

## APPENDIX 1: THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL FRAMEWORK

	Sustainability Objective	Decision Making Criteria	Indicators
LAND	1. Minimise the irreversible loss of undeveloped land, economic mineral reserves, productive agricultural holdings, and the degradation / loss of soils	Will it use land that has been previously developed?	Percentage of new and Converted Dwellings on Previously Developed Land
		Will it use land efficiently?	
Will it protect and enhance the best and most versatile agricultural land?		Amount and Type of Completed Employment on Previously Developed Land	
Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves? Will it minimise the degradation/loss of soils due to new development'		Average Density of New Residential Development Completed	
	2. Minimise waste production and support the reuse and recycling of waste products	Will it encourage reduction in household waste, and increase waste recovery and recycling?	Percentage Household Waste which is recycled or composted  Household Waste Collected per person per year
POLLUTION	3. Improve air quality and minimise or mitigate against sources of environmental pollution	Will it maintain or improve air quality?	Annual average concentration of Nitrogen Dioxide ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ) (at monitoring points)
		Will it minimise, and where possible improve on, unacceptable levels of noise, light pollution, odour and vibration?	
		Will it minimise, and where possible address, land contamination?	Annual mean number of days when PM10 levels exceeded a daily mean of $50\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$
		Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment?	% of surface waters meet the Water Framework Directive 'good' status or better for water quality
BIODIVERSITY	4. Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation interest, and geodiversity?	Change in area of sites of biodiversity importance (SPA, SAC, RAMSAR, SSSI, NNR, LNR, CWS)  Amount of new development within, or likely to adversely affect internationally or nationally important nature conservation areas  % SSSIs in favourable or unfavourable recovering condition

	<b>Sustainability Objective</b>	<b>Decision Making Criteria</b>	<b>Indicators</b>
	5. Maintain and enhance the range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	Will it reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan Targets)?	Progress in achieving priority BAP targets  Proportion of 'local sites' where positive conservation management has been or is being implemented
	6. Improve opportunities for people to access and appreciate wildlife and green spaces	Will it improve access to wildlife and green spaces, through delivery and access to green infrastructure, or access to the countryside through public rights of way?	Area of Strategic Openspace per 1000 people  % of rights of way that are easy to use
LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE	7. Maintain and enhance the diversity and local distinctiveness of landscape and townscape character	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character?	% of total built-up areas falling within conservation areas
		Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character?	Countryside Quality Counts – areas inconsistent with (local) landscape character
	8. Avoid damage to areas and sites designated for their historic interest, and protect their settings.	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)?	Number of Listed Buildings and number that are at risk  Other Heritage Assets at Risk (English Heritage)
	9. Create places, spaces and buildings that work well, wear well and look good	Will it lead to developments built to a high standard of design and good place making that reflects local character?	Satisfaction rating for Quality of the built environment  Buildings for Life Assessments – Number of Developments achieving each standard
CLIMATE CHANGE	10. Minimise impacts on climate change (including greenhouse gas emissions)	Will it support the use of renewable energy resources?	Residential Development assessed for Code For Sustainable Homes
		Will it promote energy efficiency?	
		Will it minimise contributions to climate change through sustainable construction practices?	Carbon Dioxide emissions by sector and per capita

