

Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report	
QUESTION NO.	SUMMARY OF REPS
<p>Support: 1 Object: 5 Comment: 1</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Natural England:</b> Habitats Regulations Assessment - Satisfied with the conclusion of the initial assessment which suggests no significant effects are likely as a result of the issues and options identified, alone or in combination with other plans.</li> <li>• <b>Natural England:</b> Welcome acknowledgement that the Council will need to continue to work with stakeholders, Anglian Water, Cambridge Water, and the Environment Agency, to ensure options selected can be appropriately served by water and waste water infrastructure.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should have scored contaminated land as neutral rather than positive, reflecting the precautionary principle;</li> <li>• sites that have been identified as 'not likely to be contaminated' should have a 'neutral' score whereas sites that may have contaminated land, should have a 'minor negative' score;</li> <li>• The Climate Change Sustainability Objective Decision Making Criterion does not take the energy saved through not burning fossil fuels by providing development in a sustainable location close to services and employment;</li> <li>• Does not sufficiently reflect benefits of an edge of Cambridge location for walking and cycling, doesn't reflect that short journeys more likely to be undertaken on foot and cycle than long journeys.</li> <li>• Scoping report needs to more fully consider impact of fossil fuels on climate change, linked to climate change objectives</li> <li>• Concerned land on edge of Cambridge has not been directly compared with lesser options.</li> <li>• effect of minimising car journeys is not fully reflected in the Sustainability Objective which requires minimising or mitigating against sources of pollution.</li> <li>• Access to employment test, by assessing access to sites of 2000 jobs, does not adequately highlight benefits of a Cambridge location.</li> <li>• Does not do enough to test access on foot e.g. walking to Cambridge.</li> <li>• No acknowledgement urban extension could bring forward an integrated transport system.</li> <li>• Would not acknowledge site specific benefit of</li> </ul>

	<p>delivering a transport hub.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cycling indicator should be adjusted, so 2km or less achieves highest score, and journeys over 10km get a lower score. Should also consider distance to a local centre.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Natural England:</b> Clarify how protection of public rights of way has been considered.</li> <li>• <b>RSPB:</b> The impact on designated sites (Breckland SPA and Ouse Washes SPA), even if it is not within the District Council area, needs to be a key consideration during the planning of new developments. The impact of an increased population within the plan area on the Breckland SPA features: stone curlew, nightjar and woodlark. the impact of new developments on water quality around the Ouse Washes.</li> </ul>
<b>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Report</b>	
<b>QUESTION NO.</b>	<b>SUMMARY OF REPS</b>
<p>Support:6 Object: 6 Comment: 1</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Natural England:</b> We believe the methodology, assessment and recommendations in the report generally meet the requirements of the SEA Regulations in assessing the effects of the Plan on environmental, social and economic objectives. The SA objectives being considered seem appropriate.</li> <li>• Agree within the conclusions about the outcome of not delivering sufficient housing.</li> <li>• Support for rejection of Great Shelford sites.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned it does not draw out most sustainable options on the edge of Cambridge;</li> <li>• Does not allow for the highly sustainable sites such as Cambridge Southern Expansion to be differentiated from lesser sites on several counts.</li> <li>• Need to consider sustainability implications of non-green belt release, including direct comparison with new settlement options;</li> <li>• Conclusions regarding Broad location 1 (Barton road) do not reflect potential positive impacts of development that are acknowledged in Cambridge City Council Initial Sustainability Appraisal;</li> <li>• Appraisal of Old Coal Yard Oakington incorrect.</li> <li>• Site 27 Cottenham Sawmills should be scored higher on a number of criteria;</li> <li>• Site 110 West of Birdlines, Manor Farm Comberton should be scored as red due to flooding;</li> <li>• Site 52 Cambridge Road Waterbeach, should be</li> </ul>

	scored as neutral for pollution, rather than minus.
--	---