

Greater Cambridge Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA)

Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service
September 2021

Contents

Disclaimer	4
Executive Summary.....	5
Introduction	7
National policy context.....	8
The Greater Cambridge approach	8
Stage 1 – Site/ broad location identification.....	11
Determine assessment area and site size	11
Desk Top Review of Information	11
Call for sites.....	11
‘Other sources of supply’ study.....	14
Bringing the sources together.....	19
Stage 2 – Site Assessment	21
Suitability assessment	22
Availability assessment.....	22
Achievability assessment.....	23
Capacity assessment.....	24
Stage 3 – Windfall assessment.....	25
Stage 4 – Assessment Review.....	27
Stage 5 – Final evidence base	28
Annex 1: Site Assessment Methodology	29
Introduction.....	29
Standard approaches.....	29
Reference Information	29
Site Details	30
Site Assessment Summary.....	31
Site Assessment.....	31
Suitability	31
Suitability Conclusion.....	45

Availability.....	45
Achievability	46
Development Potential.....	47
Extract from Greater Cambridge Housing Delivery Study (AECOM 2021).....	48
Annex 2: Assessment of impact on the strategic road network	53
Annex 3: Call for sites form	55
Annex 4: Review of Other Sources of sites	65
Cambridge SHLAA.....	65
South Cambridgeshire SHLAA	78
Lapsed, Withdrawn and rejected planning source	109
Appendices	129

Disclaimer

The Greater Cambridge Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) lists and maps sites within Greater Cambridge that may have potential for residential and economic development. Many of the sites are submissions from landowners and developers for possible future development potential. It is important to note they are NOT sites allocated for development. The decisions regarding which sites will be proposed for allocation will be made in the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan (and neighbourhood plans) which will be subject to full public consultation and examination before any site or plan is adopted.

The identification of potential sites in the HELAA does not state or imply that the council will necessarily grant planning permission for development. All planning applications will continue to be determined against the development plan and other relevant material considerations.

The HELAA includes estimates of potential development on individual sites. These are not based on detailed designs so should not be assumed as acceptable for the purposes of development management decisions and should not prejudice any decision that may be made on the site at a later date.

Executive Summary

The Greater Cambridge Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) forms part of the evidence base for the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan. The HELAA assesses the potential supply of land for residential and economic development related uses. The HELAA provides an assessment of the potential sites in terms of their suitability, availability and achievability.

The outputs of the HELAA will assist the Councils in identifying the choices available for site allocations to meet development needs. Specifically, it has been used to inform the choices made at the First Proposals consultation stage, alongside a range of other evidence exploring the development needs of the area and how they should be met.

However, it is important to emphasize that the inclusion of any site in the HELAA does not confer that it will be allocated for development. The decisions regarding which sites will be proposed for allocation will be made in the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan (and neighbourhood plans) which will be subject to full public consultation and examination before any site or plan is adopted.

A key part of the HELAA process was a Call for Sites. This was an open process where landowners and others could suggest sites for development and provide supporting information. The process generated nearly 700 sites which met the HELAA threshold of being capable of accommodating 5 or more dwellings or at least 500 square metres of floorspace for economic development related uses.

The Call for Sites was complemented by a desk top review of other sources of supply. This included a broad range of sources including existing allocations, recently refused, withdrawn or lapsed planning applications, the previous Strategic Housing and Land Availability Assessments, a study exploring the scope for densification of sites within Cambridge and a review of broad locations across the more rural parts of Greater Cambridge. This process spanned, literally, thousands of potential sites although relatively few additional sites were ultimately included in the HELAA.

The final tally of 728 sites from both sources were assessed using a robust methodology which is described in Annex 1. In order to ensure testing was carried out consistently a set of assumptions and principles were established to apply to all sites. A 'Red, Amber, Green' (RAG) scoring system was used to carry out the assessment. Whilst a number of the assessments used mapped information or measurements, others required specialist input or judgement. A number of specialist technical consultees, both within and outside of the Councils, were engaged.

Sites were deemed to be unsuitable if they were assessed as 'Red' against any of the criteria used. Sites were deemed to be unavailable where there was no evidence that the site was available, or alternatively, there was evidence that the site was unavailable. Sites were deemed to be unachievable where it was considered there

was no reasonable prospect that the site could be developed. As part of the HELAA process, testing viability is by necessity a broad approach. Sites identified in the Local Plan will be subject to more detailed consideration through the plan making process. For the HELAA, the capacity of sites was assessed by using both information supplied by site promoters and a typology developed by the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service. This developed a range of densities for different development forms and settlement types.

Windfall sites are another important source of supply of land for housing which must be considered alongside the HELAA. Windfall sites are those developments not specifically identified in the development plan but still come forward and deliver new homes during the plan period. The Greater Cambridge Housing Delivery Study (2021) has reconsidered the Councils' evidence of historic completions on windfall sites alongside changes in national planning policy and has recommended that the Councils can increase their windfall allowance to 425-450 dwellings a year (185-195 dwellings a year for Cambridge and 240-255 dwellings a year for South Cambridgeshire).

Results of the HELAA are provided in a number of appendices to this report. Appendix 1 provides a full list of sites. These are sorted by ward and parish. Appendix 2 provides a list of sites not currently deliverable or developable (including where sites have unknown timescales or have been assessed as Red). Appendix 3 provides a list of sites discounted from the HELAA including a short description of why they were excluded. Appendix 4 provides completed site proformas for each site. As the number of assessments run to hundreds of sites, and each proforma runs to several stages this is a substantial document. Due to the size of the appendices they have all been published as separate documents.

The Greater Cambridge Local Plan First Proposals consultation provides information on the development needs that have been identified and proposes sites that could be allocated to contribute to meeting those needs. The First Proposals is accompanied by a Strategy Topic Paper which sets out how the HELAA has informed the site identification process. The reasons for choosing sites over others is also explained in the topic paper. This process has also been informed by the Sustainability Appraisal which accompanies the Local Plan at each stage of its preparation and considers the relative environmental, social and economic impacts of the options available.

Introduction

The Greater Cambridge Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) forms part of the evidence base for the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan.

The HELAA is a background evidence document to inform plan-making, but it is not a policy statement. It is a technical assessment of sites and locations that may have potential for housing or economic development. The inclusion of sites in this assessment does not mean that they will actually be allocated for development or permission granted for housing or other uses. It does not pre-judge the strategic approach that the Local Plan will take. It is the Local Plan which will consider which sites relate best to the overall development strategy for Greater Cambridge and the creation of sustainable communities.

This is the first HELAA produced for the Greater Cambridge area. Previously, Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council produced independent Local Plans that were supported by their own land availability assessments which informed the adopted local plans.

The Greater Cambridge HELAA assesses the potential supply of land for residential and economic development related uses. The HELAA provides an assessment of the potential sites in terms of their suitability, availability and achievability.

The outputs of the HELAA will assist the Councils in identifying the choices available for site allocations to meet development needs. Specifically, it has been used to inform the choices made at the First Proposals consultation stage, alongside a range of other evidence exploring the development needs of the area and how they should be met.

The Greater Cambridge HELAA closely follows national planning policy guidance. This report describes how the guidance has been applied to a local context.

National policy context

The policy context for carrying out a HELAA is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).

The [National Planning Policy Framework \(NPPF\)](#) states (at paragraph 68):

“Strategic policy-making authorities should have a clear understanding of the land available in their area through the preparation of a strategic housing land availability assessment. From this, planning policies should identify a sufficient supply and mix of sites, taking into account their availability, suitability and likely economic viability. Planning policies should identify a supply of:

- (a) specific, deliverable sites for years 1 to 5 of the plan period; and
- (b) specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth, for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15 of the plan.”¹

Paragraph 81 states that significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development.²

The [Planning Practice Guidance \(PPG\)](#) states that the purpose of the HELAA is to identify:

“a future supply of land which is suitable, available and achievable for housing and economic development uses over the plan period.”³

Furthermore, the PPG states that:

“Plan-making authorities may carry out land availability assessments for housing and economic development as part of the same exercise, in order that sites may be identified for the use(s) which is most appropriate.”⁴

The Greater Cambridge approach

The National Planning Practice Guidance provides a methodology that plan makers should have regard to for undertaking a HELAA in a flow chart, replicated below.

