

**South Cambridgeshire Strategic Housing Land Availability
Assessment (SHLAA) Report
August 2013**

**Appendix 7iv: Assessment of sites arising from the Issues &
Options 2 Consultation**

Index of Waterbeach Site Assessment Proforma

Site Number	Site Address	Site Capacity	Page
Site 337	Land adjacent to Bannold Road, Waterbeach	140 dwellings	2712
Site 338	Bannold Road, Waterbeach	38 dwellings	2719

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Review
Site Assessment Proforma

Proforma Created	June 2013
Proforma Last Updated	August 2013
Location	Waterbeach
Site name / address	Land adjacent to Bannold Road, Waterbeach
Category of site:	A village extension i.e. a development adjoining the existing village development framework boundary
Description of promoter's proposal	Housing
Site area (hectares)	6.21 ha
Site Number	337
Site description & context	<p>The site is located to the north of Bannold Road on the north eastern edge of Waterbeach. The site is agricultural land, partly fronting Bannold Road, but mostly to the rear of linear residential development. Situated in an area of relatively open land between the edge of the village and the Barracks to the north.</p> <p>(Part of the site overlaps SHLAA sites 155 and 322, and the site is adjacent to site 206)</p>
Current or last use of the site	Agricultural
Is the site Previously Developed Land?	No
Allocated for a non-residential use in the current development plan?	No.
Planning history	A small part of the site was proposed through the LDF process for residential development (Objection Site 128). The LP 1993 Inspector considered land north of Bannold Road and concluded: the land "is for the most part open and although it is not in the Green Belt or in my opinion of great scenic value, it does contribute towards the rural character of the village. I do not consider that there is any urgent physical, social or other need for the two parts of the village to be linked by development, and I can see no justification for allocating

	<p>land in this locality contrary to the general planning policies which apply.”</p> <p>An application for 5 dwellings (S/1432/85/O) was refused and appeal dismissed. The Inspector noted: “[The site] is separated from Waterbeach Barracks by a strip of arable land only some 200m wide and the Barracks itself is as extensive as a large village. It seems to me highly desirable that a wedge of open land should be retained between the 2 settlements to prevent their coalescence. Bannold Road, with its grass verges, mature trees and generally rural appearance forms a natural northern boundary to the village providing open views of farmland with the Barracks beyond. If the appeal site were also to be built on this would further reduce the visual impact of the green wedge and it might be difficult to resist pressure for more house building on the land to the east of the site. Cody Road forms a distinct boundary to development on the northern side of Bannold Road and I consider it appropriate that the village envelope should exclude all the land to the east of this road.”</p> <p>An application for residential development (C/0452/60/) was refused as the scale of development would be too large an extension to the village and would thereby change the character of the village.</p> <p>An application for two dwellings (C/0145/66/O) was refused as development of the type proposed would detract from the open and rural appearance and character of the area.</p>
Source of site	Issues and Options Consultation 2013

Tier 1: Strategic Considerations	
Green Belt (Updated August 2013)	The site is included in the Green Belt in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.
Is the site subject to any other considerations that have the potential to make the site unsuitable for development?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minerals and Waste LDF designations – a very small part of the site, on the eastern edge, is within the Minerals Safeguarding area for sand and gravel and a very small part of the site, on the northern edge, is within a Waste Water Treatment Works Safeguarding Area.
Tier 1 conclusion: (Updated August 2013)	- Adverse impacts capable of partial mitigation.

