



EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Partial Assessment Form

Policy, practice, function or project assessed	Orchard Park Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document
Lead Officer	Claire Spencer
Team	Planning Policy
Start date of assessment	16 June 2010
Completion of assessment	28 February 2011

Please use this form to record your findings in relation to the assessment of an existing policy, function, service or practice.

A. POLICY, PRACTICE, FUNCTION OR PROJECT TO BE ASSESSED

A1. Please describe what are the main aims, objectives, purpose and intended outcomes of the policy or function?

The purpose of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) is to expand on policies set out in Development Plan Documents (DPD) and to provide additional detail. The SPD expands on Policy SP/1 Cambridge Northern Fringe West (Orchard Park) contained within the adopted Site Specific Policies DPD, adopted in January 2010 and policies in the Development Control Policies DPD.

Policy SP/1 seeks to achieve a sustainable housing-led mixed-use development on the Orchard Park site on the Cambridge Northern Fringe. A large proportion of the site has planning permission and has been, or is currently being, developed. The remainder of the site, largely plots to the north and south west of the site, has yet to come forward. The Orchard Park SPD concerns itself with the design of the remaining land parcels and is not land use specific.

Achieving good design and sustainable development are the core principals underlying planning. At the heart of sustainable development is the simple idea of ensuring a better quality of life for everyone, now and for future generations. The aim of the SPD is to provide additional guidance on how remaining developments can ensure they are sustainable and achieve a high quality of design in a way that respects the local context.

The vision of the SPD is for the remaining development at Orchard Park to contribute to making Orchard Park an attractive, vibrant and contemporary new neighbourhood for Cambridge. New development should take its inspiration from the unique Cambridge context, linking public open spaces and buildings that are formal, with fine grain and domestic scale streets. Of key importance is the creation of a place that is safe, accessible and easy to move around.

The overarching objective of the SPD is to provide clear and concise design guidance for the developers of the remaining undeveloped land within Orchard Park. It sets out the design principles the Council expects to be addressed through the planning application process to ensure the creation of a high quality desirable 'place'.

Specific objectives for the SPD are set out in paragraphs 3.6 to 3.9 of the SPD as follows:

- 3.6. The primary objective for the development of Orchard Park as a whole, as set out in the policy for the new neighbourhood, is to provide a high quality sustainable housing-led mixed-use development.
- 3.7. New developments should reinforce the character area for Orchard Park in which it is located:
 - for Arbury Park, development should be located within high quality accessible open spaces, provide an appropriate 'gateway' to Cambridge and Orchard Park and should integrate with existing developments;
 - for the Circus, development should encompass the active heart of the new community and reflect the formality of the avenue

- route from Kings Hedges Road to Unwin Square via the Circus, terminating in the civic space of Unwin Square;
- the Square character area influences only Plot COM3 and it is envisaged that the hotel under construction there, will be successfully completed; and
- for the Hedges character area, development should comprise a mix of uses oriented around open spaces; with residential development embracing the streets and mews form.

3.8. Additionally all developments should:

- embed within their design proposals the principles of sustainable design and construction and to address climate change and in so doing maximise the standards of sustainability achieved;
- from the outset, through careful site planning and the design of individual buildings, incorporate preventative measures to create a safe and hospitable environment for the site occupants in relation to the issues of noise and air quality emanating from traffic associated with the A14;
- allow for the adequate provision of high quality amenity space to serve the needs of the development, designed in a manner to reinforce the quality of public open space and play areas already established;
- complete and complement the townscape of Orchard Park;
- create strong positive closure to views along streets;
- provide strong containment of public realm areas;
- provide natural surveillance of all adjacent public realm areas;
- provide a clear delineation between public and private space;
- ensure private space is secure from unwanted access from public areas.

3.9. Developments alongside the A14 should, through careful site planning, screen the unsightly embankment for the benefit of both individual sites and the existing developments.

A2. Is this policy or function associated with any other Council policy or priority?