¹ NPPF paragraph 68 <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/5-delivering-a-sufficient-supply-of-homes>

² NPPF Paragraph 81 <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/6-building-a-strong-competitive-economy>

³ PPG Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 3-001-20190722, Revision date: 22 07 2019 <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/housing-and-economic-land-availability-assessment>

⁴ PPG Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 3-001-20190722, Revision date: 22 07 2019 <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/housing-and-economic-land-availability-assessment>


The Greater Cambridge HELAA follows the recommended approach. In addition, a number of relevant HELAA's have been reviewed across the East and South East of England to identify good practice.

It should also be noted that some elements of the HELAA process have been addressed separately in other evidence, such as our published Housing Trajectory which is updated annually, or the Greater Cambridge Housing Delivery Study (2021).


The following sections describe how the Greater Cambridge HELAA has taken the national methodology and applied it to a local context.

PPG methodology flowchart for HELAA's (7) PPG Paragraph: 005 Reference ID: 3-005-20190722, Revision date: 22 07 2019


Stage 1 - Site / broad location identification




Stage 2 - Site / broad location assessment




Stage 3 - Windfall assessment



Stage 4 - Assessment review



Stage 5 - Final evidence base



No

Stage 1 – Site/ broad location identification

Determine assessment area and site size

The Greater Cambridge HELAA covers the combined local authority areas of Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. The diverse nature of the plan area means that a broad range of sites are within scope of the project including, for example, urban redevelopment sites, urban extensions, new settlements, and village developments.

A minimum site threshold has been applied requiring that sites are capable of delivering 5 or more dwellings or 0.25 hectares (or 500 square metres) for economic development uses.

Desk Top Review of Information

Information was gathered from a range of sources to inform the HELAA.

It should be noted at this point that the Councils also publish a Housing Trajectory and five year housing land supply report. The housing trajectory is used to calculate the five-year housing land supply requirement and to demonstrate that anticipated housing delivery will meet or exceed this housing requirement. The housing trajectory is updated annually and published in early April.

The [Greater Cambridge Housing Trajectory and Five Year Housing Land Supply \(1 April 2021\)](#) provides a detailed review of the delivery of existing allocations and sites with planning permission, to consider and demonstrate sites are deliverable, and when they are likely to be delivered. As these sites have already been identified as being suitable, available, and deliverable the HELAA does not seek to duplicate the work of that study for sites with planning permission, and therefore these sites have not been subject to further assessment.

Call for sites

A Call for Sites is a way for landowners, developers, individuals and other interested parties to suggest sites for development, and to let us know when they may be available for development. [Government planning practice guidance](#) advises that, 'if the process to identify land is to be transparent and identify as many potential opportunities as possible, it is important to issue a call for sites and broad locations for development'.⁵

An initial Call for Sites was undertaken in Spring 2019, and there was a further opportunity to submit sites through the Greater Cambridge Local Plan 'First Conversation' Issues and Options consultation (January 2020).

⁵[Housing and economic land availability assessment - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](#)
(Paragraph: 012 Reference ID: 3-012-20190722, Revision date: 22 07 2019)

A response form was made available, to either complete directly online from the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning website or to complete offline and submit. This sought a range of information on sites being submitted. A copy of the form can be found in Annex 3.

Site promoters could indicate a range of uses that could be suitable on the site including:

- a range of residential development types, including dwellings, housing provided for older people including residential institutions, sites for gypsies and travellers, sites for travelling show people, and student accommodation;
- a range of employment uses including offices, R&D, industry and warehousing;
- a range of accompanying uses such as community facilities or retail.

Promoters were asked to provide information regarding the availability, suitability, and deliverability (including viability) of sites.

The initial Call for Sites in 2019 resulted in over 500 sites being submitted for consideration. The subsequent Greater Cambridge Local Plan 'First Conversation' Issues and Options consultation (January 2020) resulted in over 100 new site submissions. There were also about 140 submissions containing further details on sites submitted under the initial Call for Sites.

Subsequent to the First Conversation consultation, promoters continued to supply updated information regarding their proposals, and in some cases new sites. The Council sought to be transparent regarding further information being submitted and published it on the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning website through regular updates, including providing an accompanying updates log to highlight where additional information has been submitted. Sites identified beyond the cut-off date of 16 March 2021 were recorded but not included in the subsequent analysis.

The process of identifying sites has been complex. Within the large number of proposals received there has been some duplication, some overlapping sites, and in some cases, alternative uses or proposals within the same submission. Some sites were also discounted because they were too small.

In total the Call for Sites process has yielded 692 sites being submitted for consideration which met the site threshold (capable of delivering 5 or more dwellings or economic development on sites of 0.25 hectares (or 500 square metres of floor space) and above).

In early 2021, the councils published a survey which was open to Parish Councils and Resident Associations in Cambridge enabling them to provide the councils with any factual information regarding any of the sites submitted by landowners/developers. Any factual information submitted was then issued to the

relevant site assessors and was taken into consideration when undertaking specific site assessments.

The Call for Sites process also resulted in submissions for suggested Green Spaces which are being taken forward independently of the HELAA process, and in particular have been used to inform the Green Infrastructure Opportunities mapping project, published as a separate evidence base.

‘Other sources of supply’ study

The Call for Sites process yielded a very large number of site suggestions in a wide range of locations. However, PPG states that HELAA methodology should not rely solely on submissions:

“It is important that plan-makers do not simply rely on sites that they have been informed about, but actively identify sites through the desktop review process that may assist in meeting the development needs of an area.”⁶

PPG provides a suggested list of types of sites and supporting data sources that could be used as part of a desk top review to proactively identify further sites.⁷ These are set out in the table below (labelled types of site and potential data source). The right hand column (labelled Greater Cambridge approach/ sources) of the table provides details of specific approaches and data sources used in the Greater Cambridge HELAA.

A desk top review of sites Types of sites and data sources

Type of site	Potential data source	Greater Cambridge approach/ sources
Existing housing and economic development allocations and site development briefs not yet with planning permission	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Local and neighbourhood plans• Planning applications records• Development Briefs	<p>Existing allocations in adopted development plans without planning permission have been assessed by the ‘Greater Cambridge Housing Trajectory and Five Year Housing Land Supply’ report (1 April 2021), which provides an annual update on progress of planned developments.</p> <p>Neighbourhood plans at Regulation 16 or further advanced at the time of analysis were included. This was Great Abington LSA, Histon & Impington, Cottenham and Foxton.</p>

⁶ PPG Paragraph: 010 Reference ID: 3-010-20190722, Revision date: 22 07 2019

⁷ PPG Paragraph: 011 Reference ID: 3-011-20190722, Revision date: 22 07 2019

Type of site	Potential data source	Greater Cambridge approach/ sources
Planning Permissions for housing and economic development that are unimplemented or under construction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning application records • Development starts and completions records 	<p>Planning permissions not yet completed have been identified in the 'Greater Cambridge Housing Trajectory and Five Year Housing Land Supply' report (1 April 2021). Through this process their deliverability has been reviewed in detail.</p> <p>The sites already tested through this process were not re-assessed through the HELAA.</p>
Planning applications that have been refused or withdrawn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning application records 	<p>Planning applications that had been refused, withdrawn or lapsed were reviewed to assess whether they may be suitable sites for development. However, this process only yielded one site as there were clear reasons why sites had not progressed.</p>
Land in the local authority's ownership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local authority records 	<p>Discussions were held with CCC and SCDC to identify potential sites. Both confirmed that they had submitted the sites they wanted to be considered.</p>