Tier 2: Significant Local Considerations

Designations and Constraints	
Heritage considerations?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-statutory archaeological site - Archaeological investigations to the immediate west identified evidence for Roman activity. County Archaeologists would require archaeological works to be secured by condition of planning permission. <p>With careful design it should be possible to mitigate any impact on the historic environment.</p>
Environmental and wildlife designations and considerations?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tree Preservation Orders – a group of protected trees are located 12m to the south west. Biodiversity features - Fenland landscapes support species and habitats characterised by intensive agriculture due to the high quality soil. This has restricted biodiversity in some parts. However, drains, hedges and field margins provide refuge for species such as barn owl, corn bunting and skylark. Washlands provide temporary areas of flooded grassland that are important for plants such as the marsh foxtail, tufted hair-grass and narrow-leaved water dropwort. Important numbers of wintering wildfowl maybe found on flooded fields. The network of drainage ditches in places still retain water voles with otters occasionally found into the fens where suitable fish stocks are found. Any development proposals should show how features of biodiversity value have been protected or adequately integrated into the design. Agricultural land of high grade (i.e. Agricultural Land Classification Grade 1, 2, 3a) – a small part of the site is Grade 2. <p>With careful design it should be possible to mitigate any impact on the natural environment.</p>
Physical considerations?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise issues - Some minor to moderate additional off-site road traffic noise generation on existing residential due to development related car movements but dependent on location of site entrance. Possible to mitigate but may require s106 agreements.
Townscape and landscape impact? (Updated August 2013)	<p>The South Cambridgeshire Village Capacity Study (1998) describes the landscape surrounding Waterbeach as typical fenland, comprising very flat large arable fields, distant views, together with quite distinctive groupings of trees. Many of the surrounding roads are raised on embankments and run alongside drainage ditches, which are also visible between the fields.</p> <p>The tower of St John's Church provides a distinctive landmark within Waterbeach, being visible from many viewpoints to the east and south of the village.</p>

	<p>Moving closer to the edge of the village, there are more local landscape characteristics. To the east the village edge comprises enclosed fields and paddocks, with well used footpaths to the banks of the River Cam.</p> <p>The site is characterised as enclosed farmland. There is a well defined edge along Bannold Road, with views north across flat rough grassland to housing along Kirby Road.</p> <p>Development of this site would have an adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Waterbeach. The site is located in a relatively open area separating the village from the Barracks to the north. It is in agricultural use. Bannold Road has sporadic development along the northern side and this, together with the open land, creates a rural character and the appearance of the countryside entering the village. If this site were developed it would intrude into the rural separation area between Waterbeach and the Barracks.</p> <p>Land to the north of the village has been identified in the Proposed Submission Local Plan for the development of a new settlement. The area is important for maintaining the village character of Waterbeach, and warrants the level of protection afforded by the Green Belt in order that it remains open.</p>
<p>Can any issues be mitigated? (Updated August 2013)</p>	<p>No.</p>

Infrastructure	
<p>Highways access?</p>	<p>Regarding sites in the Milton / Waterbeach (estimated capacity of 13,602 dwellings on 14 sites) the Highways Agency comment that the vast majority of this grouping consists of the barracks site as a new settlement with the remainder essentially in-fill sites. On the whole, the in-fill sites are less likely to present an unacceptable pressure on the A14 given the majority of travel demand will be focused on Cambridge and credible alternatives to car travel could be available.</p> <p>A junction located on to Bannold Road would be acceptable to the Highway Authority. The proposed site is acceptable in principle subject to detailed design.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p>Utility services?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electricity - No significant impact on existing network. • Mains Water - The site falls within the CWC Cambridge Distribution Zone, within which there is a minimum spare

