for scale of development.</i></p>   | <p><b>R</b> = No</p> <p><b>A</b> = Yes, with mitigation</p> <p><b>G</b> = Yes</p>  | Amber: Yes, with mitigation   |
| <p>Would allocation of the site have a significant impact on the local highway capacity?</p> <p><i>Consideration should be given to the capacity of the local highway network and the impacts the development is likely to have on it.</i></p>  | <p><b>R</b> = Insufficient capacity. Negative effects incapable of appropriate mitigation.</p> <p><b>A</b> = Insufficient capacity. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.</p> <p><b>G</b> = No capacity constraints identified that cannot be fully mitigated</p>  | Amber: Insufficient capacity. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.   |
| <p>Would allocation of the site have a significant impact on the strategic road network capacity?</p> <p><i>Consideration should be given to the capacity of the strategic road network and the impacts the development is likely to have on it.</i></p>  | <p><b>R</b> = Insufficient capacity. Negative effects incapable of appropriate mitigation.</p> <p><b>A</b> = Insufficient capacity. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.</p> <p><b>G</b> = No capacity constraints identified that cannot be fully mitigated</p>  | Amber: Insufficient capacity. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation  |
| <p>Is the site part of a larger site and could it prejudice development of any strategic sites?</p>   | <p><b>R</b> = Yes</p> <p><b>G</b> = No</p>   | Green: Site is not part of a larger site and would not prejudice development of any strategic sites   |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <p><i>Comments should flag up whether the site is part of a larger development site or whether it is located in close proximity to a strategic site. Consideration of this at allocation stage can help ensure coordination of development.</i></p>   |  |  |
| <p>Are there any known legal issues/covenants that could constrain development of the site?</p> <p><i>A summary of any known legal issues that could constrain the development of the site should be given. Issues that should be considered are; whether the site is in multiple ownership, the presence of ransom strips, covenants, existing use agreements, owner agreement or developer agreement.</i></p> | <p><b>R = Yes</b><br/> <b>G = No</b></p>   | <p>Red: Cambridge United Football Club (CUFC) lease the Stadium site from the landowner Grosvenor Estates. The area covered by the Stadium's south stand is owned by Cambridge City Council and leased to CUFC. Lease on vehicle depot.</p>  |
| <p>Timeframe for bringing the site forward for development?</p> <p><i>Knowledge of the timeframe for bringing forward development will help inform whether allocation of the site would have the potential to contribute to the Council's required land supply for housing/employment land etc.</i></p>   | <p><b>R = Beyond 2031 (beyond plan period)</b><br/> <b>A = Start of construction between 2017 and 2031</b><br/> <b>G = Start of construction between 2011 and 2016</b></p>   | <p>Green: Start of construction between 2011 and 2016</p>  |
| <p>Would development of the site require significant new / upgraded utility infrastructure?</p>   | <p><b>R = Yes, significant upgrades likely to be required but constraints incapable of appropriate mitigation</b><br/> <b>A = Yes, significant upgrades likely to be required, constraints capable of appropriate mitigation</b><br/> <b>G = No, existing infrastructure likely to be sufficient</b></p> | <p>Amber: Improved utilities required. The developer will need to liaise with the relevant service provider/s to determine the appropriate utility infrastructure provision.</p>   |
| <p>Is the site in the vicinity of an existing or proposed district heating network/community energy networks?</p>   | <p><b>G = Yes</b><br/> <b>A = No</b></p>   | <p>Amber: No</p>   |
| <p>Would development of the site be likely to require new education provision?</p>  | <p><b>R = School capacity not sufficient, constraints cannot be appropriately mitigated.</b><br/> <b>A = School capacity not sufficient, constraints can be appropriately mitigated</b><br/> <b>G = Non-residential development / surplus school places</b></p>  | <p>Amber: The implications of development locations for education provision will need to be considered as part of taking the Plan forward. The scale and location of development will be important in terms of current education capacity and how any issues can be met. This will include capacity of the development itself to support new primary</p> |



|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  |   | and secondary schools where there is a shortfall. The current review of school catchments will have a bearing on this issue. |
| <b>Level 1 Conclusion</b>  |   |  |
| <p>Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)</p> <p><i>Include an assessment of the suitability of the proposed use. Also whether the development of this site for this use would be in line with emerging policy in the Local Plan – from the Issues and Options Report and key issues emerging from consultation responses.</i></p> | <p>RR = Very significant constraints or adverse impacts<br/> <b>R</b> = Significant constraints or adverse impacts<br/> <b>A</b> = Some constraints or adverse impacts<br/> <b>G</b> = Minor constraints or adverse impacts<br/>                 GG = None or negligible constraints or adverse impacts</p> | <p>Amber: There are lease issues on the site which need to be overcome and would result in lower number of dwellings</p>     |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Level 2</b>   |  |  |