Type of site	Potential data source	Greater Cambridge approach/ sources
Surplus and likely to become surplus public sector land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National register of public sector land • Engagement with strategic plans of other public sector bodies such as county councils, central government, National Health Service, police, fire services, utilities services, statutory undertakers 	<p>The Register of Surplus Land was reviewed but it identified no additional sites that were not already part of the HELAA process. The only sites on the register were owned by the Ministry of Defence or National Health Service and all were already allocated or permitted.</p> <p>Cambridgeshire County Council submitted a number of sites through the Call for Sites process.</p> <p>There was regular engagement with public sector bodies through the plan making and monitoring processes.</p>
Sites with permission in principle, and identified brownfield land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brownfield land registers (parts 1 and 2) • National Land Use Database • Valuation Office database • Active engagement with sector 	<p>The Brownfield Land register did not yield any sites that were not already allocations in existing plans or land with planning permission.</p>

Type of site	Potential data source	Greater Cambridge approach/ sources
Vacant and derelict land and buildings (including empty homes, redundant and disused agricultural buildings, potential permitted development changes, e.g. offices to residential)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local authority empty property register • English Housing Survey • National Land Use Database • Commercial property databases (e.g. estate agents and property agents) • Valuation Office database • Active engagement with sector • Brownfield land registers 	Vacant and derelict land and buildings were included if nominated through the Call for Sites.
Additional opportunities for un-established uses (e.g. making productive use of under-utilised facilities such as garage blocks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ordnance Survey maps • Aerial photography • Planning applications • Site surveys 	Additional opportunities for un-established uses were included if nominated through the Call for Sites or identified through other processes referenced in this table.
Business requirements and aspirations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enquiries received by local planning authority • Active engagement with sector 	A separate study has been carried out exploring employment needs - Greater Cambridge Employment Land and Economic Development Evidence Study (2020), and a wide range of sites were received through the Call for Sites process.

Type of site	Potential data source	Greater Cambridge approach/ sources
Sites in rural locations/ Large scale redevelopment and redesign of existing residential or economic areas/ Sites in adjoining villages and rural exceptions sites/ Potential urban extensions and new free-standing settlements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local and neighbourhood plans • Planning applications • Ordnance Survey maps • Aerial photography • Site surveys 	<p>Through the Call for Sites a wide range of sites, from new settlements and urban extensions to village sites were received. Strategic alternative approaches have also been considered through the wider plan making process.</p> <p>The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments that informed the 2018 local plans were reviewed to identify sites that had previously been considered acceptable but that had not progressed.</p> <p>Further considering all the sources above, officers considered whether additional sites warranted inclusion at this stage. However, after taking account of development constraints no further sites were identified.</p>

Almost 5,000 planning applications that had been refused, withdrawn or lapsed in the last four years were considered. An initial screening ruled out sites that were too small to accommodate five dwellings or 500 square metres of business floorspace, sites that had been developed through a more recent application and sites that had been promoted through the Call for Sites process. The remaining sites were reviewed individually. Where development management comments suggested that reasons for refusal were insurmountable or the mitigation required would reduce the scheme to a scale below the HELAA threshold these were also ruled out. The outcome of these reviews is shown in Annex 4.

A review of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments (SHLAA's) prepared in support of the currently adopted local plans for Cambridge and South

Cambridgeshire was used to identify potential sites that had not already been re-submitted to the HELAA through the Call for Sites process.

Sites within the earlier SHLAAs were excluded from the HELAA assessment process based on planning history (a permission already implemented, an extant permission or a refusal where mitigation measures appeared unlikely) and ownership (where sites were owned by public bodies that had nominated other sites through the Call for Sites process). Many sites were excluded by the Cambridge SHLAA because they fell below a threshold of 0.5 hectares or were not considered capable of delivering more than 5 dwellings. Finally, the outcome of the previous SHLAA site assessments was considered, and in particular, the reasons for rejection. Where a site had not been considered suitable and had not been resubmitted through the call for sites, it was discounted. The outcome of these reviews is shown in Annex 4.

In Cambridge, other sources of supply, where sites had not already come from other sources, were not considered suitable for further testing. Excluded sites included:

- sites providing active employment uses, including where the Employment Land Review employment uses, for loss to residential use.
- sites identified as protected open spaces.

The Local Plan First Proposals identified a number of areas of major change and opportunity areas in Cambridge, where future changes of use have potential to come forward during the plan period. These will be explored further as the plan making process progresses. In addition, there are buildings capable of being redeveloped over the plan period to provide higher densities, for example due to making efficient use of development plots, or sites not available currently which become available, for example garage courts where need reduces.

To assess capacity where it cannot be specifically identified at this stage, a windfall rate is proposed to be included in the housing trajectory. Further information can be found later in this report.

Bringing the sources together

The key outcome of this stage was an aggregated list combining all sites identified. Each site has been given a site reference number. All of the sites have been mapped to provide a visual representation of the sites that have been assessed across the plan area.

Besides basic information on the location, scale and use of each site, sites were also grouped by their type of location. The following typology was used:

- Densification of existing urban areas
- Edge of Cambridge – outside the Green Belt
- Edge of Cambridge – Green Belt
- New Settlements
- Dispersal: Villages

- Dispersal: Villages/ Transport Corridor
- Integrating homes and jobs - Southern cluster
- Growth around transport nodes: Cambourne Area

In total the HELAA process identified 728 potential sites suitable for assessment (excluding those withdrawn from the process by the promoter).

Stage 2 – Site Assessment

Stage 2 of the HELAA process involves estimating the development potential of each site. This, in turn, is based on an assessment of the suitability, availability and achievability (including viability) of each site.

A methodology was developed for undertaking the initial assessment of sites. This was based on experience from previous Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire local plans, good practice identified elsewhere and PPG. Details of the methodology applied can be found in Annex 1.

PPG notes:

“An important part of the desktop review, however, is to identify sites and their constraints, rather than simply to rule out sites outright which are known to have constraints.”⁸

Hence, the HELAA has not ruled out sites because they are inconsistent with policies in the adopted local plans such as those relating to development frameworks (settlement boundaries) or the loss of employment land. A key purpose of the HELAA is to consider future locations for development which depending on the strategy choices made could include land that would currently be considered contrary to policy in the adopted local plans.

Similarly, the Green Belt has not been treated as an absolute constraint by the HELAA. However, if sites in the green belt are identified for potential allocation in the local plan then the requirements of the NPPF would need to be met regarding demonstrating exceptional circumstances. This process is not part of the HELAA process and is, instead, addressed in the Greater Cambridge Local Plan First Proposals Strategy Topic Paper accompanying the First Proposals consultation.

However, where sites clearly contravene national planning policy and legislation there is no value in assessing these sites further. To conduct this assessment, the Council has identified a list of “intrinsic constraints” that were used to remove sites that are protected by national designations and policies that restrict development. The following constraints led to sites being rejected from further consideration:

Absolute development constraint	Reason	Application
Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), SAC, SPA, Registered Park & Garden, or ancient Woodland	Sites subject to significant constraints by national or international designations do not warrant further assessment	Sites wholly or mostly (>50%) containing a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), SAC, SPA, Registered Park & Garden, and / or ancient Woodland

⁸ PPG Paragraph: 010 Reference ID: 3-010-20190722

No sites fell within 400m of a Special Area of Conservation (SAC). RAMSAR sites are not listed as an absolute constraint because there are no RAMSAR sites within, or within close proximity to, the Greater Cambridge local plan area.

Suitability assessment

The first stage of the site assessment was to determine the suitability of sites.

In order to ensure testing was carried out consistently a set of assumptions and principles were established to apply to all sites. Each site was assessed using the assessment criteria addressing the issues in the table below. A 'Red, Amber, Green' (RAG) scoring system was used to carry out the assessment. A full list of the assessment criteria is provided in Annex 1.