	<p>capacity of 3,000 properties based on the peak day for the distribution zone, less any commitments already made to developers. There is insufficient spare capacity within Cambridge Distribution Zone to supply the number of proposed properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites within the zone were to be developed. CWC will allocate spare capacity on a first come first served basis. Development requiring an increase in capacity of the zone will require either an upgrade to existing boosters and / or new storage reservoir, tower or booster plus associated mains</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gas – Waterbeach has a gas supply and to serve this site with gas is likely to be able to be accommodated with minimal disruption or system reinforcement. • Mains sewerage - There is sufficient capacity at the waste water treatment works to accommodate this development site. The sewerage network is approaching capacity and a pre-development assessment will be required to ascertain the specific capacity of the system with regards to this site. If any mitigation is deemed necessary this will be funded by the developer.
<p>Drainage measures?</p>	<p>No FRA provided.</p> <p>A majority of the development sites falls within the Waterbeach Level Internal Drainage District. The District does not have any capacity to accept any direct discharge into its system above the green field run off rate. All surface water from the site would have to be balanced before it is released into the Boards system. We also have main drains adjacent to the site, therefore any works involving these drains would require the consent of the Board.</p> <p>The promoter has sought advice from Anglian Water and the Internal Drainage Board in respect of foul and surface water disposal - on-site attenuation of surface water will be required in order to control the discharge of flows from the site to an existing drain to the east alongside Bannold Drove. In addition there is understood to be identified capacity at the sewage treatment works to accommodate the level of additional flows from the proposed development of the site.</p>
<p>School capacity?</p>	<p>Waterbeach has a primary school with a PAN of 60 and school capacity of 420 and, and lies within the catchment of Cottenham Village College with a PAN of 180 and school capacity of 900 children. In their 2011 submission to the South Cambridgeshire and City Infrastructure Study, the County Council stated there were deficit of 25 primary places in Waterbeach taking account of planned development in Waterbeach, and a deficit of 30 secondary places taking account of planned development across the village college catchment area.</p> <p>After allowing for surplus school places, development of this site</p>

	would be likely to require an increase in school planned admission numbers, which may require the expansion of existing schools and/or the provision of new schools.
Health facilities capacity?	There is one doctors practice in Waterbeach which has potential for expansion.
Any other issues?	
Can issues be mitigated?	Yes, with upgrades to local infrastructure, including sustainable transport, utilities (mains water and sewerage), school capacity and health.

Tier 2 Conclusion: (Updated August 2013)	--- Significant adverse impacts which cannot be effectively mitigated.
--	--

Tier 3: Site Specific Factors

Capacity	
Developable area (Updated August 2013)	None (4.66 ha. if unconstrained)
Site capacity	140 dwellings
Density	30 dph

Potential Suitability	
Conclusion (Updated August 2013)	The site is not potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints.

Availability	
Is the land in single ownership?	Yes
Site ownership status?	Freehold ownership by Persimmon Homes East Midlands.
Legal constraints?	Unknown
Is there market interest in the site?	Unknown

When would the site be available for development?	Unknown
--	---------

Achievability	
Phasing and delivery of the development	Unknown
Are there any market factors that would significantly affect deliverability?	Unknown
Are there any cost factors that would significantly affect deliverability?	Unknown
Could issues identified be overcome?	Unknown
Economic viability?	Unknown

Site Assessment Conclusion
Updated August 2013: Site with no development potential.

Status of Site in Proposed Submission Local Plan 2013
Not allocated for development; outside Development Framework; Green Belt.

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Review
Site Assessment Proforma

Proforma Created	June 2013
Proforma Last Updated	August 2013
Location	Waterbeach
Site name / address	Land adjacent to Bannold Road, Waterbeach
Category of site:	A village extension i.e. a development adjoining the existing village development framework boundary
Description of promoter's proposal	Housing
Site area (hectares)	1.42 ha
Site Number	338
Site description & context	The site is located to the east of Cody Road and north of Bannold Road on the north eastern edge of Waterbeach. The site is agricultural land situated in an area of relatively open land between the edge of the village and the Barracks to the north. (Part of the site overlaps SHLAA sites 155 and 337)
Current or last use of the site	Agricultural
Is the site Previously Developed Land?	No
Allocated for a non-residential use in the current development plan?	No.
Planning history	A small part of the site was proposed through the LDF process for residential development (Objection Site 128). The LP 1993 Inspector considered land north of Bannold Road and concluded: the land "is for the most part open and although it is not in the Green Belt or in my opinion of great scenic value, it does contribute towards the rural character of the village. I do not consider that there is any urgent physical, social or other need for the two parts of the village to be linked by development, and I can see no justification for allocating land in this locality contrary to the general planning policies which apply."