The SPD supplements policy SP/1 in the adopted Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document: www.scambs.gov.uk/ldf/sspdpd and policies in the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document: www.scambs.gov.uk/ldf/dcpoliciesdpd

It is also linked with Council Aims B: We are committed to ensuring that South Cambridgeshire continues to be a safe and healthy place for you and your family and C: We are committed to making South Cambridgeshire a place in which residents can feel proud to live.

<http://www.scambs.gov.uk/CouncilAndDemocracy/CorporateObjectivesandPriorities/Corpplan.htm>

A3. Who are the intended beneficiaries/stakeholders of the policy or function? How many people are affected and from what sections of the community?

The SPD seeks to ensure the highest quality of development is delivered to ensure the remaining development is well integrated and minimises impact on the wider area. Existing and new residents, as well as visitors and people using the facilities and services on offer in Orchard Park, including people from the immediately surrounding area, such as Histon and Impington and Kings Hedges in the City, will directly benefit from and/or be affected by the development.

The success of the development will inform other developments across the rest of the district, including other developments along the Cambridge Northern Fringe.

Orchard Park is also visible from the A14 trunk road, a major through route which connects the east coast ports with the rest of the country, and one junction which may provide peoples' first point of access to the City or villages to the north. A well designed development will visually improve the edge of Cambridge and peoples' impression of the area.

A4. Is the policy/function corporate and far-reaching?

Yes the SPD links with two of Council aims (see A.2 above).

A5. Are you expecting to make any significant change to the policy or service in the near future? If so, please give details.

No changes are anticipated.

A6. Is this a new or existing policy or function?

The SPD supplements and amplifies the adopted Development Plan Document policy.

B. EVIDENCE/ DATA and CONSULTATION

It is important to consider all information that is available in determining whether the policy or function could have a differential impact. Please attach examples of monitoring information, research or consultation reports.

B1. What monitoring or other information do you have about relevant target groups, which will show the impact of the policy or function?

Local Development Framework Annual Monitoring Report indicators help review the success of the SPD:

- SSLO7 Development at Cambridge Northern Fringe West (Orchard Park).
- Core Output Indicator CO-H6 Quality of new housing developments.
- Core Output Indicator CO-E3 (i) Renewable energy capacity installed by type: and (ii) Renewable energy capacity with planning permission by type.
- Local Output Indicator LOG2 Proportion of development proposals greater than 1,000m² of floorspace or 10 dwellings that are using renewable energy to provide at least 10% of their predicted energy requirements.
- Significant Effect Indicator SE13 (i) Residents' satisfaction with the quality of the built environment; and (ii) % of residents 'very satisfied' or 'fairly satisfied' with their local area as a place to live.
- Significant Effect Indicator SE14 % new homes developed to Eco-homes 'good' or 'excellent' standard.
- Significant Effect Indicator SE25 (i) % residents feeling 'safe' or 'fairly safe' after dark: and (ii) % residents feeling 'very safe' or 'fairly safe' when outside in their local area after dark.
- Significant Effect indicator SE29 (i) % residents who feel their local area is harmonious: and (ii) % residents that 'definitely agree' and 'tend to agree' that their local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together.

A New Communities Survey was undertaken in April 2009 of residents living in Cambourne and Orchard Park, as a supplement to the national Place Survey 2008. This included Indicator NI 5 Percentage of people satisfied overall with local area (for further details see section B2).

B2. Have you compared the data you have with the equality profile of the local population? What does it show?

Core Output Indicator Co-H6 is a new national indicator that will be monitored and reported on in the next Annual Monitoring Report (2009-10). The Council is working with its Joint Urban Design team to implement the use of the Building for Life Assessment to inform the evaluation of the design of developments submitted for planning approval (for developments of at least 10 dwellings).

The following is taken from the Local Development Framework Annual Monitoring Report, December 2009:

Significant Effect Indicator SE13 - between 2003 and 2006 residents' satisfaction with the quality of the built environment fell by 10% in

South Cambridgeshire. However, the 2008 Place Survey recorded that 91% of South Cambridgeshire residents were 'very satisfied' or 'fairly satisfied' with their local area as a place to live; the quality of the environment will contribute to residents' perception of their local area as a place to live.

