

Cambridge City Council / South Cambridgeshire District Council

Green Belt Site and Sustainability Appraisal Assessment Proforma

Site Information	Broad Location 8 Land east of Gazelle Way
Site reference number(s): SC296	
Site name/address: Land east of Gazelle Way	
Functional area (taken from SA Scoping Report): <i>City only</i>	
Map:	
<p>The map displays a suburban residential area on the left, a large grey-shaded site area labeled 'SC 296' in the center, and agricultural fields on the right. Key features include Gazelle Way, Caraven Park, Caudle Corner Farm, and several drainage lines. A dashed line indicates the District Boundary. A north arrow and a scale bar are also present.</p>	
<p>Site description: Large flat arable fields with low boundary hedges to Gazelle Way. Woodland belt adjoins Cherry Hinton Road, more significant hedges elsewhere. Suburban residential to west of Gazelle Way. Major electricity transformer station to south at junction of Gazelle Way and Fulborn Old Drift with two lines of pylons, one high, metal pylon line to eastern field boundary and a second double line of lower power, wooden pylons crosses the middle of the site. Tesco supermarket to south. Prefab housing site adjoins Fulbourn Old Drift to the east. The land very gently falls away towards the east.</p>	
<p>Current use: Agricultural</p>	
<p>Proposed use(s): Residential</p>	
<p>Site size (ha): 21 approximately</p>	
<p>Assumed net developable area: 10.5 approximately</p>	
<p>Assumed residential density: 40 dph</p>	
<p>Potential residential capacity: 420</p>	
<p>Site owner/promoter: Known</p>	
<p>Landowner has agreed to promote site for development?: Landowners appear to support development</p>	
<p>Site origin: Green Belt assessment</p>	

Relevant planning history:

Planning permission granted in 1981 for land fronting onto the northern half of Gazelle Way for housing development, open space and schools. A subsequent planning permission in 1985 limited built development to the west of Gazelle Way only, which was implemented.

The Panel Report into the draft Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Structure Plan published in February 2003 considered proposals for strategic large scale development to the east of Cambridge Airport around Teversham and Fulbourn. The panel report rejects this proposal but also states at paragraph 8.35 that 'We conclude below that the longer term expansion of the city eastwards would not accord with the vision of Cambridge as a compact city. We recognise that the existing distributor road along the eastern edge of Cherry Hinton represents a clear boundary to the city, although we also note that some limited development in this location could make more efficient use of this existing infrastructure without necessarily leading to coalescence with Teversham or Fulbourn. In our view, any scope which may exist for any amendments to the Green Belt boundary in this location are not a strategic matter. Thus, we do not propose to recommend that the change proposed by the Structure Plan Authorities be included in the Structure Plan'.

Level 1**Part A: Strategic Considerations****Conformity with the Council's Sustainable Development Strategy (SDS)**

Criteria	Performance (fill with relevant colour R A G or RR R A G GG etc and retain only chosen score text)	Comments
Is the site within an area that has been identified as suitable for development in the SDS?	G = Yes	Edge of Cambridge

Flood Risk

Criteria	Performance	Comments
Is site within a flood zone?	G = Flood risk zone 1	Green:
Is site at risk from surface water flooding?	G = Low risk	Green: Site subject to minor surface water flood risk but capable of mitigation.

Green Belt

Criteria	Performance	Comments
What effect would the development of this site have on Green Belt purposes, and other matters important to the special character of Cambridge and setting?	See below	See below-
To preserve the unique character of Cambridge as a compact and dynamic City with a thriving historic core	Distance from edge of the defined City Centre in Kilometres to approximate centre of site: 5km	Red:
To prevent communities in the environs of Cambridge from merging into one another and with the City.	R = Significant negative impacts	Red: Depending on the scale and type of development the proposals could visually or physically link Cherry Hinton with