	<p>An application for 5 dwellings (S/1432/85/O) was refused and appeal dismissed. The Inspector noted: “[The site] is separated from Waterbeach Barracks by a strip of arable land only some 200m wide and the Barracks itself is as extensive as a large village. It seems to me highly desirable that a wedge of open land should be retained between the 2 settlements to prevent their coalescence. Bannold Road, with its grass verges, mature trees and generally rural appearance forms a natural northern boundary to the village providing open views of farmland with the Barracks beyond. If the appeal site were also to be built on this would further reduce the visual impact of the green wedge and it might be difficult to resist pressure for more house building on the land to the east of the site. Cody Road forms a distinct boundary to development on the northern side of Bannold Road and I consider it appropriate that the village envelope should exclude all the land to the east of this road.”</p> <p>An application for two dwellings (C/0145/66/O) was refused as development of the type proposed would detract from the open and rural appearance and character of the area.</p>
Source of site	Issues and Options Consultation 2013

Tier 1: Strategic Considerations	
Green Belt (Update August 2013)	The site is included in the Green Belt in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.
Is the site subject to any other considerations that have the potential to make the site unsuitable for development?	None.
Tier 1 conclusion: (Updated August 2013)	- Adverse impacts capable of partial mitigation.

Tier 2: Significant Local Considerations

Designations and Constraints	
Heritage considerations?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-statutory archaeological site - Archaeological investigations to the immediate west identified evidence for Roman activity. County Archaeologists would require archaeological works to be secured by condition of planning permission. <p>With careful design it should be possible to mitigate any impact on the historic environment.</p>
Environmental and wildlife designations and considerations?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tree Preservation Orders – a group of protected trees are located 12m to the south west. Biodiversity features - Fenland landscapes support species and habitats characterised by intensive agriculture due to the high quality soil. This has restricted biodiversity in some parts. However, drains, hedges and field margins provide refuge for species such as barn owl, corn bunting and skylark. Washlands provide temporary areas of flooded grassland that are important for plants such as the marsh foxtail, tufted hair-grass and narrow-leaved water dropwort. Important numbers of wintering wildfowl maybe found on flooded fields. The network of drainage ditches in places still retain water voles with otters occasionally found into the fens where suitable fish stocks are found. Any development proposals should show how features of biodiversity value have been protected or adequately integrated into the design. Agricultural land of high grade (i.e. Agricultural Land Classification Grade 1, 2, 3a) – a small part of the site is Grade 2. <p>With careful design it should be possible to mitigate any impact on the natural environment.</p>
Physical considerations?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise issues - Some minor to moderate additional off-site road traffic noise generation on existing residential due to development related car movements but dependent on location of site entrance. Possible to mitigate but may require s106 agreements.
Townscape and landscape impact? (Updated August 2013)	<p>The South Cambridgeshire Village Capacity Study (1998) describes the landscape surrounding Waterbeach as typical fenland, comprising very flat large arable fields, distant views, together with quite distinctive groupings of trees. Many of the surrounding roads are raised on embankments and run alongside drainage ditches, which are also visible between the fields.</p> <p>The tower of St John's Church provides a distinctive landmark within Waterbeach, being visible from many viewpoints to the east and south of the village.</p>

	<p>Moving closer to the edge of the village, there are more local landscape characteristics. To the east the village edge comprises enclosed fields and paddocks, with well used footpaths to the banks of the River Cam.</p> <p>The site is characterised as enclosed farmland. There is a well defined edge along Bannold Road, with views north across flat rough grassland to housing along Kirby Road.</p> <p>Development of this site would have an adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Waterbeach. The site is located in a relatively open area separating the village from the Barracks to the north. It is in agricultural use. Bannold Road has sporadic development along the northern side and this, together with the open land, creates a rural character and the appearance of the countryside entering the village. If this site were developed it would intrude into the rural separation area between Waterbeach and the Barracks.</p> <p>Land to the north of the village has been identified in the Proposed Submission Local Plan for the development of a new settlement. The area is important for maintaining the village character of Waterbeach, and warrants the level of protection afforded by the Green Belt in order that it remains open.</p>
<p>Can any issues be mitigated? (Updated August 2013)</p>	<p>No.</p>