Significant Effect Indicator SE25 – between 2003 and 2006 the percentage of residents feeling 'safe' or 'fairly safe' after dark fell by 5% to 64%. The 2008 Place Survey recorded that 71% of South Cambridgeshire's residents felt 'very safe' or 'fairly safe' when outside in their local area after dark.

Significant Effect Indicator SE29 – between 2003 and 2006 the percentage of residents feeling that their local area is harmonious fell by 10%. The 2008 Place Survey recorded that 82% of South Cambridgeshire's residents 'definitely agree' or 'tend to agree' that their local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together; this would suggest that they felt their local area is harmonious.

On 17 January 2008 South Cambridgeshire District Council's Scrutiny and Overview Committee held one of its regular 'off-site' meetings at the Meadows Community Centre, to the north of Cambridge, to discover local people's concerns. The committee received several questions regarding the new housing development at Arbury Park (the former name for Orchard Park). They decided that, to give due attention to the issues, they would set up a task and finish group, to "examine the development of Arbury Park and to recommend learning points for use in the ongoing development and at the Cambridge fringes and Northstowe developments". The report was published in October 2008 and found the majority of the respondents to our survey expressed overall satisfaction with Arbury Park, the quality of their homes, and services such as play areas and community events.

The New Communities service commissioned CELLO **mr**uk research (an independent market research organisation, who also conducted the Place Survey) to conduct a postal survey with residents living in Cambourne and Orchard Park to establish their views on experiences and perceptions of living in a new community. The purpose was to compare the results with those from the national Place Survey pulling out interesting and useful conclusions from the views of the "new communities" compared to the more established communities. In April 2009 a postal questionnaire was sent to all households in Cambourne and Orchard Park. The results should be treated with caution given the confidence levels especially at Orchard Park, however, when comparing the results to the Place Survey residents present lower scores for Indicator NI 5 - percentage of people satisfied overall with local area (81.7 compared to District score of 90.4) (-8.7).

For Orchard Park NI 5 shows that 70.4% of people are satisfied overall with their local area, against the rest of South Cambs figure of 90.4%. This could be linked back to the results shown by the new communities about what they feel most needs improving, which was about the need for facilities. Orchard Park residents are desperate for shopping facilities and the multi use games area (MUGA). Of the younger people surveyed, the activity they most wanted to see in their local area was sports clubs. The level of development remaining at Orchard could have an impact on satisfaction given the issues SCDC has been dealing with at Orchard Park relating to its appearance and delays in house building.

The results of the survey were reported to the New Communities Portfolio Holder on 5 November 2009 and can be viewed on the Council's website: <http://scams.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=872&MId=4838&Ver=4>

B3. Have you identified any improvements or other changes that could be made from monitoring the data?

The district-wide Annual Monitoring Report shows a mixed response to South Cambridgeshire residents' impressions of quality of the built environment, perceptions of personal safety and harmony of place. Earlier results show a decline in opinion however, in the more recent Place Survey there appears to be a more positive response. However, this is not a representation of public perceptions of the Orchard Park site specifically.

The Scrutiny Report in October 2008 shows general satisfaction with Arbury Park (as it was known then). However, the New Communities' survey (2009) showed a lower proportion of residents satisfied with their local area when compared to the district as a whole, which was largely due to the delays to the development.

The Orchard Park SPD will assist with the delivery of the highest quality development, taking into account local opinions expressed through the public consultation exercise. Local people, including existing residents of Orchard Park, will continue to have the opportunity to share their experience and help to shape the place in which they live.

B4. Have you consulted or involved external stakeholders about the policy or function? If so, what were their views?

The Orchard Park Partners Group, the Orchard Park Community Council and the Orchard Park Community Primary School Governors were consulted. At the request of the Orchard Park Community Council a drop-in event was held on 22 September 2010 for the residents of Orchard Park to identify their issues.