		Teversham / Fulbourn to the north and east. A significant landscape buffer will be required between the villages.
To maintain and enhance the quality of the setting of Cambridge	A = Medium and medium/minor impacts	Amber: There would be a significant expansion of development into the fen edge landscape which forms the setting for Cambridge, particularly evident from Airport Way.
Key views of Cambridge / Important views	G = No or negligible impact on views	Green: There are no significant views of Cambridge identified at this point
Soft green edge to the City	A = Existing lesser quality edge / negative impacts but capable of mitigation	Amber: The soft green edge of the city is of mixed quality at this point. Sensitive development may offer the opportunity to improve the soft green edge
Distinctive urban edge	G = Not present	Green: Not present
Green corridors penetrating into the City	G = No loss of land forming part of a green corridor / significant opportunities for enhancement through creation of a new green corridor	Green: Not present
The distribution, physical separation, setting, scale and character of Green Belt villages (SCDC only)	A = Negative impacts but capable of partial mitigation	Amber: Sensitive development would be needed to retain visual and physical separation between Cherry Hinton, Fulbourn and Teversham. Longer views from the south east begin to link Fulbourn and Cherry Hinton

A landscape which has a strongly rural character	R = Significant negative impacts incapable of satisfactory mitigation	Red: Despite suburban edges and the presence of infrastructure such as pylons, the area retains a strongly rural Fen edge character
Overall conclusion on Green Belt	A = Medium and medium/minor impacts	Amber: Development of this site is likely to have impacts on several green Belt functions, notably the possible joining of villages and communities and on the Fen edge character to the east Cambridge.
Impact on national Nature Conservation Designations		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
Would allocation impact upon a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)?	G = Site is not near to an SSSI with no or negligible impacts	Green:
Impact on National Heritage Assets		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
Will allocation impact upon a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)?	G = Site is not on or adjacent to a SAM	Green: There are two Scheduled Monuments in the vicinity, to the north east (a moated site at Manor Farm), and to the south east (settlement site at Caudle Farm).
Would development impact upon Listed Buildings?	A = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such buildings with potential for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation	Amber: Manor Farmhouse, Fulbourn Road, Listed Grade II, lies approximately 500m to the north east of the site The proposed development would have harmful impacts on wider settings through the loss of open countryside in views to and from them, and in the change to the character of the area between the three villages and the way they are experienced in relation to that area.
Part B: Deliverability and other constraints		
Criteria	Performance	Comments

Is there a suitable access to the site?	A = Yes, with mitigation	
Would allocation of the site have a significant impact on the local highway capacity?	A = Insufficient capacity. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.	Amber: In the Highway Authority's opinion a significant level of infrastructure will be required to encourage more sustainable transport links; such infrastructure will extend beyond the confines of the site. . Most of the land is likely to be within 400 metres of bus stops on Gazelle Way. Transport modelling needs to be undertaken as part of the overall spatial strategy work to understand the implications as a whole of further development on the transport network.
Would allocation of the site have a significant impact on the strategic road network capacity?	G = No capacity constraints identified that cannot be fully mitigated	Green: Regarding sites in the Fen Ditton / Fulbourn et al / Gt Wilbraham / Teversham area (estimated capacity of 10,922 dwellings on 25 sites) the Highways Agency comment that sites at the southern end of this group are likely to be well integrated with Cambridge though clearly there could be some additional pressure on M11 and A14. Sites around Fen Ditton are more likely to generate pressure on the A14 corridor, particularly to and from employment along the northern fringe of Cambridge.
Is the site part of a larger site and could it prejudice development of any strategic sites?	G = No impact	Green: The proposed boundary has been drawn to ensure appropriate separation between the Cambridge urban area, Fulbourn and Teversham.
Are there any known legal issues/covenants that could constrain development of the site?	R = Yes G = No	Unknown
Timeframe for bringing the site forward for	A = Start of construction between 2017 and 2031	Amber: Unknown, but given the location of the site and