Suitability Assessment Criteria

Constraints	Impact
Site Access	Locally Sensitive Landscapes
Accessibility to Local Services and Facilities	Townscape
On-site utilities	Biodiversity and Geodiversity
Contamination and Ground Stability	Historic Environment
Flood Risk	Open Space/Green Infrastructure
Air Quality	Transport and Roads including site access
Noise, Vibration, Odour and Light Pollution	
Consistency with Development Plan Policies	

Whilst a number of the assessments used mapped information or measurements, others required specialist input or judgement. A number of specialist technical consultees were engaged. Other statutory bodies, statutory undertakers and other infrastructure providers (including the local education authority) are being engaged through other Local Plan evidence studies such as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Duty to Co-operate process.

A site which scored one or more 'Red' impacts and constraints has been identified as unsuitable.

Availability assessment

The National Planning Practice Guidance describes availability as follows, 'A site can be considered available for development, when, on the best information available (confirmed by the call for sites and information from land owners and legal searches where appropriate), there is confidence that there are no legal or ownership

impediments to development. For example, land controlled by a developer or landowner who has expressed an intention to develop may be considered available.'

The key consideration for assessing the availability of sites was whether each site was controlled by a developer or landowner who had expressed an intention to develop. However, any legal and/or ownership impediments and the current planning status of the site were also considered. Sites with unresolved ownership problems were not considered available unless there was a reasonable prospect the problems could be overcome.

A timeline for the availability of each site was determined. This was guided by information from developers, but also from information on lead in times provided by the Greater Cambridge Housing Delivery Study (2021). The timelines are an indication of when sites are likely to be physically capable of being developed. However in some cases, deliverability may be subject to a Local Plan allocation.

Achievability assessment

The National Planning Practice Guidance describes achievability as follows, 'A site is considered achievable for development where there is a reasonable prospect that the particular type of development will be developed on the site at a particular point in time. This is essentially a judgement about the economic viability of a site, and the capacity of the developer to complete and let or sell the development over a certain period.'

As part of the HELAA process testing viability is by necessity a broad approach. Sites identified in the Local Plan will be subject to more detailed consideration through the plan making process of the Local Plan.

The Greater Cambridge Local Plan will be subject to a Viability Assessment, in tandem with an Infrastructure Delivery Study. The early stages of these evidence bases were published in November 2020 and included testing a range of locations with different amounts of development and typology assumptions. This test showed that development is generally viable across all residential scenarios with varying levels of surplus produced. Testing also showed that commercial development is generally viable with only greenfield rural offices proving unviable.

Updated viability and infrastructure evidence has been prepared to accompany the First Proposals consultation. This takes account of the policy approaches proposed on a range of issues that could impact on development costs.

At this high level it is difficult to account for the individual aspirations and personal circumstances of each landowner and, as a result, whilst a scheme may be considered to be viable (or unviable) that would not necessarily guarantee or prevent its delivery.

The achievability assessment has not been subject to detailed site by site assessment of the utilities infrastructure that would be required to unlock and service the development. The Integrated Water Management study has explored capacity for waste water treatment, includes information on current capacity of existing facilities. Work is ongoing regarding the need to enhance the electricity network, working with the Greater Cambridge Partnership.

Capacity assessment

The site capacity was assessed for all sites considered to be suitable, available and achievable. The starting point was to use the capacity information provided by the site promoter. Estimates provided were 'sense checked' against a typology approach developed to support the HELAA. This developed a range of densities for different development forms and settlement types. Where the original estimates differed significantly from the typology, or were missing, an appropriate density from the typology study was used to derive an alternative capacity. Sites being proposed for allocation have been subject to a more detailed assessment including consideration of constraints that may further limit development capacity.

Lead in times and build out rate assumptions allowed the development to be profiled across 5-year periods. This was informed by the findings of the Greater Cambridge Housing Delivery Study (2021). An extract of this study has been included in Annex 1 which details the assumptions made.

Stage 3 – Windfall assessment

Windfall sites are those developments not specifically identified in the development plan but still come forward and deliver new homes during the plan period. Local plans provide policy guidance on where such sites may be acceptable should a site become available, and such sites continue to deliver new homes in Greater Cambridge.

PPG states that:

“A windfall allowance may be justified in the anticipated supply if a local planning authority has compelling evidence as set out in paragraph 70 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Local planning authorities have the ability to identify broad locations in years 6-15, which could include a windfall allowance (using the same criteria as set out in paragraph 67 of the National Planning Policy Framework).”⁹

A windfall allowance was recognised as a sound element of the housing land supply in Greater Cambridge by the examination of the 2018 Local Plans. The ‘Greater Cambridge Housing Trajectory and Five Year Housing Land Supply’ report published on 1 April 2021 includes details of windfalls anticipated, although it was based on the methodology described in more detail in the previous housing trajectory report.¹⁰

The windfall allowance is considered developable as each of the sites will be permitted in a suitable location for housing development with a reasonable prospect that the site will be available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged. However, the windfall allowance is not considered to meet the definition of deliverable in the glossary of the National Planning Policy Framework, and therefore no anticipated completions from the windfall allowance is included within the first five year period in our housing trajectory reports.¹¹

The Greater Cambridge Housing Delivery Study (2021) has reconsidered the Councils’ evidence of historic completions on windfall sites alongside changes in national planning policy and has recommended that the Councils can increase their windfall allowance. The study sets out that the Councils current windfall allowance of 350 dwellings a year (that consists of 130 dwellings a year in Cambridge and 220 dwellings a year in South Cambridgeshire) is an under estimate, and instead recommends that 425-450 dwellings a year is an appropriate estimate (185-195 dwellings a year for Cambridge and 240-255 dwellings a year for South Cambridgeshire). Following the same principles as applied to the windfall allowance in the Greater Cambridge housing trajectory, and using the lower estimate for each area, 5,345 dwellings are anticipated from the windfall allowance in 2020-2041. This

⁹ PPG, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, Paragraph: 023
Reference ID: 3-023-20190722, Revision date: 22 07 2019

¹⁰ Appendix D of the Greater Cambridge Housing Trajectory and Five Year Housing Land Supply – Main Document (November 2019).

¹¹ NPPF Annex 2

is an additional 1,125 dwellings to what was anticipated in the Greater Cambridge housing trajectory (April 2021).

Stage 4 – Assessment Review

Stage 4 of the methodology recommended in the National Planning Practice Guidance involves comparing the identified development needs of the area with the sites identified as available, suitable and deliverable.

As stated earlier, the Greater Cambridge Housing Trajectory and Five Year Housing Land Supply' report published on 1 April 2021 provides an assessment of the current housing supply, including considering whether sites identified are available, suitable and deliverable. This compares the sites identified with the identified housing requirement and provides information regarding the five year housing land supply.

This HELAA has been used as a tool for testing potential site allocations, which could be added to the land supply through inclusion in the Greater Cambridge Local Plan. More on how the HELAA has been used in plan making is included in the next section.

Stage 5 – Final evidence base

Results of the HELAA are provided in a number of appendices to this report.

Appendix 1 provides a full list of sites. These are sorted by parish and are supported by a series of maps to illustrate the spatial distribution of sites.

Appendix 2 provides a list of sites not currently deliverable or developable (including where sites have unknown timescales or have been assessed as Red)

Appendix 3 provides a list of sites discounted from the HELAA. These are sorted by parish/ ward and include a short description of why they were excluded.

Appendix 4 provides completed site proformas for each site. As the number of assessments run to hundreds of sites, and each proforma runs to several stages this is a substantial document.

Due to the size of the appendices they have all been published as separate documents.

The Greater Cambridge Local Plan First Proposals consultation provides information on the development needs that have been identified and proposes sites that could be allocated to contribute to meeting those needs.

The First Proposals is accompanied by a Strategy Topic Paper which sets out how the HELAA has informed the site identification process. The reasons for choosing sites over others is also explained in the topic paper. This process has also been informed by the Sustainability Appraisal which accompanies the Local Plan at each stage of its preparation and considers the relative environmental, social and economic impacts of reasonable options.