The draft SPD was subject to six-weeks public consultation with a range of external stakeholders from 6 September to 18 October 2010. During the consultation the draft SPD was available on the SCDC website www.scamb.gov.uk/ldf/spds. A Statement of Consultation has been produced and details the representations received and subsequently amendments have been incorporated into the final adopted SPD. The Council's partners have also been consulted on the proposed responses to the representations, for which general support has been received.

A total of 98 representations were received during the consultation period of which 1 supporting, 64 objecting and 33 commenting on the draft SPD. One comment was also received on the Equality Impact Assessment. The issues raised include:

- The document should be robust and comprehensive and past mistakes should not be repeated.
- Strengthen the vision and objectives; embed the objective for 'sustainable housing led development; and include for the creation of high quality life and living.
- The identification of errors in the document. Paragraph 2.13 does not refer to planning permission be granted for a hotel on COM3 and other references to this site are therefore unnecessary. Paragraph 4.8 incorrectly states all sites front onto Chieftain Way. Figure 16 has a vehicular access arrow pointing the wrong way and has no access to L2 and the east of COM4. COM4 does not front onto Chieftain Way.
- Requests for clarity in relation to: the overall 'vision'; the status of the Arbury Camp Design Guide 2007 and its relationship with the SPD;

the extent of green space to be provided on development (with representations for both higher and lower requirements); the status of the approved scheme on plot 2a; the clarity of the key on Figure 16; the height restriction on plot Q.

- Highlighting the lack of clarity in some paragraphs as they were being interpreted differently than originally intended. Such issues related to paragraphs: 4.2 relating to an active frontage on the north side of the plot COM4 and views from the A14; 4.40 relating to the worsening of air quality; 5.8 relating to directing traffic away from residential areas; 5.31 refers to new technologies.
- The removal of repetition.
- The validity of Policy SP/1 to allow up to an additional 220 residential units on Orchard Park, was questioned in light of the intended revocation of the Regional Spatial Strategy.
- The possible location of residential premises on sites alongside the A14, in close proximity to the sources of noise and poor air quality arising from the traffic on the A14; that these matters should direct the design of development from the start; that a minimum distance for residential properties from the A14 should be stated; that habitable rooms should not face the noise source; that development should not be permitted where national standards cannot be met; and that priority should be given to commercial uses adjacent to the A14. References to World Health Organisation and national standards of air quality and the LDF document District Design guide: High Quality and sustainable Development in south Cambridgeshire should also be made. Further air quality and noise studies are required and the results mapped. Planning should be based on a worst-case scenario.
- The noise barrier could not be fully funded through developer contributions and other sources of funding should be sought. Clear design principles should be stated for any replacement barrier.
- Criticism the Council is not seeking sufficiently high levels of sustainability on new developments and that high standards of sustainability should be at the heart of the SPD. Allied to this concerns were raised that sustainable development should also address climate change issues. There is too much emphasis on biomass and in a related technical matter was raised that some biomass technologies could be appropriate as they have lesser impact on air quality. Requests were made for to encourage water efficiency and sustainable urban drainage.
- There is a problem of on-street car parking, as the roads in Orchard Park have not been adopted.
- Criticism of car parking standards and how it is addressed, with requests for car parking to the front of premises and for reference to the English Partnerships' publication 'What Works Where'. There is no justification for alternative parking means and undercroft parking is not financially viable.
- Suggestions that cycle parking and storage should be well located and secure; and garages should be designed to allow cycle parking in them as well as car parking.
- Requests for a high quality public realm, with minimal street clutter, linkages to adjacent plots and with pedestrians and cycles having priority.
- Support for the provision of public art in addition to a high quality public realm.
- Reference should be made to the importance of green spaces and play spaces.
- There was both support and opposition to screening the A14 embankment with landscaping.
- Landscaping the interface between COM4 and P is contrary to the landscape strategy and providing a public realm connection encroaches into the site.
- Requests to provide greater detail of landscape requirements, especially breaking up car parking areas with landscaping. Reference to up to 20% of a site to be landscaping should be removed, with representations seeking a 20% requirement and other representations seeking

a lower requirement.