| <b>Accessibility to existing centres and services</b>  |  |  |
| <b>Criteria</b>  | <b>Performance</b>   | <b>Comments</b>  |
| <p>How far is the site from edge of defined Cambridge City Centre?</p> <p><i>A key element of sustainable development is ensuring that people are able to meet their needs locally, thus helping to encourage a modal shift. This criteria has been included to provide an indication of the sustainability of the site. Sites located closer to the City Centre, where the majority of services are located, are expected to score more highly in sustainability terms.</i></p> | <p><b>R</b> = &gt;800m<br/> <b>A</b> = 400-800m<br/> <b>G</b> = &lt;400m</p> | <p>Red: Site is more than 800m from the edge of the City Centre</p>              |
| <p>How far is the site from the nearest District or Local centre?</p> <p><i>A key element of sustainable development is ensuring that people are able to meet their needs locally, thus helping to encourage a modal shift. Criteria measuring the distance of a site from its nearest district/local centre has been included to provide an indication of the sustainability of the site and to determine the appropriate density of development of a site.</i></p>             | <p><b>R</b> = &gt;800m<br/> <b>A</b> = 400-800m<br/> <b>G</b> = &lt;400m</p> | <p>Amber: Site within 800m of Barnwell Road Local District Centre</p>            |
| <p>How far is the nearest health centre or GP service?</p> <p><i>Local services are essential to the quality of life of residents and</i></p>  | <p><b>R</b> = &gt;800m<br/> <b>A</b> = 400-800m<br/> <b>G</b> = &lt;400m</p> | <p>Red: Site is more than 800m from the nearest health centre or GP service.</p> |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <p><i>employees. In planning for new development, consideration needs to be given to the proximity of development to local services so that new residents can access these using sustainable modes of transport. As such, measuring the distance of a site from the nearest health centre/GP service has been included to provide an indication of the sustainability of the site.</i></p>  |  |  |
| <p>Would development lead to a loss of community facilities?</p>  | <p><b>R</b> = Allocation would lead to loss of community facilities<br/> <b>G</b> = Development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities or replacement /appropriate mitigation possible</p> | <p>Green: Development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities or replacement /appropriate mitigation possible</p>   |
| <p>How far is the nearest secondary school?</p> <p><i>In planning for new development, consideration needs to be given to the proximity to schools so that new residents can access these using sustainable modes of transport. As such, measuring the distance of a site from the nearest secondary school has been included to provide an indication of the sustainability of the site. Development will also be required to contribute to the provision of new local services.</i></p> | <p><b>R</b> = &gt;3km<br/> <b>A</b> = 1-3km<br/> <b>G</b> = &lt;1km or non-housing allocation</p>  | <p>Amber: Site is within 3km of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chesterton Community College</li> <li>• Coleridge Community College</li> <li>• St Bede's Inter-Church Comprehensive School</li> <li>• Manor Community College</li> <li>• Parkside Community College</li> </ul> |
| <p>How far is the nearest primary school?</p> <p><i>In planning for new development, consideration needs to be given to the proximity to schools so that new residents can access these using sustainable modes of transport. As such, measuring the distance of a site from the nearest primary school has been included to provide an indication of the sustainability of the site. Development will also be required to contribute to the provision of new local services.</i></p>     | <p><b>R</b> = &gt;800m<br/> <b>A</b> = 400-800m<br/> <b>G</b> = &lt;400m or non-housing allocation</p>   | <p>Amber: Site is within 800m of Abbey Meadows Primary School</p>  |
| <p><b>Accessibility to outdoor facilities and green spaces</b></p>  |  |  |
| <p>Criteria</p>   | <p>Performance</p>   | <p>Comments</p>  |
| <p>Is the site defined as protected open space or have the potential to be protected</p>  | <p><b>R</b> = Yes<br/> <b>G</b> = No</p>   | <p>Red: CUFC stadium pitch (0.84ha) is identified in City Council Open Space &amp; Recreation Strategy as protected open space and of recreational importance.</p>   |



|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <p>If the site is protected open space can the open space be replaced according to CLP Local Plan policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space</p>   | <p><b>R = No</b><br/> <b>G = Yes</b></p>  | <p>Red: Any future development would need to satisfactorily demonstrate recreational facilities are re-provided elsewhere in an appropriate manner</p>  |