	<b>Sustainability Objective</b>	<b>Decision Making Criteria</b>	<b>Indicators</b>
	11. Reduce vulnerability to future climate change effects	Will it use water in a sustainable manner, and enable and encourage high levels of water efficiency?	Renewable energy capacity installed by type (in MegaWatts)
		Will it minimise risk to people and property from flooding, and incorporate sustainable drainage measures?	Kilowatt hours of gas consumed per household per year, Kilowatt hours of electricity consumed per household per year
		Will it minimise the likely impacts on future development of climate change through appropriate adaptation?	Water consumption per head per day (Cambridge Water Company area)  Amount of new development completed on previously undeveloped functional floodplain land, and in flood risk areas, without agreed flood defence measures
HEALTH	12. Maintain and enhance human health	Will it promote good health, encourage healthy lifestyles, and reduce health inequalities?	Life expectancy at birth  % of residents with a long-term illness (Census data)
	13. Reduce and prevent crime and reduce fear of crime	Will it reduce actual levels of crime, and will it reduce fear of crime?	Number of recorded crimes per 1000 people  Percentage of people feeling safe after dark
	14. Improve the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space.	Will it increase the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space?	Hectares of Outdoor Sport and Play Space per 1000 people
HOUSING	15. Ensure everyone has access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	Will it support the provision of a range of quality housing of appropriate types and sizes, including affordable housing, to meet the identified needs of all sectors of the community?	Total and percentage of Dwellings completed that are affordable  House price to earnings ratio  Delivery of Extracare Housing
		Will it result in quality homes for people within the district to live in?	Number of new Gypsies and Travellers pitches and Travelling Showpeople plots
		Will it provide for housing for the ageing population?	

	<b>Sustainability Objective</b>	<b>Decision Making Criteria</b>	<b>Indicators</b>
		Will it provide for the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?	
INCLUSIVE COMMUNITIES	16. Redress inequalities related to age, disability, gender, race, faith, location and income	Will it improve relations between people from different backgrounds or social groups?	% of residents who feel their local area is harmonious
		Will it redress all the sections of inequality included in the Council's Single Equality Scheme which are as follows - Age Disability Gender Reassignment Marriage and Civil Partnership Pregnancy and Maternity Race Religion or Belief Sex Sexual Orientation	% of residents that definitely agree or tend to agree that their local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together  Index of multiple deprivation
		Will it redress rural isolation - rurality?	
	17. Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities (e.g. health, transport, education, training, leisure opportunities)	Will it provide accessibility to key local services and facilities, including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs etc?)	Amount of new residential development within 30 minutes public transport journey time of key services
Will it improve quality and range of key local services and facilities including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs etc?)			
18. Encourage and enable the active involvement of local people in community activities	Will it increase the ability of people to influence decisions, including 'hard to reach' groups?	% of adults who feel they can influence decisions affecting their local area	
		% of residents that 'definitely agree' and 'tend to agree' that they can influence decisions affecting their local area	
	Will it encourage engagement in community activities?	% of people who have participated in regular formal volunteering in last twelve months	
ECONOMIC ACTIVITY	19. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy.	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?	Number of People in Employment  Annual net change in VAT registered firms

	<b>Sustainability Objective</b>	<b>Decision Making Criteria</b>	<b>Indicators</b>
		Will it promote the industries that thrive in the district – the key sectors such as research and development /high tech/ Cambridge University related particularly through the development and expansion of clusters?	Industrial composition of employee jobs
		Will it protect the shopping hierarchy, supporting the vitality and viability of Cambridge, town, district and local centres?	
	20. Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to their skills, potential and place of residence	Will it contribute to providing a range of employment opportunities, in accessible locations?	Percentage of people claiming Job Seekers Allowance
		Will it encourage the rural economy and diversification, and support sustainable tourism?	% of Residents aged 16-64 in employment and working within 5km of home or at home (Census data)  Economic Activity Rate  Median Gross Household income
	21. Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and other infrastructure	Will it improve the level of investment in key community services and infrastructure, including communications infrastructure and broadband?	Investment Secured for Infrastructure and Community Facilities through developer contributions
		Will it improve access to education and training, and support provision of skilled employees to the economy?	Percentage of 15/16 year olds achieving 5 or more GCSE/GNVQ passes at A* to C grade

	<b>Sustainability Objective</b>	<b>Decision Making Criteria</b>	<b>Indicators</b>
TRANSPORT	22. Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices.	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?	Vehicle flows across the South Cambridgeshire – Cambridge City boundary over 12 hour period Cycling trips index
		Will it support movement of freight by means other than road?	Congestion – average journey time per mile during the am peak environment
	23. Secure appropriate investment and development in transport infrastructure, and ensure the safety of the transport network.	Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity?	Investment secured for transport infrastructure through developer contributions
		Will it make the transport network safer for all users, both motorised and non-motorised?	People killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents



## APPENDIX 2: THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL FRAMEWORK - SITES

+++	Significant positive
+	Minor positive
0	Neutral
-	Minor Negative
---	Significant Negative

THEME	Sustainability Objective	Decision Making Criteria	+++	+	0	-	---	Notes
Land & Soil Resources	Minimise the irreversible loss of undeveloped land, economic mineral reserves, and productive agricultural holdings and the degradation / loss of soils	Will it use land that has been previously developed?	75% or more Previously Developed Land (PDL)	25% to 74% Previously Developed Land (PDL)	0% to 24% Previously Developed Land (PDL)			Appropriately located previously developed land (PDL) should be given priority over Greenfield land, in order to support efficient use of resources. In the district there is a limited supply of previously developed land. Greenfield development will therefore be scored as neutral, with the positive impacts of using PDL highlighted by positive scoring.
		Will it use land efficiently?						n/a dependent on type and design of development not location
		Will it protect and enhance the best and most versatile agricultural land?			Development would not affect best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1 and 2)	Minor loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1 and 2)	Significant loss (20 hectares or more) of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1 and 2)	Maps produced by DEFRA identify that most of South Cambridgeshire's farmland is in the higher grades of the Agricultural Land Grades 1, 2 and 3a are the grades which comprise the best and most versatile land which is a national resource. The DEFRA maps do not divide zone 3 into a and b. The focus of the appraisal will be on grade 1 and 2. Loss of 20 hectares or more would be considered significant, reflecting the threshold used for referring planning applications to DEFRA.



THEME	Sustainability Objective	Decision Making Criteria	+++	+	0	-	---	Notes
	Environmental Pollution Air Quality and		Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves?  Will it minimise the degradation/loss of soils due to new development?			Site not within a designated area identified in the Minerals and Waste LDF, development would not have negative impact.	Site falls within a designated area in the Minerals and Waste LDF, development would have minor negative impacts on identified Minerals Reserves	Site falls within a designated area in the Minerals and Waste LDF, development would have significant negative effect on identified Minerals Reserves
Minimise waste production and support the reuse and recycling of waste products		Will it encourage reduction in household waste, and increase waste recovery and recycling?						n/a dependent on type and design of development not location
Improve air quality and minimise or mitigate against sources of environmental pollution		Will it maintain or improve air quality?	Would remove significant existing source of air pollution. Site lies in an area where air quality will be acceptable.	Would remove minor existing source of air pollution. Site lies in an area where air quality will be acceptable.	Development unlikely to impact on air quality. Site lies in an area where air quality acceptable. Development unlikely to impact on air quality.	Site lies near source of air pollution, or development could impact on air quality, with minor negative impacts incapable of mitigation.	Site lies near source of air pollution, or development could impact on air quality, with significant negative impacts incapable of adequate mitigation.	Assessment will include impact on Air Quality Management Areas. They do not automatically make an area unsuitable for development, but are a material consideration. The assessment will include consideration of the health impacts of air quality.