development?		its scale a start of construction between 2017 and 2031 may be possible.
Would development of the site require significant new / upgraded utility infrastructure?	A = Yes, significant upgrades likely to be required, constraints capable of appropriate mitigation	Amber: Utility infrastructure will require reinforcement and investment. A buffer zone will be required around the high power high metal pylons to the eastern boundary of the site. It may be necessary to bury the low power pylons underground. A national high pressure gas pipeline is located in the vicinity of the site running from the south west to the north east. It appears to run just to the east of the site.
Would development of the site be likely to require new education provision?	A = School capacity not sufficient, constraints can be appropriately mitigated	Amber: After allowing for surplus school places, development of this site would be likely to require an increase in school planned admission numbers, which may require the expansion of existing schools and/or provision of new schools.
Is the site allocated or safeguarded in the Minerals and Waste LDF?	G = Site is not within an allocated or safeguarded area.	Green: Site is not allocated / identified for a mineral or waste management use through the adopted Minerals and Waste Core Strategy or Site Specific Proposals Plan. It does not fall within a Minerals Safeguarding Area; a WWTW* or Transport Zone Safeguarding Area; or a Minerals or Waste Consultation Area.
Is the site located within the Cambridge Airport Public Safety Zone (PSZ) or Safeguarding Zone?	A = Site or part of site within the SZ	Amber: Location within a zone will not in itself prevent development, it depends upon the nature of the development and its height. No erection of buildings, structures or works exceeding 15.2m/50ft, in height.

Level 2		
Accessibility to existing centres and services		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
How far is the site from the nearest District or Local centre?	R = >800m	Red: 1.16km ACF – Cherry Hinton High Street
How far is the nearest health centre or GP service in Cambridge?	R = >800m	Red: 1.01km ACF – Cherry Hinton
Would development lead to a loss of community facilities?	G = Development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities or appropriate mitigation possible	Green:
Site integration with existing communities	A = Adequate scope for integration with existing communities	Amber:
How far is the nearest secondary school?	A = 1-3km	Amber: 1.94km ACF St Bede's Inter-Church Comprehensive School. Netherhall, c2,000m. Coleridge c2,500m.
How far is the nearest primary school?	City preference: A = 400-800m SCDC: G = <1km or non housing allocation or site large enough to provide new school	Amber/ Green: 0.55km ACF - Bewick Bridge Community Primary School
Would development protect the shopping hierarchy, supporting the vitality and viability of Cambridge, Town, District and Local Centres?	G = No effect or would support the vitality and viability of existing centres	Green:
Accessibility to outdoor facilities and green spaces		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
Would development result in the loss of land protected by Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/2 or South Cambridgeshire Development Control policy SF/9? (excluding land which is protected only because of its Green Belt status).	G=No	Green:
If the site is protected open	R=No	Not applicable

space can the open space be replaced according to CLP Local Plan policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space or South Cambridgeshire Development Control policy SF/9 (for land in South Cambridgeshire)?	G=Yes	
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 (OS) provision?	G = Assumes minimum on-site provision to adopted plan standards is provided onsite	Green:
Supporting Economic Growth		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
How far is the nearest main employment centre?	A = 1-3km	Amber: 2.58km ACF – nearest employment 2000+ employees
Would development result in the loss of employment land identified in the Employment Land Review?	G = No loss of employment land / allocation is for employment development	Green:
Would allocation result in development in deprived areas of Cambridge?	A = Not within or adjacent to the 40% most deprived Super Output Areas within Cambridge according to the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010.	Amber: From GIS e.g. Site in Fulbourn LSOA 8243: 11.41 and Fulbourn LSOA 8244: 3.58 and adjacent to Cherry Hinton LSOA 7960: 20.41 (within 40% most deprived LSOA)
Sustainable Transport		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
What type of public transport service is accessible at the edge of the site?	G = High quality public transport service	Green:
How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?	R = >800m	Red: 3.65km ACF – Cambridge Station
What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?	A = Medium quality off-road path.	Amber: If appropriate crossing points across Gazelle Way provided and improvements to off-road links through the estate.
SCDC Would development reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable transport choices:	RR = Score 0-4 from 4 criteria below R = Score 5-9 from 4 criteria below	Green, Green: Total Score = 22