| <p>If the site does not involve any protected open space would development of the site be able to increase the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space /outdoor sports facilities and achieve the minimum standards of onsite public open space provision?</p>   | <p><b>RR = No</b>, the site by virtue of its size is not able to provide the minimum standard of OS and is located in a ward or parish with identified deficiency.</p> <p><b>R = No</b>, the site by virtue of its size is not able to provide the minimum standard of OS.</p> <p><b>G = Assumes</b> minimum on-site provision to adopted plan standards is provided onsite</p> <p><b>GG = Development</b> would create the opportunity to deliver significantly enhanced provision of new public open spaces in excess of adopted plan standards</p> | <p>Red: Difficult for any development to not affect the loss of playing fields.</p>   |
| <p>How far is the nearest outdoor sports facilities?</p> <p><i>A key objective of national planning policy is for planning to promote healthy communities. Good accessibility to sports facilities is likely to encourage healthier lifestyles. Inclusion of criteria that measures distance from the site to outdoor sports facilities has therefore been included to provide an indication of the sustainability of the site. The assessment should also give consideration as to whether the size of the site and scale of development are likely to require a contribution to the provision of new local services such as new outdoor sports facilities via S106 contributions.</i></p> | <p><b>R = &gt;3km</b><br/> <b>A = 1 - 3km</b><br/> <b>G = &lt;1km</b>; or allocation is not housing</p>   | <p>Green: Site is within 1km of Abbey Meadows Primary School outdoor sports facilities and Barnwell Road Recreation Ground and the playing pitches on Coldhams Common adjacent to the Abbey Sports Complex.</p> |
| <p>How far is the nearest play space for children and teenagers?</p> <p><i>Proximity to high quality play spaces makes an important contribution to the health and well-being of children. As such, measuring the distance of a site from the nearest children's play space has been included to provide an indication of the</i></p>   | <p><b>A = &gt;400m</b> from children and teenager's play space<br/> <b>G = &lt;400m</b>; or allocation is not housing</p>   | <p>Green: Site is within 400m of children's play area beside Abbey Pool.</p>  |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <p><i>sustainability of the site.</i><br/> <i>The assessment should also give consideration as to whether the size of the site and scale of development are likely to require a contribution to the provision of new local services such as new play space via S106 contributions</i></p>  |  |   |
| <p>How far is the nearest accessible natural greenspace of 2ha?</p> <p><i>Proximity to high quality open spaces makes an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities. In planning for new development, consideration needs to be given to the proximity of development to parks/open space/multi-functional greenspace so that new residents can access these using sustainable modes of transport. As such, measuring the distance from the site to such spaces (as identified in the Council's Open Space Strategy) has been included to provide an indication of the sustainability of the site. The assessment should also give consideration as to whether the size of the site and scale of development</i></p> | <p><b>R =</b> &gt;400m<br/> <b>G =</b> &lt;400m; or allocation is not housing or employment</p>  | <p>Green: Site is within 400m of accessible natural greenspace of 2ha.</p>        |
| <b>Supporting Economic Growth</b>  |  |   |
| <p><b>Criteria</b></p>   | <p><b>Performance</b></p>  | <p><b>Comments</b></p>  |
| <p>How far is the nearest main employment centre?</p> <p><i>National planning policy promotes patterns of development which facilitate the use of sustainable modes of transport. Proximity between housing and employment centres is likely to promote the use of sustainable modes of transport. Criteria has therefore been included to measure the distance between the centre of the site and the main employment centre to provide an indication of the sustainability of the site.</i></p>  | <p><b>R =</b> &gt;3km<br/> <b>A =</b> 1-3km<br/> <b>G =</b> &lt;1km or allocation is for or includes a significant element of employment or is for another non-residential use</p>   | <p>Green: Site is less than 1km from an employment centre.</p>                    |
| <p>Would development result in the loss of employment land identified in the Employment Land Review?</p> <p><i>The ELR seeks to identify an adequate supply of sites to meet indicative job growth targets and</i></p>   | <p><b>R =</b> Significant loss of employment land and job opportunities not mitigated by alternative allocation in the area (&gt; 50%)<br/> <b>A =</b> Some loss of employment land and job opportunities mitigated by alternative</p> | <p>Green: No loss of employment land or allocation for employment development</p> |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <p><i>safeguard and protect those sites from competition from other higher value uses, particularly housing. Proposals for non employment-uses for sites identified for potential protection in the ELR should be weighed up against the potential for the proposed use as well as the need for it.</i></p>  | <p>allocation in the area (&lt; 50%).<br/> <b>G</b> = No loss of employment land / allocation is for employment development</p>   |  |