THEME	Sustainability Objective	Decision Making Criteria	+++	+	0	-	---	Notes
		Minimise, and where possible improve on, unacceptable levels of noise, light pollution, odour and vibration?	Development would remove existing use that creates nuisance, resulting in significant benefits	Development would remove existing use that creates nuisance, resulting in minor benefits	Development compatible with neighbouring uses.	Will create minor negative impacts to, or as a result of, the development, with minor negative impacts incapable of mitigation.	Will create significant negative impacts to, or as a result of, the development, incapable of adequate mitigation	Considers whether the development of a site would result in nuisance that could affect surrounding uses, or whether the development itself would be subject to nuisance from surrounding uses. The assumption is made that sites will be designed to minimise light pollution, and the introduction of light to a previously dark area is not sufficient alone to result in a negative score.
	Will it minimise, and where possible address, land contamination?	Contamination, potential for major benefits through remediation of significant contamination	Contamination, potential for minor benefits through remediation of minor contamination	Development not on land likely to be contaminated.		Land likely to be contaminated, which due to physical constraints or economic viability cannot be satisfactorily remediated.	The presence of contamination will not always rule out development, as mitigation may be possible, although this could impact on delivery in terms of economic viability and timing of development. Removal and clean up of contamination can create positive benefits for the environment.	
	Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment?	Development would result in significant improvement to water quality (e.g. by removing source of pollution)	Development would result in minor improvement to water quality (e.g. by removing source of pollution)	Development unlikely to affect water quality.	Development has potential to affect water quality, with minor negative impacts incapable of mitigation.	Development has potential to effect water quality, with significant negative impacts incapable of mitigation.	The Environment Agency designates Source Protection Zones where there is a risk of contamination to groundwater resources. The presence of a Source Protection Zone does not rule out development, but may influence land use or require pollution control measures. Assumptions for a neutral impact are that appropriate standards and pollution control measures will be achieved through the development process, e.g. as part of Sustainable Drainage Systems (Suds).	

THEME	Sustainability Objective	Decision Making Criteria	+++	+	0	-	---	Notes
	Biodiversity	Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation interest and geodiversity?	Significant positive impact on protected sites and species	Minor positive impact on protected sites and species	No impact on protected sites and species (or impacts could be mitigated)	Minor negative impact on protected sites and species incapable of mitigation.	Significant negative impact on protected sites and species incapable of mitigation.
Maintain and enhance the range and viability of characteristic habitats and species		Will it reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan Targets)?	Significant Positive Impact (opportunity for enhancement and new features.	Minor Positive Impact (some opportunity for enhancement and new features.)	No impact (existing features that warrant retention can be retained or appropriate mitigation)	Minor Negative Impact (Existing features unlikely to be retained in their entirety, impacts cannot be fully mitigated)	Significant Negative Impact (loss of existing features, significant impacts unlikely to be capable of satisfactory mitigation)	Assumptions for a neutral impact include that appropriate design and mitigation measures would be achieved through the development process.
Improve opportunities for people to access and appreciate wildlife and green spaces		Will it improve access to wildlife and green spaces, through delivery and access to green infrastructure?	Development would deliver significant new Green Infrastructure.	Development would create minor opportunities for new Green Infrastructure.	No impact (existing features retained, or appropriate mitigation possible)	Development would result in minor loss of Green Infrastructure, incapable of mitigation.	Development would result in significant loss of Green Infrastructure, No satisfactory mitigation measures possible.	Green Infrastructure is a strategic, multi-functional network of public green spaces and routes, landscapes, biodiversity and heritage. It includes a wide range of elements such as country parks, wildlife habitats, rights of way, commons and greens, nature reserves, waterways and bodies of water, and historic landscapes and monuments.

THEME	Sustainability Objective	Decision Making Criteria	+++	+	0	-	---	Notes
Landscape, Townscape and Cultural Heritage	Maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape character	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character?	Significant Positive Impact (Development would relate to local landscape character and offer significant opportunities for landscape enhancement)	Minor Positive Impact (Development would relate to local landscape character and offer opportunities for landscape enhancement)	No impact (generally compatible, or capable of being made compatible with local landscape character)	Minor Negative Impact (Development conflicts with landscape character, minor negative impacts incapable of mitigation)	Significant Negative Impact (Development conflicts with landscape character, with significant negative impacts incapable of mitigation)	This indicator is generally qualitative rather than quantitative. Where studies exist on landscape character these will be used to inform the assessment. Whilst not explicitly about the Green Belt, impact on the significance of the site with regard to purposes of the Green Belt will be a consideration when identifying the impact. Built development cannot get a positive impact in the Green Belt.
		Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character?	Significant Positive Impact (Development would relate to local townscape character and offer significant opportunities for enhancement)	Minor Positive Impact (Development would relate to local townscape character and offer opportunities for enhancement)	No impact (generally compatible with local townscape character)	Minor Negative Impact (Development conflicts with townscape character, minor negative impacts incapable of mitigation)	Significant Negative Impact (Development conflicts with townscape character, with significant negative impacts incapable of mitigation)	This indicator is generally qualitative rather than quantitative. Where studies exist of townscape character these have been used to inform the assessment. Will also take into account the presence of Protected Village Amenity Areas and Important Countryside Frontages.