- Objections to the use of green walls, concerned about the difficulty of establishing them. There were both objections and support for the use of green roofs.
- Requests that bin storage to be accessible, practical and suitable to accommodate the Council's requirements for bins.
- Objection that the SPD gives no recognition of the Government's aim of 'localism' and how the existing community will help the Council achieve the vision for Orchard Park and another that localism and involving the existing community should be an objective.
- The items in the tables in Section 6 should largely be essential criteria and more specific.
- Buildings adjacent to the primary school should not exceed 2 storeys.
- Plot Q should have an entrance direct from Kings Hedges Road.
- The figures in Section 6 should show more detail.
- Stated building heights are restrictive, being too high for COM2a and COM2b and too low for COM4.
- Greater detail should be stated as to the requirements for plot K1 to promote the site for the highest possible standards of sustainability.
- Opposition to the long distance view across plot Q.
- Object to paragraph 2.5 of Policy SP/1.
- Insufficient development is shown on plot L2 to be commercially viable.

B5. Have you undertaken any consultation with staff to assess their perception of any impacts of the policy or function? If so, what has been learnt from them?

Yes, internal consultation was undertaken with the Council's Major Development Team, Urban Design Team, Planning Policy Team, Environmental Health Officers and the Landscape Design Officer during the preparation of the Supplementary Planning Document. The Consultation Statement details the comments received: www.scambs.gov.uk/ldf/spds.

B6. Please provide information about any other consultation, research, or involvement undertaken in relation to this impact assessment.

The SPD was published for a six-weeks public consultation, as detailed in B4 above. A public notice was placed in the Cambridge News at the start of the public consultation. A number of stakeholders were sent a letter and CD-Rom containing each of the public participation documents, supporting documents, and forms for making comments. All documents were available to view and / or download from the Council's website: www.scambs.gov.uk/ldf/spds, and a link was included from the home page. Interactive online versions of documents were also available to enable people to make comments online during the consultation period, as well as Word and PDF versions of a response form that could be completed and emailed / posted to the Council. South Cambs Magazine, which is delivered to every household in the district, also included information on the consultation. Printed copies of the document were also available to view or purchase at the Council's offices. The SPD was also an item on the agenda at the North West Community Forum on 22 September, which was open to all residents living in the North West sector of Cambridge.

C1. IMPACT OF THE POLICY OR FUNCTION		
Assess the potential impact on each of the following protected characteristics. The impact could be negative, positive or neutral. If you assess a negative impact for any of the groups then you will need to assess whether that impact is low, medium or high. Refer to the evidence you use.		
DESCRIPTION OF IMPACT	Nature of Impact (Positive, Neutral, Adverse)	Extent of Impact (Low, Medium, High)
AGE: Identify the potential impact of the policy or function on different age groups.		
The Orchard Park SPD should benefit people of any age, but is not specific to age.	Neutral	
DISABILITY: Identify the potential impact of the policy or function on disabled people.		
The Orchard Park SPD should benefit people of any ability, but is not specific to disability.	Neutral	
GENDER REASSIGNMENT: Identify the potential impact of the policy or function on people that have changed gender identity.		
The Orchard Park SPD should benefit people of any gender, but is not specific to gender.	Neutral	
MARRIAGE AND CIVIL PARTNERSHIPS: Identify the potential impact of the policy or function on people who are married or in a civil partnership.		
The Orchard Park SPD should benefit people of any marital status, but is not specific to any type of relationship.	Neutral	
PREGNANCY AND MATERNITY: Identify the potential impact of the policy or function on pregnant or maternal mothers and those women who wish to breastfeed.		
The SPD should benefit women of any stage of maternity, but is not specific to pregnancy and maternity.	Neutral	
RACE: Identify the potential impact of the policy or function on different ethnic groups, including national origins, colour and nationality.		
The Orchard Park SPD should benefit people of any race, but is not specific to race.	Neutral	