| <p>Would allocation result in development in deprived areas of Cambridge?</p> <p><i>The English Indices of Deprivation 2010 are measures of multiple deprivation at the small area level. The model of multiple deprivation which underpins the Indices of Deprivation 2010 is based on the idea of distinct domains of deprivation which can be recognised and measured separately. These domains are experienced by individuals living in an area. Inclusion of this criteria will identify where development may benefit areas where deprivation is an issue.</i></p> | <p><b>A</b> = Not within or adjacent to the 40% most deprived Super Output Areas within Cambridge according to the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010.<br/> <b>G</b> = Within or adjacent to the 40% most deprived Super Output Areas within Cambridge according to the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010.</p> | <p>Green: Site in Abbey LSOA 7945: 24.27 and Abbey LSOA 7946: 33.03. Both within the 40% most deprived LSOAs</p> |

**Sustainable Transport**

| Criteria   | Performance  | Comments  |
|--|--|---|
| <p>What type of public transport service is accessible at the edge of the site?</p> <p><i>National Planning Policy promotes the need to support a pattern of development which facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport. Access between residential, employment and retail uses and high quality public transport routes is pivotal to achieving that aim. As such the inclusion of criteria that measures the distance of a site from the nearest high quality public transport route will provide an indication of the sustainability of the site. In assessing the performance of this criteria, reference should be made to the Cambridge City Local Plan definition of 'high quality public transport routes'.</i></p> | <p><b>R</b> = Service does not meet the requirements of a high quality public transport (HQPT)<br/> <b>A</b> = service meets requirements of high quality public transport in most but not all instances<br/> <b>G</b> = High quality public transport service</p> | <p>Green: Accessible to HQPT as defined. Site is within 400m of other bus services that link the site to the City Centre and other areas.</p> |
| <p>How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?</p> <p><i>National Planning Policy promotes the need to support a pattern of development which facilitates the</i></p>  | <p><b>R</b> = &gt;800m<br/> <b>A</b> = 400 - 800m<br/> <b>G</b> = &lt;400m</p>   | <p>Red: Site is beyond 800m from either an existing or proposed train station</p>   |

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <p><i>use of sustainable modes of transport. Access between residential, employment and retail uses and high quality public transport routes is pivotal to achieving that aim. As such the inclusion of criteria that measures the distance of a site from the nearest train station will provide an indication of the sustainability of the site.</i></p>  |   |   |
| <p>What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?</p> <p><i>National Planning Policy stresses the importance of developments being located and designed where practical to give priority to pedestrian and <b>cycle movements</b>. The inclusion of criteria that measures the distance of a site from the nearest cycle route will provide an indication of the sustainability of the site.</i></p>  | <p><b>RR</b> = no cycling provision and traffic speeds &gt;30mph with high vehicular traffic volume.</p> <p><b>R</b> = No cycling provision or a cycle lane less than 1.5m width with medium volume of traffic. Having to cross a busy junction with high cycle accident rate to access local facilities/school.</p> <p><b>A</b> = Poor or medium quality off-road path.</p> <p><b>G</b> = Quiet residential street speed below 30mph, cycle lane with 1.5m minimum width, high quality off-road path e.g. cycleway adjacent to guided busway.</p> <p><b>GG</b> = Quiet residential street designed for 20mph speeds, high quality off-road paths with good segregation from pedestrians, uni-directional hybrid cycle lanes.</p> | <p>Amber: There are good, though more circuitous links to the city centre via riverside but the more direct link via Newmarket rd is poor. There is an off-road link across Coldham's Common towards the station but this is unlit so there are personal security issues.</p> |
| <b>Air Quality, pollution, contamination and noise</b>  |   |   |
| Criteria  | Performance   | Comments  |
| <p>Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?</p> <p><i>The planning system has a role to play in the protection of air quality by ensuring that land use decisions do not adversely affect, or are not adversely affected by, the air quality in any AQMA, or conflict with or render ineffective any elements of the local authority's air quality action plan. There is currently one AQMA within Cambridge. Inclusion of criteria that measures the distance between the site and the AQMA, as well as between the site and roads with the highest traffic volumes causing poor air quality, will provide an indication</i></p> | <p><b>R</b> = Within or adjacent to an AQMA, M11 or A14</p> <p><b>A</b> = &lt;1000m of an AQMA, M11 or A14</p> <p><b>G</b> = &gt;1000m of an AQMA, M11, or A14</p>  | <p>Amber: &lt;1000m of an AQMA</p>  |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <p><i>of the sustainability of the site.</i></p> <p>Would the development of the site result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?<br/> <i>National planning policy requires preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of air pollution.</i></p>  | <p><b>R</b> = Significant adverse impact<br/> <b>A</b> = Adverse impact capable of adequate mitigation.<br/> <b>G</b> = Minimal, no impact, reduced impact</p>   | <p>Amber: Adverse impact capable of adequate mitigation.</p>   |