THEME	Sustainability Objective	Decision Making Criteria	+++	+	0	-	---	Notes
		Avoid damage to areas and sites designated for their historic interest, and protect their settings.	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)?	Significant Positive Impact on Historic Assets	Minor Positive Impact on Historic Assets	No impact (or impacts capable of mitigation)	Minor Negative Impact on historic Assets (incapable of satisfactory mitigation)	
	Create places, spaces and buildings that work well, wear well and look good	Will it lead to developments built to a high standard of design and good place making that reflects local character?						n/a dependent on type and design of development not location
Climate Change	Minimise impacts on climate change (including greenhouse gas emissions)	Will it support the use of renewable energy resources?	Development would create major additional opportunities for renewable energy	Development would create minor additional opportunities for renewable energy	Standard requirements for renewables would apply.			Policies may continue to be included in the plan which require all sites to include a level of on-site renewable energy, which will therefore be proportionate to the scale of the development, therefore schemes will generally be scored as neutral. A positive score will be reserved for where the site offers a specific opportunity that can be secured through development beyond established policy.
		Will it promote energy efficiency?						n/a dependent on type and design of development not location.

THEME	Sustainability Objective	Decision Making Criteria	+++	+	0	-	---	Notes
		Will it minimise contributions to climate change through sustainable construction practices?						
Reduce vulnerability to future climate change effects	Will it minimise risk to people and property from flooding, and incorporate sustainable drainage measures?	Flood Zone 1 and no issues that cannot be appropriately addressed PLUS opportunities for reducing flood risk elsewhere.			Flood Zone 1 and no drainage issues that cannot be appropriately addressed	Flood Zone 2, Flood Zone 3 (or other form of flood risk incapable of appropriate mitigation)		National planning guidance requires a sequential approach to development and flood risk. Land in Flood Zones 2 or 3, in that sequence, should only be allocated if it can be demonstrated that there are no reasonably available sites in Zone 1 (the lowest risk of flooding) and must then take account of the vulnerability of the proposed land use and apply the exception test. National policy also requires developments not to increase flood risk elsewhere. Where a development offers a specific and deliverable opportunity to reduce flood risk elsewhere, this will achieve a positive score.
	Will it minimise the likely impacts of climate change on the development through appropriate design?							n/a dependent on type and design of development not location.
	Will it use water in a sustainable manner, and enable and encourage high levels of water efficiency?							n/a dependent on type and design of development not location.

THEME	Sustainability Objective	Decision Making Criteria	+++	+	0	-	---	Notes
Health	Maintain and enhance human health	Will it promote good health, encourage healthy lifestyles, and reduce health inequalities?						n/a dependent on type and design of development not location. To avoid repetition this indicator will not be applied at a site comparison level. There are a range of other indicators relate to human health, including environmental issues (air quality and other forms of pollution), access to services and facilities, safe transport access and opportunities to use alternative transport modes, access to open space and Green Infrastructure.
	Reduce and prevent crime and reduce fear of crime	Will it reduce actual levels of crime, and will it reduce fear of crime?						n/a dependent on type and design of development not location.
Inclusive Communities - Housing	Improve the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space.	Will it increase the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space?	Development would deliver significant new public open space	Development would create minor opportunities for new public open space	No impact (existing features retained or appropriate mitigation)	Development would result in loss of public open space, minor impacts incapable of mitigation.	Development would result in significant loss of public open space.	It will be assumed that all potential housing sites would, as a minimum, provide the required level of new open space by policies established elsewhere in the plan. A positive weighting will be considered where a potential development site presents the opportunity to improve public accessibility or remedy an existing deficiency in provision. A development that will deliver open space against adopted standards, to meet the needs generated by the development, would be scored as a neutral impact. Development proposals that would result in loss of public open space which is not surplus to requirements would have a negative impact on existing communities.
	Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	Will it support the provision of a range of housing types and sizes, including affordable and key worker housing, to meet the identified needs of all sectors of the community?						N/A It is likely that all sites would be required to make provision for affordable housing, in line with the Council's adopted policies. Scale of contribution will depend on the scale of the site.