Infrastructure	
<p>Highways access?</p>	<p>Regarding sites in the Milton / Waterbeach (estimated capacity of 13,602 dwellings on 14 sites) the Highways Agency comment that the vast majority of this grouping consists of the barracks site as a new settlement with the remainder essentially in-fill sites. On the whole, the in-fill sites are less likely to present an unacceptable pressure on the A14 given the majority of travel demand will be focused on Cambridge and credible alternatives to car travel could be available.</p> <p>A junction located on to Cody Road would be acceptable to the Highway Authority. The proposed site is acceptable in principle subject to detailed design.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p>Utility services?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electricity - No significant impact on existing network. • Mains Water - The site falls within the CWC Cambridge Distribution Zone, within which there is a minimum spare

	<p>capacity of 3,000 properties based on the peak day for the distribution zone, less any commitments already made to developers. There is insufficient spare capacity within Cambridge Distribution Zone to supply the number of proposed properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites within the zone were to be developed. CWC will allocate spare capacity on a first come first served basis. Development requiring an increase in capacity of the zone will require either an upgrade to existing boosters and / or new storage reservoir, tower or booster plus associated mains.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gas – Waterbeach has a gas supply and to serve this site with gas is likely to be able to be accommodated with minimal disruption or system reinforcement. • Mains sewerage - There is sufficient capacity at the waste water treatment works to accommodate this development site. The sewerage network is approaching capacity and a pre-development assessment will be required to ascertain the specific capacity of the system with regards to this site. If any mitigation is deemed necessary this will be funded by the developer.
Drainage measures?	<p>No FRA provided.</p> <p>A majority of the development sites falls within the Waterbeach Level Internal Drainage District. The District does not have any capacity to accept any direct discharge into its system above the green field run off rate. All surface water from the site would have to be balanced before it is released into the Boards system. We also have main drains adjacent to the site, therefore any works involving these drains would require the consent of the Board.</p>
School capacity?	<p>Waterbeach has a primary school with a PAN of 60 and school capacity of 420 and, and lies within the catchment of Cottenham Village College with a PAN of 180 and school capacity of 900 children. In their 2011 submission to the South Cambridgeshire and City Infrastructure Study, the County Council stated there were deficit of 25 primary places in Waterbeach taking account of planned development in Waterbeach, and a deficit of 30 secondary places taking account of planned development across the village college catchment area.</p> <p>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 the provision of new schools.</p>
Health facilities capacity?	<p>There is one doctors practice in Waterbeach which has potential for expansion.</p>
Any other issues?	

Can issues be mitigated?	Yes, with upgrades to local infrastructure, including sustainable transport, utilities (mains water and sewerage), school capacity and health.
---------------------------------	--

Tier 2 Conclusion: (Updated August 2013)	--- Significant adverse impacts which cannot be effectively mitigated.
--	--

Tier 3: Site Specific Factors

Capacity	
Developable area (Updated August 2013)	None (1.28 ha. if unconstrained)
Site capacity	38 dwellings
Density	30 dph

Potential Suitability	
Conclusion (Updated August 2013)	The site is not potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints.

Availability	
Is the land in single ownership?	Unknown
Site ownership status?	Unknown
Legal constraints?	Unknown
Is there market interest in the site?	Unknown
When would the site be available for development?	Unknown

Achievability	
Phasing and delivery of the development	Unknown
Are there any market factors that would significantly affect deliverability?	Unknown
Are there any cost factors that would significantly affect deliverability?	Unknown
Could issues identified be overcome?	Unknown
Economic viability?	Unknown

Site Assessment Conclusion
Updated August 2013: Site with no development potential.

Status of Site in Proposed Submission Local Plan 2013
Not allocated for development; outside Development Framework; Green Belt.