Annex 1: Site Assessment Methodology

Introduction

The following technical methodology has been used to assess sites that have been subject to full assessment in the HELAA. It has been informed by the previous studies carried out by the individual councils, Planning Practice Guidance and good practice used elsewhere, to identify an approach that could be applied effectively in both rural and urban locations.

Standard approaches

In carrying out the assessment a number of standard approaches were applied:

- The intentions of the Call for Sites respondents (where they have been made known) will be taken into account regarding the use proposed. However, this does not rule out other uses or mix of uses.
- Sites were assessed individually with no account given to cumulative impacts/constraints of combining them with other sites being tested. If sites near to or adjoining each other are selected for allocation cumulative impacts will be considered during the preparation of the Local Plan.
- All distances have been calculated from the centre of the service or facility being measured to the edge of a site.
- All distances have been calculated using existing roads and paths using network modelling rather than 'as the crow flies'.
- Where different parts of a site could be scored differently – for example in relation to flood risk, the final score has been determined by calculating the area of the site affected by each risk and scoring the site in accordance with the majority risk.
- Where access to a site relies upon third party land that does not form part of another HELAA site with identified housing or economic potential, it will be regarded as undeliverable unless there is firm evidence that this constraint has clear and realistic prospects of being overcome within a reasonable period.
- Areas not suitable for built development will be discounted when calculating the development capacity of such sites if they are allocated in the emerging Local Plan.

Reference Information

The following information has been captured for each site:

- Site Name
- Site Reference (with weblink to a relevant call for sites submission) – each site has a unique reference number. Where a site has been received through

the Call for Sites, this will include a web link to the original submissions and documents that have been submitted.

- Map – a simple map is provided. A link to an interactive map is also available, which provides further context.

Site Details

The following information has been captured for each site:

Site area (hectares)	Parish or Ward	Greenfield or Previously Developed Land	Category of site	Category of Settlement	Current or Last Use
-	-	Greenfield / Brownfield / Both	-	-	-

Proposed development	Employment (m ²)	Housing units
Market and affordable housing, Office, etc.	-	-

The site area reflects the outline of the site proposed, as shown on the map. Within that area the site promoter may have indicated in their submission areas that would not be developed.

Each site has been assigned a category appropriate to the location and the nature of the proposal.

- Densification of existing urban areas
- Edge of Cambridge – outside the Green Belt
- Edge of Cambridge – Green Belt
- New Settlements
- Dispersal: Villages
- Dispersal: Villages/ Transport Corridor
- Integrating homes and jobs - Southern cluster
- Growth around transport nodes: Cambourne Area

The category of settlement has also been captured:

- Cambridge
- Town
- Rural Centre
- Minor Rural Centre
- Group Village

- Infill Village
- New Settlement

The proposed development, housing units and/or employment space reflects the proposal as submitted through the Call for Sites process. An updated estimate has been provided at the end of the proforma where an assessment has been made reflecting constraints identified.

Site Assessment Summary

Each proforma starts with a summary of the outcome against each of the key criteria.

Criteria	Outcome
Suitable	-
Available	-
Achievable	-

Site Assessment

Each site has been assessed using the following assessment criteria to reach an overall conclusion about its suitability for development and the likelihood of development coming forward (site availability and achievability). A traffic light scoring system has been used in respect of a range of constraints and potential impacts which may affect the development.

Suitability

Adopted Development Plan

Score	Assessment Criteria
Red	Development of the site would be in fundamental conflict an adopted Development Plan policy or allocation
Amber	Development of the site would be incompatible/ inconsistent with an adopted Development Plan policy or allocation
Green	Development of the site would not be inconsistent with an adopted Development Plan policy or allocation

This criterion provides an assessment of the site against adopted policies in the Cambridge Local Plan 2018, South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2021 and 'made' (adopted) Neighbourhood Plans. This is primarily a review against policies map designations.

A score of 'Green' was given to a site generally consistent with policies in the adopted plans.

When a site does not comply with an existing policy this will be generally scored as 'Amber'. Using the Green Belt as an example, any site that lies either partly or wholly within the Green Belt would be classed as 'Amber'. Sites may be considered for allocation in the new local plan taking into account the range of evidence that will inform that process.

A site has been scored 'Red' where there are fundamental conflicts with an adopted policy, such as developing on a minerals or waste allocation.

Flood Risk

Score	Assessment Criteria
Red	The site is wholly or largely within Flood Zones 2 or 3 such that it cannot accommodate at least 5 additional dwellings or an increase of 500 square metres of employment floorspace and/or the site is a 'dry island' whereby all potential accesses to the adopted public highway require crossing land that is within Flood Zones 2 or 3.
Amber	The site contains areas at high, or medium risk from surface water flooding and/or the site contains some land in Flood Zones 2 and/or 3 but there is sufficient land in Flood Zone 1 to accommodate 5 additional dwellings or an increase of 500 square metres of employment floorspace.
Green	The site is at low risk of flooding (within flood zone 1) and no / limited areas identified as at risk surface water flooding.

The National Planning Policy Framework states that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future).

Flood Zones for fluvial flooding (rivers and sea) are defined by the Environment Agency and are present on the Environment Agency's flood map. Flood Zone 1 represents an area with less than a 0.1% chance of flooding (a 1 in 1,000-year flood event). Flood Zone 2 represents areas having between 1% and 0.1% chance of flooding (between a 1 in 100 and 1 in 1,000-year flood event). Flood Zone 3 represents land assessed as having a greater than 1% chance of flooding (a greater than 1 in 100-year event).

The Environment Agency Flood Zones only show flood risk as of the situation today. However, when planning for new development the risk over the lifetime of development needs to take into account the effects of climate change. Climate change modelling is not available across the area reflecting the latest predictions. The updated Greater Cambridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 2021 advocates taking a precautionary approach and applying Flood Zone 2 as the Flood Zone 3 plus climate change scenario.

Other sources of flooding can also cause problems. The Environment Agency has published a surface water flood map for England which identifies areas of high, medium, low and very low surface water flood risk.

Whilst flooding may not provide an absolute constraint to development, it may limit the development potential of the site or involve additional costs which may affect the viability of the site. The sequential test, and potentially the exception test, will be considered during the preparation of the Local Plan ¹².

Sites wholly or largely within Flood Zone 2 and 3 will be scored 'red'. Larger sites could be in a number of flood zones. The site testing considered if there is enough land outside Flood Zone 2 and 3 for a development to take place outside, and whether safe access could be achieved to and from the development without crossing significant areas of Flood Zones 2 or 3.

Landscape and Townscape

Score	Assessment Criteria
Red	Development of the site would have a significant negative impact which cannot be mitigated.
Amber	Development of the site would have a detrimental impact which could be satisfactorily mitigated.
Green	Development of the site would have either a neutral or positive impact.

Landscape assessment was provided by Landscape Architects within the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service Built and Natural Environment Team.

Greater Cambridge does not contain any nationally important landscape designations such as National Parks or Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, but the landscape of Cambridge still has local importance, particularly as the setting for the historic city of Cambridge. In the local context therefore, site landscapes are assessed against the National and Regional Landscape Character Areas and how typical or atypical (how unique) they are to those National and District Character Areas. Its settlements also have characteristic built form, which could be enhanced by development but there is also potential for detrimental impacts.

Sites to be assessed were located and reviewed and all constraints identified from the councils' GIS data and other planning sources such as MaGIC, if needed. The presence of site designations or features were identified, for example Conservation Areas, Tree Preservation Orders, Important Countryside Frontages or Protected Green Space. Greenbelt was omitted from consideration, as this would be subject to a separate assessment as part of the Local Plan process.