THEME	Sustainability Objective	Decision Making Criteria	+++	+	0	-	---	Notes
		Will it provide for housing for the ageing population?						N/A Dependent on type and design of development not location.
		Will it provide for the housing accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?	Site would provide 5 or more pitches	Site would provide 1 to 4 pitches	No effect on pitch or plot provision.	Site would result in loss of 1 to 4 pitches	Site would result in loss of 5 or more pitches	Sites which would specifically provide accommodation for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation will achieve a positive score against this indicator.
Inclusive Communities - Redressing inequalities and involving the community	Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities (e.g. health, transport, education, training, leisure opportunities)	Will it improve accessibility to key local services and facilities, including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs, sports facilities etc?)	Edge of Cambridge	Rural Centre	Minor	Group	Infill	The Settlement hierarchy will be developed considering the accessibility to services and facilities, and provides an appropriate proxy for assessing this objective. Note: Measures as the crow flies. Note: New Settlements will be considered on a case by case basis where they could fit in the hierarchy.
		Sub-Indicator: Distance to centre	Within 400m	Within 600m	Within 800m	Within 1000m	Beyond 1000m	The location in the village hierarchy is considered to be the key indicator, but the location of the site relative to the village centre is also an important issue. It will be particularly helpful for differentiating between sites at similar levels in the hierarchy. Note: Measures as the crow flies, to a specific central point in the village centre identified considering the location of facilities. If a particular service is disproportionately distant from a site, this will be noted. For sites on the edge of Cambridge measurements to a district or local centre defined in the Cambridge Local Plan will be used. For major development proposals the appraisal will also consider whether facilities would be provided on site.



THEME	Sustainability Objective	Decision Making Criteria	+++	+	0	-	---	Notes
		Will it improve quality and range of key local services and facilities including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs etc?)	New local facilities or improved existing facilities are proposed of significant benefit	New facilities or improved existing facilities are proposed of minor benefit	No impact on facilities (or satisfactory mitigation proposed).	Development would result in loss of existing facilities, minor negative impact.	Development would result in loss of an existing facilities, major negative impact.	Site assessments will consider whether a suggested development site would affect any existing or proposed community services or facilities. Where new or improved facility that is suitable or viable is proposed it will receive a positive assessment. Where an existing facility would be lost, the assessment will consider the scale of the impact. For example if a facility was underused, it would receive a lesser impact. If appropriate mitigation is proposed, such as a replacement facility of equivalent value, the assessment would indicate a neutral impact.
	Will improve relations between people from different backgrounds or social groups?						n/a dependent on type and design of development not location.	
	Redress inequalities related to age, disability, gender assignment race, faith, location and income	Will it redress inequalities?					n/a dependent on type and design of development, and a range of factors addressed by other indicators	
		Will it increase the ability of people to influence decisions, including 'hard to reach' groups?					n/a dependent on type and design of development, and a range of factors addressed by other indicators	
	Encourage and enable the active involvement of local people in community activities	Will it encourage engagement with community activities?	New local community / village hall or improved existing facility is proposed of significant benefit (and is viable and sustainable)	New local community / village hall or improved existing facility is proposed of minor benefit (and is viable and sustainable)	No facilities would be lost.	Development would result in loss of an existing local community / village hall. No satisfactory mitigation proposed.	Village Halls, Community centres of other meeting places. Focus will be on facilities addressed by the South Cambridgeshire Community Facilities Assessment.	