RELIGION/BELIEF: Identify the potential impact the policy or function on different religious/faith groups.		
The Orchard Park SPD should benefit people of any religion/belief, but is not specific to religion/belief.	Neutral	
SEX: Identify the potential impact of the policy or function on men and women.		
The Orchard Park SPD should benefit people of any gender, but is not specific to gender.	Neutral	
SEXUAL ORIENTATION: Identify the potential impact of the policy or function on lesbian, gay men, bisexual or heterosexual people.		
The SPD should benefit people of any sexual orientation, but is not specific to sexual orientation.	Neutral	
OTHER CHARACTERISTIC SPECIFIC TO SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE – RURALITY: Identify the potential impact of the policy or function on people who are rurally isolated.		
The SPD is site specific to Orchard Park and is only concerned with the design of the remaining land parcels at the site. The site is located on the edge of Cambridge and therefore will not address rural isolation.	Neutral	

PLEASE NOTE: Following completion of the section above, if the nature of the impact is adverse then you may need to proceed to a full equality impact assessment.

C2. Could you minimise or remove any adverse or potential impact that is high, medium or low significance, in advance of a full impact assessment? Explain how.

N/A

C3. Does the policy or function actively promote equal opportunities and good community relations? Or could changes be made so that it does so?

The SPD addresses Council Aims B: We are committed to ensuring that South Cambridgeshire continues to be a safe and healthy place for you and your family and C: We are committed to making South Cambridgeshire a place in which residents can feel proud to live.

C4. Please provide any further information, qualitative or quantitative that does not fit into the questions but you feel has a likely impact on this assessment.

Achieving good design and sustainable development are the core principals underlying planning. At the heart of sustainable development is the simple idea of ensuring a better quality of life for everyone, now and for future generations. The SPD may have a slight positive impact on Disability through the delivery of well designed new development that can improve the layout and legibility of the place, improving mobility and access for all. There may also be a slight positive impact on Age and Gender as the principles of 'Secured by Design' should ensure the environment is and feels safer for everyone, and may particularly benefit women, children and the elderly.

D. CONCLUSIONS			
D1. Was there sufficient data to complete the partial assessment?	Yes?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	If “NO”, what arrangements are in place for evidence gathering and continuing with the assessment?
	No?	<input type="checkbox"/>	
D2. Is the outcome of the partial assessment that the policy or function would have an adverse impact (medium or high impact) on one or more target group?	Yes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	If “YES”, will you proceed to a full assessment? If so, what arrangements are in place to carry out the full assessment?
	No?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D3. Is the outcome of the partial assessment that the policy or function would have a neutral or positive impact on equalities?	Yes?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	If “YES”, have you included proposals in the Action Plan to further improve the impact of the policy or function on equalities? No
	No?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Do you plan to review the service or policy again in future to assess whether there has been any change? If so, when? No Has the Equalities Steering Group and the Consultative Forum reviewed the assessment? If so what were their comments? No
D4. Do you have any other conclusions/outcomes from the partial assessment?			

ACTION PLAN for enhancing existing practice

Recommendation/ issue to be addressed	Planned Milestone	Planned completion of milestone (date)	Officer Responsible	Progress
The success of the Orchard Park SPD will be addressed through the Annual Monitoring Report.	-	Annually		

RESOURCES

Does the above action plan require any additional resources?

No resource issues have been identified.

ARRANGEMENTS FOR MONITORING

Please give your plans for monitoring the achievement of the above actions.

SIGN OFF: The officers below confirm that this partial assessment has been completed in accordance with the Council's guidance

Signature of Lead Officer

Date:

Signature of Corporate Manager or Chief Officer:

Date:

Please retain the original form on your service area and return a copy of the completed form to the Equality & Diversity Officer.