The site assessment was informed by the relevant Council's 2018 Local Plan policies, the SCDC Design Guide, Village Design Guides, Neighbourhood Plans, and

¹² See NPPF paragraphs 155 to 159

Cambridge Suburbs and Approaches Studies, and Landscape Character Assessment. To begin, each site as assessed individually and upon its own merits. Sites were reviewed in a similar way to that of a standard planning application, particularly for the small-medium sized sites. Large and very large sites were reviewed more widely and at larger scale due to their expected impacts on their local area.

Based on the constraints of the site, the scope of the intended proposals and/or expected unit numbers, it was considered whether the site was developable and if so, to what extent the landscape and existing townscape had been considered. For example, would there be enough room for adequate boundary buffering, would there be enough room for tree planting within the site, would the grain/density of the development fit in with surrounding development or setting of the village, and would the surrounding designations be impacted by the development.

If the site was found to be unacceptable at the proposal's scale/units/density etc, further consideration was given to determine if there was an option wherein development could occur if various amendments were made such as a reduction in unit numbers to the avoidance of a part of the site. If the development was within an urban area or within a development framework boundary with on-site constraints it was likely to be green. Some countryside site outside the development framework were considered green if the expected impacts could be considered as negligible. An amber rating required some mitigation or alteration to the proposals to be found acceptable. Red meant the proposal would result in significant harm that could not be reasonably mitigated.

Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Score	Assessment Criteria
Red	Development of the site would have a detrimental impact on designated sites, or those with a regional or local protection which cannot be reasonably mitigated or compensated as appropriate.
Amber	Development of the site may have a detrimental impact on a designated site or those with a regional or local protection but the impact could be reasonably mitigated or compensated.
Green	Development of the site would not have a detrimental impact on any designated site or those with a regional or local protection.

Designated sites whether within or outside Greater Cambridge are those with national or international protection, namely:

- Special Areas of Conservation (including possible Special Areas of Conservation);
- Special Protection Areas (including potential Special Protection Areas);
- Ramsar sites (including proposed Ramsar sites);
- Sites of Specific Scientific Interest; and
- National Nature Reserves.

This also includes those sites with regional or local protection, namely:

- Regionally Important Geological Sites;
- Local Nature Reserves; and
- County Wildlife Sites.

The Greater Shared Planning Service Natural Environment team and Cambridge City Council Ecology Officer reviewed sites in terms of their impact on biodiversity and geodiversity. Sites were assessed in terms of their potential impact on both statutory designations such as SSSIs and non-statutory designated sites such as County Wildlife Sites. Sites benefitting from statutory protection were assessed by reference to the Impact Risk Zones issued by Natural England. Assessment of sites with non-statutory designations assessment was more dependent on local knowledge. Comments were also provided on the likely habitat or species issues that would result from each site proposal. This was based on aerial photos to develop assumptions about site values and species presence.

Sites with national or international protection, in close proximity to such sites or with links to these sites may be at risk of detrimental impacts which cannot be mitigated against and therefore need to be classified as a red impact. Where mitigation is possible, these sites could be assessed as an amber impact. Compensatory provision is not an option for the top three designations, as compensatory measures are only appropriate where an overriding national need for development has been demonstrated.

Sites which could have a detrimental impact on the other designated sites listed above will be regarded as a red impact if mitigation or compensatory provision cannot be provided. Where mitigation or compensatory provision can be provided sites will be assessed as having an amber impact¹³.

Priority habitats and species are those listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act, 2006 and UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UK BAP). Ecological networks are coherent systems of natural habitats organised across whole landscapes so as to maintain ecological functions. A key principle is to maintain connectivity - to enable free movement and dispersal of wildlife e.g. badger routes, river corridors for the migration of fish and staging posts for migratory birds).

Open Space/Green Infrastructure

Score	Assessment Criteria
Red	Development of the site would result in a loss of open space which could not be replaced locally.
Amber	Development of the site would result in a loss of open space which could be replaced locally.
Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space.

¹³ See paragraphs 174-176 of the NPPF.

Open space includes play space, amenity space, playing fields, sports pitches, sports facilities, semi-natural space, parks, green corridors/infrastructure and land designated as Local Green Space. It also includes areas of water (such as rivers, canals, lakes and reservoirs) which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation and can act as visual amenity.

Sites for development on open spaces will only be suitable if the open space could be replaced by a better or equivalent open space in terms of size and quality¹⁴.

‘Replaced locally’ is defined as within the same community.

Historic Environment

Score	Assessment Criteria
Red	Development of the site would cause substantial harm, or severe or significant “Less than substantial harm” to a designated heritage asset or the setting of a designated heritage asset which cannot be reasonably mitigated ¹⁵ .
Amber	Development of the site could have a detrimental impact on a designated or non-designated heritage asset or the setting of a designated or non-designated heritage asset, but the impact could be reasonably mitigated.
Green	Development of the site would have either a neutral or positive impact, but importantly not have a detrimental impact on any designated or non-designated heritage assets.

Heritage Assets are buildings, monuments, sites, landscapes and places identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions because of their heritage interest. Designated heritage assets include:

- Listed Buildings (grade I, grade II* and grade II)
- Registered Parks and Gardens
- Scheduled Monuments
- Conservation Areas

Non-designated Heritage Assets can include locally listed buildings (or Buildings of Local Interest identified in Conservation Area Appraisals and Neighbourhood Plans), non-registered parks or gardens.

The Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service Historic Environment team reviewed each site. This was informed by identification of relevant constraints such as listed buildings and scheduled monuments. Conservation officers then used other available evidence such as Conservation Area Appraisals to help consider the wider setting of an asset and the potential impact on any heritage assets. The sorts of issues considered included whether significant views would be impacted, whether development could be consistent with the characteristic layout of a conservation area and the access to the site. The extent to which these issues could be mitigated by

¹⁴ See paragraph 97 of the NPPF.

¹⁵ See paragraphs 193-195 of the NPPF.

only developing part of a site was also assessed. Sites were assessed as 'Red' where the development of the site would cause substantial harm, or severe or significant 'Less than substantial harm' to a designated heritage asset or the setting of a designated heritage asset which could not be reasonably mitigated.

Archaeology

Score	Assessment Criteria
Red	Known archaeology of significance which could not be mitigated through design or conditions
Amber	Development of the site could have a detrimental impact to archaeology. Further information regarding the extent and significance of archaeology would be required. Archaeological works could be secured by condition of planning permission
Green	Development of the site would have either a neutral or positive impact to archaeology

The County Archaeology Team were consulted on each of the sites, and assessments have been informed by the Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record (HER)¹⁶. Each site was assessed against known areas of archaeology using GIS data. Where a site contained known archaeology of significance which could not be mitigated by the development, these sites were scored Red. Examples of this include sites containing Scheduled Ancient Monuments.

Accessibility to Local Services and Facilities

Accessibility of a site to local services and facilities by means other than the car – and the extent to which development might provide new services or enhance sustainable accessibility to existing ones – are important considerations in determining the suitability of a site for development.

The HELAA used ten different access categories and assessed suitability in terms of the distance from these categories. Distances were agreed that were consistent with the approach taken in the Sustainability Appraisal. The distances are set out in the table below.

Category	Green	Amber	Red
Health	<720m	720-2000m	>2000m
City, District or Rural Centre	<720m	720-2000m	>2000m
Local, Neighbourhood or Minor Rural centre	<720m	720-2000m	>2000m
Rapid Public Transport	<1800m	>1800m	-

¹⁶ See paragraph 196 of the NPPF.