THEME	Sustainability Objective	Decision Making Criteria						Notes
			+++	+	0	-	---	
Economic Activity	Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy.	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?	Development would significantly enhance employment opportunities	Development would support minor additional employment opportunities	Development would have no effect on employment land or premises	Development would have a minor negative effect on employment opportunities, as a result of the loss of existing employment land.	Development would have significant negative effect on employment opportunities, as a result of the loss of existing employment land.	Tests the impact of a site proposal on employment land and premises. If a site is proposed for mixed use development, or proposed for employment uses, it could enhance employment opportunities.
		Will it promote the industries that thrive in the district – the key sectors such as research and development /high tech/ Cambridge university related particularly through the development and expansion of clusters?						N/A Not applicable to residential development proposals
		Will it protect the shopping hierarchy, supporting the vitality and viability of Cambridge, town, district and local centres?	Development would significantly add to vitality or viability of existing centres.	Development would support vitality or viability of existing centres.	Development would have no effect on vitality or viability of existing centres.	Development would have negative effect on vitality or viability of existing centres.	Development would have significant negative effect on vitality or viability of existing centres.	National planning policy requires the consideration of the impact of policies and proposals on vitality and viability of town centres. The indicator is likely to apply particularly to sites which include retail, offices, or leisure uses.

THEME	Sustainability Objective	Decision Making Criteria	+++	+	0	-	---	Notes
		Will it encourage the rural economy and diversification, and support sustainable tourism?						
	Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to their skills, potential and place of residence	Will it contribute to providing a range of employment opportunities, in accessible locations?	Public Transport Accessibility to Nearest Area of Employment with 2000+ Employees - Less than 15 minutes	Public Transport Accessibility to Nearest Area of Employment with 2000+ Employees - Between 15 and 30 minutes	Public Transport Accessibility to Nearest Area of Employment with 2000+ Employees - Between 30 and 45 minutes	Public Transport Accessibility to Nearest Area of Employment with 2000+ Employees - Between 45 and 60 minutes	Public Transport Accessibility to Nearest Area of Employment with 2000+ Employees - Greater than 60 minutes	Delivery of employment through sites is tested separately, this indicator utilises transport modelling to assess transport accessibility to employment areas by public transport or walking. It utilises accession transport modelling, operated by the County Council, to measure journey time to a major employment area, identified as proving over 2000 jobs in the 2001 census. Major new settlements, which could include employment hubs, will be considered to be highly accessible. Where assumptions are made regarding site options this will be highlighted.
	Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and other infrastructure	Will it improve the level of investment in key community services and infrastructure, including broadband?	Development can use existing capacity in utilities infrastructure	Minor Utilities Infrastructure improvements required, but constraints can be addressed.	No impact on Utilities e.g. not built development	Major utilities Infrastructure improvements required, but constraints can be addressed.	Utilities capacity not sufficient, constraints cannot be adequately addressed.	Focus of site testing will be utilities infrastructure. Information will be sought from utilities service providers. A particular focus will be on Sewage Treatment capacity, where infrastructure capacity can be limited by capacity of receiving watercourses. Utilising existing infrastructure where there is existing capacity will be scored highest.
		Will it improve access to education and training, and support provision of skilled employees to the economy?	Sufficient surplus capacity available in local Schools	School capacity constraints but potential for improvement to meet needs.	No impact on Schools e.g. not residential development	School capacity not sufficient, but significant issues be adequately addressed	Capacity not sufficient, constraints cannot be adequately addressed.	The infrastructure requirements of a new development must be considered. There may be capacity in existing schools to serve the needs of new developments, and there may be potential for improvements to schools to serve additional pupils. Larger developments may create a requirement for new schools. Homes specifically for older people will be assumed to have a neutral impact.