| <p>Are there potential noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?<br/> <i>National planning policy requires preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of noise pollution.</i><br/> <i>Criteria has been included to assess whether there are any existing noise sources that could impact on the suitability of a site, which is of particular importance for residential development. The presence of noise sources will not necessarily render a site undevelopable as appropriate mitigation measures may be available, and will also depend on the proposed development use.</i></p> | <p><b>R</b> = Significant adverse impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation<br/> <b>A</b> = Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation<br/> <b>G</b> = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation</p>  | <p>Amber: Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation.</p>  |
| <p>Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?</p>   | <p><b>R</b> = Significant adverse impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation<br/> <b>A</b> = Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation<br/> <b>G</b> = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation</p>  | <p>Green: No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation</p>   |
| <p>Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?</p>   | <p><b>R</b> = Significant adverse impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation<br/> <b>A</b> = Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation<br/> <b>G</b> = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation</p>  | <p>Green: No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation</p>   |
| <p>Is there possible contamination on the site?<br/> <i>Contaminated land is a material planning consideration, and Land Use History Reports are available from the Council's Environmental Health Scientific Team. The presence of contamination will not always rule out development, but development should not be</i></p>   | <p><b>R</b> = All or a significant part of the site within an area with a history of contamination which, due to physical constraints or economic viability, is incapable of appropriate mitigation during the plan period<br/> <b>A</b> = Site partially within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination, or capable of remediation</p> | <p>Amber. Site partially within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination, or capable of remediation appropriate to proposed development.</p> |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <i>permitted in areas subject to pollution levels that are incompatible with the proposed use. Mitigation measures can be implemented to overcome some contaminated land issues, although this may have an impact on the economic viability of the development. Further investigation will be required to establish the nature of any contamination present on sites and the implications that this will have for development.</i>   | appropriate to proposed development<br><b>G</b> = Site not within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination  |   |
| <b>Protecting Groundwater</b>  |   |   |
| <b>Criteria</b>  | <b>Performance</b>  | <b>Comments</b>   |
| <p>Would development be within a source protection zone (EA data)?</p> <p><i>Groundwater sources (e.g. wells, boreholes and springs) are used for public drinking water supply. These zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area.</i></p>   | <p><b>A</b> = Within SPZ 1<br/> <b>G</b> = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace</p>  | Green: Not within SPZ1  |
| <b>Protecting the townscape and historic environment</b> ( <i>Landscape addressed by Green Belt criteria</i> )   |   |   |
| <b>Criteria</b>  | <b>Performance</b>  | <b>Comments</b>   |
| <p>Would allocation impact upon a historic park/garden?</p> <p><i>Historic parks and gardens that have been registered under the 1983 National Heritage Act have legal protection. There are 11 historic parks and gardens in Cambridge. National planning policy requires substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, including historic parks, to be wholly exceptional. As such this criteria has been included to allow consideration of whether development on the site would have an adverse impact on a historic park or garden its setting.</i></p> | <p><b>R</b> = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such areas with potential for significant negative impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation<br/> <b>A</b> = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such areas with potential for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation<br/> <b>G</b> = Site does not contain or adjoin such areas, and there is no impact to the setting of such areas</p>         | Green: Site does not contain or adjoin such areas, and there is no impact to the setting of such areas                            |