	A = Score 10-14 from 4 criteria below G = Score 15-19 from 4 criteria below GG = Score 19-24 from 4 criteria below	
SCDC Sub-indicator: Distance to a bus stop / rail station	Within 400m (6)	Green, Green: 372m ACF to nearest bus stop.
SCDC Sub-indicator: Frequency of Public Transport	10 minute service or better (6)	Green, Green: 10 minute service.
SCDC Sub-Indicator: Typical public transport journey time to Cambridge City Centre	Between 21 and 30 minutes (4)	Green: 26 minute journey time. (Gazelle Way – Cambridge, nr St. Andrew's Street).
SCDC Sub-indicator: Distance for cycling to City Centre	Up to 5km (6)	Green, Green: 4.09km ACF
Air Quality, pollution, contamination and noise		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?	G = >1000m of an AQMA, M11, or A14	Green:
Would the development of the site result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?	A = Adverse impact	Amber: Despite this proposal not being adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area, it is potentially of a significant size and therefore, there is a potential for an increase in traffic and static emissions that could affect local air quality. More information is required for this location, particularly details for air quality assessment and a low emission strategy.
Are there potential noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?	A = Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation	Amber: The West of the site is bounded by the relatively busy Gazelle Way and there is a mainline railway to the South. Transport noise will need assessment in accordance with industry best practice / guidance. The impact of existing noise on any future residential in this area is a material consideration in terms of health and well being and

		<p>providing a high quality living environment.</p> <p>However residential use is likely to be acceptable with careful noise mitigation – combination of appropriate distance separation, careful orientation / positioning / design / internal layout of buildings, noise insulation scheme and extensive noise attenuation measures to mitigate traffic noise (single aspect, limited height, dual aspect with sealed non-openable windows on façade facing Roads, acoustically treated alternative ventilation, no open amenity spaces such as balconies / gardens). Commercial shielding or noise berms / barriers options? Noise likely to influence the design / layout and number / density of residential premises. Therefore no objection in principle on grounds of transport noises.</p> <p>NOISE: Industrial / Electricity Transformer Station</p> <p>The South West corner of site is bounded by a major electricity transformer station which is a possible noise source that may have intrusive low frequency noise content that can be very difficult to mitigate. Might be possible to coexist but it is a viable potential off-site noise impact that could have significant adverse impacts or statutory nuisances so requires careful consideration prior to allocation. Noise not quantified so off site industrial noise mitigation may be required at source</p>
--	--	--

		but no guarantee that they can be secured and viability and any detrimental economic impact on existing businesses should be considered prior to allocation. However existing residential already in close proximity so minor to medium risk.
Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?	G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation	Green:
Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?	G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation	Green:
Is there possible contamination on the site?	A = Site partially within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination, or capable of remediation appropriate to proposed development	Amber: Site is adjacent to a major electricity transformer site and agricultural land, potential contaminative uses. Requires assessment but can be conditioned

Protecting Groundwater

Criteria	Performance	Comments
Would development be within a source protection zone? 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.	G = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace	Green:

Protecting the townscape and historic environment (*Landscape addressed by Green Belt criteria*)

Criteria	Performance	Comments
Would allocation impact upon a historic park/garden?	G = Site does not contain or adjoin such areas, and there is no impact to the setting of such areas	Green:
Would development impact upon a Conservation Area?	A = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such an area with potential for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation	Amber: The Fulbourn Hospital Conservation Area lies just to the south of the railway line and Fulbourn Old Drift.
Would development impact	G = Site does not contain or	Green:

upon buildings of local interest (Cambridge only)	adjoin such buildings, and there is no impact to the setting of such buildings	
Would development impact upon archaeology?	A = Known archaeology on site or in vicinity	<p>Amber: The site is located in an area of high archaeological potential. A Roman Villa is known at this site. It was first identified on aerial photographs and by fieldwalking in the 1970s. Small scale trial excavations were undertaken seasonally between 1978 and 1986, the results of which suggest a Villa was first constructed of timber in the 2nd century, and replaced with stone, flint and timber structure in the late 3rd century. Surviving elements include walls and foundations and evidence for at least one tessellated pavement survived.</p> <p>In conjunction with the archaeological investigations of the main Villa structure, site investigation to the north revealed timber and stone buildings in associated with cobbled yards. A kiln found in associated with pottery 'wasters' (ceramic vessels which have failed during firing) and fragments of a crucible indicate that this area was industrial in character, most probably associated with the Villa.</p> <p>Further details of these sites are held in the Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record under monument reference numbers 05099 and 05100. The results of the investigations are held as an unpublished report; E. J Pullinger and P. J. White, <i>Romano-British Sites at Hinton Fields, Teversham</i>.</p>