THEME	Sustainability Objective	Decision Making Criteria	+++	+	0	-	---	Notes
Transport	Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices.	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?	Score 20 to 24 from four criteria below	Score 15 to 19 from four criteria below	Score 10 to 14 from four criteria below	Score 5 to 9 from four criteria below	Score 0 to 4 from four criteria below	In order to provide an indication of the sustainability of a site with regard to its potential to promote travel by alternative modes of transport, a scoring mechanism has been developed to consider access to and quality of public transport, and cycling. Scores are attributed through the four sub-criteria below, and the totals are used to provide an overall assessment of accessibility.
		Sub-indicator: Distance to bus stop / rail station	Within 400m (6)	Within 600m (4)	800m (3)	Within 1000m (2)	Beyond 1000m (0)	Distance to the nearest public transport node (i.e. bus stop or potentially rail station) is one element of considering the quality of access to public transport. It should also be considered that in relation to some very large sites new or revised public transport routes or stops may be provided to meet the needs of the development. Where this is assumed this will be made clear in the assessment. Distance is measured as the crow flies from the centre of the site, to a point in the centre of Cambridge or market town. Where there are alternative transport routes available, the appraisal will explore the combination that will get the highest score.
		Sub-indicator: Frequency of Public Transport	10 Minute Service or better (6)	20 minute service (4)	30 minute frequency service (3)	hourly service (2)	less than hourly service (0)	Frequency of public transport is based on timetables as available at the time of the assessment, and summarised in the Village Services and Facilities study. Where there is variation it will utilise the frequency of peak times. If there is more than one bus service it will consider the combined frequency. It will also consider the highest frequency destination e.g. Cambridge or a market town. Where there is variation it will utilise frequency at peak times.

THEME	Sustainability Objective	Decision Making Criteria	+++	+	0	-	---	Notes
			Sub-indicator: Typical Public Transport Journey Time to Cambridge City Centre or Market Town	20 minutes or less (6)	Between 21 and 30 minutes (4)	Between 31 and 40 minutes (3)	Between 41 and 50 minutes (2)	Greater than 50 minutes (0)
		Sub-indicator: Distance for cycling to City Centre or Market Town	up to 5km (6)	5 to 10km (4)	10 to 15km (3)	15km+ (2)	20+ Km (0)	National policy highlights that cycling has the potential to substitute for short car trips, particularly under 5 kilometres. In the context of the district and reducing car trips, the indicator considers distance to Cambridge or a market town. Notes: Measures the distance from the centre of a site to a defined point at the centre of Cambridge or nearest market town.
	Secure appropriate investment and development in transport infrastructure, and ensure the safety of the transport network.	Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity?	No capacity constraints identified that cannot be addressed, would result in significant improvement in highway capacity or improve highway access	No capacity constraints identified that cannot be addressed, would result in minor improvement in highway capacity or improve highway access	No capacity constraints identified, safe access can be achieved.	Insufficient capacity or access constraints. Minor negative effects incapable of mitigation.	Insufficient capacity or access constraints that cannot be adequately mitigated.	Sites will need to be capable of achieving appropriate access that meets Local Highway Authority standards for the scale of the development. For large sites in particular, the issue of capacity in the surrounding network will also be relevant. The Highways Agency and the Local Highways Authority have been consulted.

THEME	Sustainability Objective	Decision Making Criteria	+++	+	0	-	---	Notes
		Will it make the transport network safer for and promote use of non-motorised modes?	Would result in significant improvement to public transport, walking or cycling facilities	Would result in minor improvement to public transport, walking or cycling facilities	no impact	Would result in minor negative impact to public transport, walking or cycling facilities	Would result in major negative impact to public transport, walking or cycling facilities	New development may provide the opportunity for infrastructure improvements which would support travel by alternative modes to the car.