| <p>Would development impact upon a Conservation Area?</p> <p><i>The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, imposes a duty on planning authorities to designate as conservation areas 'areas of special architectural or historic interest that character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance'. Cambridge's Conservation Areas are relatively diverse. As such consideration needs to be given to the potential impact that</i></p>   | <p><b>R</b> = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such an area with potential for significant negative impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation<br/> <b>A</b> = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such an area with potential for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation<br/> <b>G</b> = Site does not contain or adjoin such an area, and there is no impact to the setting of such an area</p> | Amber: Site is adjacent to Central Conservation Area and has the potential for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation |



|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <i>development may have on the setting, or views into and out of a Conservation Area.</i>   |  |  |
| <p>Would development impact upon buildings of local interest<br/> <i>There are over 1,000 buildings in Cambridge that are important to the locality or the City's history and architectural development. Local planning policy protects such buildings from development which adversely affects them unless:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>The building is demonstrably incapable of beneficial use or reuse;</i></li> <li>- <i>or there are clear public benefits arising from redevelopment.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>As such the presence of a locally listed building on a site would not necessarily rule development; however detailed justification would be required to demonstrate acceptability of schemes at the planning application stage.</i></p> | <p><b>A</b> = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such buildings with potential for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation<br/> <b>G</b> = Site does not contain or adjoin such buildings, and there is no impact to the setting of such buildings</p> | Green: Site does not contain or adjoin such buildings, and there is no impact to the setting of such buildings   |
| Would development impact upon archaeology?  | <p><b>R</b> = Known archaeology on site or in vicinity requiring verification before any planning consent can be given<br/> <b>A</b> = Known archaeology on site or in vicinity<br/> <b>G</b> = No known archaeology on site or in vicinity</p>  | Amber: Located in an area known for its 18th and 19th century industry, evidence for Roman and Saxon settlement has been identified to the north (HER 17486). Of particular significance is Stourbridge Chapel to the north west, dating from the 12th century (HER 04781) |

**Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure**

| Criteria   | Performance  | Comments   |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Would development impact upon a locally designated wildlife site i.e. (Local Nature Reserve, County Wildlife Site, City Wildlife Site)</p> <p><i>Sites of local nature conservation include Local Nature Reserves, County Wildlife Sites and City Wildlife Sites. Local authorities have a Duty to have regard to the conservation of biodiversity in exercising their functions. As such development within such sites, or that may affect the substantive nature conservation value of such sites, will not normally be permitted. Where development is permitted, suitable mitigation and/or compensatory measures and nature conservation enhancement measures should be implemented.</i></p> | <p><b>R</b> = Contains or is adjacent to an existing site and impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation<br/> <b>A</b> = Contains or is adjacent to an existing site and impacts capable of appropriate mitigation<br/> <b>G</b> = Does not contain, is not adjacent to or local area will be developed as greenspace</p> | Amber: Site adjacent to Coldham's Common County Wildlife Site and Coldham's Brook City Wildlife Site and Barnwell Pit City Wildlife Site. Existing stadium currently has pedestrian access from the Common and across the watercourse. |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Does the site offer opportunity for green infrastructure delivery?<br/> <i>Green infrastructure plays an important role in delivering a wide range of environmental and quality of life benefits for local communities. As such criteria has been included to assess the opportunity that development on the site could have on creating and enhancing green infrastructure delivery.</i></p>   | <p><b>R</b> = Development involves a loss of existing green infrastructure which is incapable of appropriate mitigation.<br/> <b>A</b> = No significant opportunities or loss of existing green infrastructure capable of appropriate mitigation<br/> <b>G</b> = Development could deliver significant new green infrastructure</p>  | <p>Amber: Constrained site would provide limited opportunities for Green Infrastructure. Potential to enhance existing brook and grassland.</p>  |