Future Rapid Public Transport	<1800m	>1800m	-
Public Transport	<450m	450-1000m	>1000m
Primary School	<450m	450-1000m	>1000m
Secondary School	<900m	900-2000m	>2000m
Major employment sites	<1800m	>1800m	-
Cycle network	<800m	800-1600m	>1600m

Employment measured to key Greater Cambridge employment centres.
Cambridge

- Cambridge City Centre (as defined on Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policies Map)
- Cambridge Biomedical Campus / Addenbrookes
- West Cambridge
- North East Cambridge including Cambridge Science Park / Business Park

South Cambridgeshire:

- Babraham Research Campus
- Buckingway Business Park, Swavesey;
- Bourn Airfield (Bourn Quarter Location)
- Granta Park, Great Abington;
- Bar Hill (Trafalgar Way)
- Cambourne Business Park, Cambourne;
- Northstowe (town centre location)
- Land at Hinxton Road, South of Duxford;
- Wellcome Trust Genome Campus, Hinxton;
- Cambridge Research Park, Landbeach (adjoining Waterbeach new town);
- Sawston (former Spicers site)
- Melbourn Science Park
- Histon Vision Park

To simplify the process, RAG ratings were converted to a points based scoring system. Where sites were assessed as Green they scored 2 points, Amber scored 1 point and Red scored 0 points. The aggregate score for each site was applied to a threshold to achieve a final RAG rating. The thresholds used were

- Overall Accessibility Green RAG score: 12-20
- Overall Accessibility Amber RAG score: 6-11

- Overall Accessibility Red RAG score: 0-5

However, where a site was assessed as being able to deliver a significant number of new homes based on our capacity calculations, specific RAGs were amended to Green based on the following net additional dwelling thresholds on the grounds that these services would be provided on site as part of any future development. These assumptions were used in order to provide an objective assessment with a clear set of assumptions. These types of infrastructure/facilities would usually be considered on a site by site basis but given the large number of sites being considered as part of the HELAA, a more broad-brush approach was taken based on the indicative thresholds below.

Infrastructure/Facility	Catchment population	Number of dwellings
Primary school	4,000	1,650
Secondary school	8,000	3,300
Health Centre (4 doctors)	10,000	4,100
Community centre	4,000	1,650
Local centre / employment provision	6,000	2,500
District centre / superstore	24,000	10,000

Site Access

Score	Assessment Criteria
Red	No possibility of creating a safe access.
Amber	There are potential access constraints, but these could be overcome through development.
Green	Access by all means is possible.

Cambridgeshire County Council as the Local Highway Authority had been consulted to inform this assessment. Site access is an important consideration in determining the suitability of sites for development. Suitable and safe highway access is needed for both construction and occupation phases of a development. A site with no direct vehicular access or without the potential to provide suitable safe access cannot be considered suitable for development.

Transport and Roads

Score	Assessment Criteria
Red	Development of the site would have an unacceptable impact on the functioning of trunk roads and/or local roads that cannot be reasonably mitigated.
Amber	Any potential impact on the functioning of trunk roads and/or local roads could be reasonably mitigated.
Green	Development of the site will not have a detrimental impact on the functioning of trunk roads and/or local roads.

Cambridgeshire County Council undertook transport assessments of each site above 50 dwellings and all employment sites by considering the potential impact of each proposal on the local transport network, including trunk routes (major 'A' roads such as A10, A505, A1303, and A1307) as well as local roads. Internal workshops were run to review and moderate the individual site assessments.

Key issues included: the current and future potential for site accessibility / connectivity, the proximity to areas of known safety/congestion issues, the proximity to strategic investment and the current and future level of sustainable transport provision. Proposals of under 50 dwellings will not need a Transport Assessment but may need a Transport Statement if they are close to a large committed development or they are located in a congested corridor, near a problem junction or within a cluster of sites. Proposals of 50 or more dwellings will require a Transport Assessment. Factors that contributed to a 'Red' score included:

- there were any large committed developments close to the site
- the site was located in a congested corridor
- the site was located near a problem junction
- the site was not sustainable
- the site needed major transport infrastructure to be delivered
- the site was located in an area with ongoing transport improvements
- the site was located by a major accident cluster
- the site was located by a major TIP Scheme- indicate contributions may be required.

The assessments reflect the current Local Transport Plan (LTP) which include references to the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro (CAM). The LTP is due to be updated in late 2021/early 2022 by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and any changes to the LTP will be reviewed and reflected as necessary in the HELAA as well as the draft Local Plan

Noise, Vibration, Odour and Light Pollution

Score	Assessment Criteria
Red	<p>The site is incapable of being developed to provide healthy internal and external environments and acceptable quality of life / amenity living conditions in regard to noise / vibration / odour/ light pollution.</p> <p>Site is within 200m of a waste facility (As regulated by Cambridgeshire County Council Minerals and Waste).</p>
Amber	<p>The site is capable of being developed to provide healthy internal and external environments in regard to noise / vibration / odour/ Light Pollution after careful site layout, design and mitigation.</p>
Green	<p>The site is at low risk in regard to noise / vibration / odour.</p> <p>Development of the site would have either a neutral or positive impact on the Noise, Vibration, Odour and Light Pollution.</p>

New homes and workplaces must be capable of providing a healthy internal and external environment and acceptable living conditions in terms of quality of life / amenity, after careful site layout, design and mitigation. Sources of noise, vibration, odour, air and light pollution include transportation (road traffic, rail and aircraft), industrial, commercial, business, leisure, agricultural premises / land uses, floodlights, road traffic light and wind farms. Account will be taken of site layout, design and mitigation which can be reasonably anticipated, which are appropriate to their location and do not have unacceptable impacts on other planning requirements.

Each Local Planning Authority's Environmental Health team had been consulted. Sites were then assessed using a range of evidence. This included published studies and reports such as DEFRA's [Strategic noise mapping \(2017\) - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/618212/Strategic-noise-mapping-2017.pdf) and the [Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD - Cambridge City Council](#) (adopted January 2020), and internal monitoring and mapping systems alongside officer experience and knowledge.

If existing neighbouring/adjoining land uses or potential future land uses (i.e. from other neighbouring sites being considered in the assessment) would create amenity issues for current or future residents or occupiers such as noise, odour or light pollution, or safety which cannot be mitigated then the site should be considered unsuitable for development. Sensitive design may lessen the impact of amenity issues and in some cases may still allow a site to be used for a conflicting use.

For large sites it may be that part of the site is unsuitable, but the remainder is sufficient to deliver a suitable development.

Air Quality

Score	Assessment Criteria
Red	The site is incapable of being developed to provide healthy internal and external environments and acceptable quality of life / amenity living conditions in regard to air quality after careful design and mitigation.
Amber	The site is capable of being developed to provide healthy internal and external environments in regard to air quality after careful design and mitigation. 'Amber' is the default score for sites within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) in case of changes to the AQMA and potential mitigation measures that can be put in place.
Green	The site is at low risk in regard to air quality.

Each Local Planning Authority's Environmental Health team had been consulted to provide this assessment. Their assessments were informed by Air Quality Management Areas where negative impacts were most likely. Sites were then assessed using a range of evidence.

The assessments focused on considering the potential for unacceptable or significant impacts on current or future sensitive developments such as residential and the scope for mitigating these impacts.

Contamination and Ground Stability

Score	Assessment Criteria
Red	The site is likely to be incapable of being developed due to significant contamination / ground stability issues incapable of appropriate mitigation or remediation.
Amber	The site is likely to be capable of being developed after appropriate mitigation or remediation of contamination / ground stability issues.
Green	The site is capable of being developed as there are unlikely to be any contamination / ground stability issues.

Most previously developed (brownfield) sites will be affected by land contamination to some degree largely depending upon the site's land use history, in particular industrial and commercial usage. Such contamination can pose risks to human health as well as causing pollution to rivers/groundwater and the wider natural environment. Even previously undeveloped (greenfield) sites may be affected by land contamination, for example caused by the use of agricultural chemicals.

Ground stability issues are often associated with former landfill sites, mineral workings, and quarries where significant and long-term soil settlement can occur. Ground stability issues are also a natural function of geology (chalk in particular) when the bedrock has dissolved/eroded over time leading to the overlying soil prone to collapse.

In most cases contamination and ground stability issues can be overcome following appropriate investigation, risk assessment, and mitigation and do not usually present an insurmountable constraint to development, although certain types of development may be precluded (such as houses with gardens). However, a small percentage of sites may be so seriously affected by contamination and/or ground stability issues that the cost and scale of mitigation is such that the site is unviable for residential development.