		<p>Comparisons can be made between this site and other Roman settlements in the area which benefit from designation as Scheduled Monuments (e.g. Roman Settlement south of Chronicle Hills, SAM 255; Roman Settlement Site at Duxford, SAM76).</p> <p>Consequently the site should be considered in terms of paragraph 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that <i>non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets.</i> Paragraph 132, concerning designated heritage assets, states that <i>great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.</i> The paragraph goes on to state that <i>substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, should be wholly exceptional.</i></p>
--	--	--

Making Efficient Use of Land		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
Would development lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?	R = Significant loss (20 ha or more) of grades 1 and 2 land	Red: All of site is Grade 2 land.
Would development make use of previously developed land (PDL)? (CITY)	R = No	Red:
Would development make use of previously developed land (PDL)? (SCDC)	A=No	Amber:

Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure

Criteria	Performance	Comments
Would development impact upon a locally designated wildlife site i.e. (Local Nature Reserve, County Wildlife Site, City Wildlife Site)	G = Does not contain, is not adjacent to or local area will be developed as greenspace	Green:
Does the site offer opportunity for green infrastructure delivery?	A = No significant opportunities or loss of existing green infrastructure capable of appropriate mitigation	Amber: Unknown, but no loss of existing green infrastructure.
Would development reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?)	G = Development could have a positive impact by enhancing existing features and adding new features or network links	Green: Chalklands – These support species and habitats characterised by scattered chalk grassland, beechwood plantations on dry hill tops, willow and alder in wetter valleys, scrub of hawthorn and blackthorn with ivy or bramble beneath. Spring-fed fens, mires and marshy ground with reed, sedge and hemp agrimony occur along with small chalk rivers supporting watercrowfoots and pondweeds with reed sweet-grass at the margins with bullhead fish and occasional brown trout and water vole. Large open arable fields may support rare arable plants such as grass poly or Venus’s looking-glass. Brown hare and typical farmland birds, such as linnet, yellow hammer and corn bunting also occur. Any development proposals should show how features of biodiversity value have been protected or adequately integrated into the design.
Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?	G = Site does not contain or adjoin any protected trees	Green:
Any other information not captured above?		
Past Green Belt studies have appraised the site differently. The Cambridge Inner Green Belt Boundary study 2002 for the City Council found the land to be of low to medium		

importance to the Green Belt where land could be released for development. The Cambridge Green Belt Study 2002 for South Cambridgeshire District Council found the land to be essential to the special character and setting of Cambridge where there is no scope for substantial release of land for development. At that time the City Council were advocates for large scale development to the east of Teversham and north of Fulbourn and both Councils were seeking to influence the outcome of the examination in public of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan.

Environmental Health comment that the south of the site will be adjacent to / in close proximity to a major electricity transformer station. It is also noted that a high voltage overhead electricity line runs through part of and around the East of the site so possible Electromagnetic field health issues (EMFs). The Health and Safety Executive generally has the enforcement responsibility for legislation safeguarding the health and safety of the general public from such EMF sources. The HSE and Health Protection Agency should be contacted for advice on the suitability of this site for residential.

Conclusions

Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)	A = Some constraints or adverse impacts	Amber: - Adverse impact on Green Belt purposes
Level 2 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)	R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts	Red: - Distant from existing services and facilities - Very significant archaeology constraints
Overall Conclusion	R = Site with no significant development potential (significant constraints and adverse impacts)	Red:
Viability feedback (from consultants)	R = Unlikely to be viable, A = May be viable G = Likely to be viable	Consultants are at an early stage in the viability appraisal work. This work will be available to inform the choice of sites to include in the Draft Local Plan.