| <p>Would development reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?)<br/> <i>A number of Biodiversity Species and Habitat Action Plans exist for Cambridge. Such sites play an important role in enhancing existing biodiversity for enjoyment and education. National planning policy requires the protection and recovery of priority species populations, linked to national and local targets. As such development within sites where BAP priority species or habitats are known to be present, or that may affect the substantive nature conservation value of such sites, will not normally be permitted. Where development is permitted, suitable mitigation and/or compensatory measures and nature conservation enhancement measures should be implemented.</i></p> | <p><b>R</b> = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links incapable of appropriate mitigation<br/> <b>A</b> = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links but capable of appropriate mitigation<br/> <b>G</b> = Development could have a positive impact by enhancing existing features and adding new features or network links</p> | <p>Green: Potential to enhance existing brook through improved bank treatment, invasive species control and target species for recovery such as scarce aquatic plants and water voles.</p> |
| <p>Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?<br/> <i>Trees are an important facet of the townscape and landscape and the maintenance of a healthy and species diverse tree cover brings a range of health, social, biodiversity and microclimate benefits. Cambridge has in excess of 500 TPOs in force. When considering sites that include trees covered by TPOs, the felling, significant surgery or potential root damage to such trees should be avoided unless there are demonstrable public benefits accruing from the development that outweigh the current and future amenity value of the trees.</i></p>   | <p><b>R</b> = Development likely to have a significant adverse impact on the protected trees incapable of appropriate mitigation<br/> <b>A</b> = Any adverse impact on protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation<br/> <b>G</b> = Site does not contain or adjoin any protected trees</p>   | <p>Green: Site does not contain or adjoin any protected trees</p>  |
| <p><b>Any other information not captured above?</b></p>  |  |  |

| <b>Level 2 Conclusion</b>                                       |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <b>Level 2 Conclusion</b> (after allowing scope for mitigation) | <p><b>R</b> = Significant constraints or adverse impacts<br/> <b>A</b> = Some constraints or adverse impacts<br/> <b>G</b> = Minor constraints or adverse impacts</p>  | <p><b>Red:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Loss of Protected Open Space</li> <li>· More than 400m from nearest area of accessible natural greenspace of 2ha</li> <li>· More than 800m from the edge of the City Centre</li> <li>· More than 800m from the nearest health centre or GP service</li> <li>· More than 800m from existing or proposed train station</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Overall Conclusion</b>                                       | <p><b>R</b> = Site with no significant development potential (significant constraints and adverse impacts)<br/> <b>A</b> = Site with development potential (some constraints or adverse impacts)<br/> <b>G</b> = Site with development potential (few or minor constraints or adverse impacts)</p> | <p><b>Amber:</b><br/>                     Site with development potential (some constraints or adverse impacts)</p> <p><b>Pros:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Close to good public transport</li> <li>· Development in a deprived part of the city.</li> <li>· Opportunities to improve green infrastructure</li> <li>· Many constraints such as access and highway capacity could be overcome with suitable mitigation</li> <li>· Limited impact on the environment with mitigation measured available</li> </ul> <p><b>Cons:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· There are lease issues on the site which need to be overcome</li> <li>· Loss of United Football Ground. Any future development would need to satisfactorily demonstrate recreational facilities are re-provided elsewhere in an appropriate manner.</li> <li>· More than 400m from nearest area of accessible natural greenspace of 2ha</li> <li>· More than 800m from the edge of the City Centre</li> </ul> |

Cambridge Local Plan – Towards 2031  
 Technical Background Document – Site Assessments Within Cambridge

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
|   |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· More than 800m from the nearest health centre or GP service</li> <li>· More than 800m from existing or proposed train station</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Viability feedback (from consultants)</b></p> | <p><b>R</b> = Unlikely to be viable,<br/> <b>A</b> = May be viable<br/> <b>G</b> = Likely to be viable</p> | <p>Amber: Viability work is currently underway and will inform the next stage of site allocations work and any future updates of the SHLAA</p>                                    |