Each Local Planning Authority's Environmental Health team was consulted to provide this assessment.

Further constraints

Constraints to development

Score	Assessment Criteria
Red	Constraints to development that would seriously constrain development potential
Amber	There are potential constraints, but these could be overcome
Green	Development of the site would be unconstrained

Known site constraints have been reviewed to identify the presence of any infrastructure on the site, such as high pressure gas pipelines or overhead electricity pylons or cables. Such issues will not always rule a site out from development but could impact on how much of a site could be developed, or potentially add additional development costs.

Strategic Highways Impact

Highways impacts were considered in consultation with Highways England (for the Strategic Road Network) and Cambridgeshire County Council (as the local highway authority).

Work with Highways England (now named National Highways) agreed an overall approach to assessing the impact of proposals on the strategic road network (M11, A11, A14, and A428). Based upon junction capacity, a zonal approach was developed to consider the potential impact of sites according to which part of the strategic road network they were connected to. While most sites fall within a single Highways England zonal area, a number of sites had to be apportioned to a single zone dependent on which zone the majority of the site fell under. The 'A14 Cambridge Northern Bypass' and 'M11 North' zones were considered to be the only zones with no capacity for growth where sites would need to ensure no net increase in vehicles trips on the strategic road network. (See Annex 2 for further information).

Agricultural Land Classification

[Planning Practice Guidance for the Natural Environment](#) paragraph 001 states that planning policies and decisions should take account of the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a).

In order to meet development needs identified the Local Plan may need to allocate sites on agricultural land. Agricultural land grade is presented for information but will inform the sustainability appraisal process.

Green Belt – Assessment of harm of Green Belt Release

National planning policy states that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, through the preparation or updating of plans.

When drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries, the need to promote sustainable patterns of development should be taken into account. Strategic policy making authorities should consider the consequences for sustainable development of channelling development towards urban areas inside the Green Belt boundary, towards towns and villages inset within the Green Belt or towards locations beyond the outer Green Belt boundary.

In order to ensure the sustainability issues of development inside and outside the Green Belt are fully understood, the HELAA has taken a 'policy off' approach and considered all sites whether they are in the Green Belt or not.

A Greater Cambridge Green Belt Study (2021) has been prepared to inform plan making. This identifies relative variations in harm to the Green Belt that would be associated with development. This is a complex study which explored the potential impacts of development across the Cambridge Green Belt. It is not possible to capture the full detail of the assessments in the HELAA proforma. Please see the Green Belt study itself for information on how the study was carried out and how it should be interpreted.

The HELAA identifies the name of the parcel in the study, and the harm rating. This has not been used to identify whether sites are suitable or unsuitable, as there will be consideration of whether exceptional circumstances exist for releasing land from the green belt as part of the wider plan making process.

Suitability Conclusion

Following the testing against individual criteria each site is given an overall suitability assessment.

Score	Assessment Criteria
Unsuitable	The site does not offer a suitable location for development for the proposed use and/or there are known significant constraints or impacts which cannot be mitigated.
Potentially Suitable	The site offers a potentially suitable location for development for the use proposed but is subject to constraints or impacts which could inhibit its development for the proposed use. Likely to require more extensive mitigations than a suitable site.
Suitable	The site offers a suitable location for development for the use proposed and is compatible with neighbouring uses when considered against relevant constraints and their potential to be mitigated. There are no known constraints or impacts that will significantly limit the development potential of the site.

Availability

Question	Response
Is the site controlled by a developer or landowner who has expressed an intention to develop?	Yes/No
Are there known legal or ownership impediments to development?	Yes/No
Is there planning permission to develop the site?	Yes/No
When will the site be available for development? (sites proposed for development within 5 years must meet the NPPF definition of deliverable)	Within 0-5 years Within 6-10 years Within 11-15 years Site not currently deliverable or developable

The Call for Sites process requested information regarding the availability of sites, including seeking confirmation of landowner support, and confirmation that there were no legal issues that would impede availability. The Call for Sites questionnaire also sought information on when a site would be available for development.

If there is evidence available that a site is not available for development, it will fail this element of the assessment.

Score	Assessment Criteria
Red	There is no evidence that the site is available, or alternatively, there is evidence that the site is unavailable.
Amber	There is evidence of legal or land ownership constraints that may impact on the availability of the site.
Green	There is evidence that the site is available for development in the timescales indicated.

Achievability

Question	Response
Is there are reasonable prospect that the site could be developed?	Yes/No

An assessment of viability for all suitable and available sites will be undertaken as part of the whole plan wide viability assessment for the emerging Local Plan.

Score	Assessment Criteria
Red	The land has not been promoted by the landowner and or developer and therefore it is not known to be available for development. Due to existing site constraints and/or high existing use value, development is unlikely to be economically viable at an appropriate density.
Amber	The land has not been promoted by the landowner and or developer and therefore it is not known to be available for development. However the site has a low existing use value and development is likely to be economically viable at an appropriate density.
Green	The land has been promoted by the landowner and or developer and is known to be available for development. The site has a low existing use value and residential development is likely to be economically viable at an appropriate density.

Development Potential

Capacity and Delivery	Response
Estimated dwellings per hectare	
Estimated dwellings units	
Estimated employment space (m ²)	
Estimated start date	0-5 years 6-10 years 11-15 years Sites not currently deliverable or developable
Estimated annual build-out rate	
Development completion timescales (years)	0-5 years 6-10 years 11-15 years Sites not currently deliverable or developable

This part of the assessment also provides a sense check of the site capacities that were submitted through the Call for Sites Process. The Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service produced a range of density assumptions for different typologies of sites as set out in the Typologies Study and summarised below. A 'low-medium' density was applied to each site based on the typology it fell within to produce a comparative capacity estimate. Where the capacity cited by the site promoter was within the upper 25% of this comparative estimate the original estimate by the landowner/promoter was retained. Similarly, for mixed use and employment sites as well as those of 1,000 units or more, the landowner/promoters estimate was used based on the majority of sites having been submitted following a masterplan led approach. Where there was a difference of more than 25% in the estimates, the comparative estimate capacity was used.

Figure 1: Site typology applied density overview

Site typology	Low (DPH)	Medium (DPH)	High (DPH)	V high (DPH)
Central Cambridge	75	125	175	225
Suburban Cambridge	40	60	90	120
Rural connected	30	40	60	80
Rural minor centre / group	n/a	30	40	N/A
Rural infill	15	n/a	n/a	N/A
City edge	50	70	100	150
New settlement	40	50	60	N/A

Estimates of start dates and build out rates have been guided by the findings of the Greater Cambridge Housing Delivery Study (2021). An extract from the study detailing the findings regarding build out rates can be found below.

Extract from Greater Cambridge Housing Delivery Study (AECOM 2021)

Table 2: Strategic site lead-in time and build-out rate assumptions

Site Size	Plan adoption to submission*	Submission to Approval**	Approval to first Completion	Average build-out rate	Average outlets	Peak build-out rate	Peak outlets
200-499	2 years	4	2	50	1	50	1
500-999	2 years	4	2	90	1-2	100	2
1000-1499	3 years	4	2	120	2-3	150	3
1500-1999	3 years	4	2	145	3-4	200	4
2000+ New	3 years	4	2	200-250	4-5	300	5

Settlement							
2000+ Urban Extension	3 years	4	2	225-275	5	350	7

*(N.B. this assumes the preparation of some form of supplementary guidance e.g. masterplan, design guide/code or Supplementary Planning Document to guide strategic developments of >200 dwellings. This timeframe could be reduced where no supplementary guidance or Green Belt release is required prior to submission of an application).

** Approval is defined as a legally implementable permission e.g. following approval of Reserved Matters. It is assumed that strategic site promoters will typically seek outline planning approval in the first instance. It is acknowledged that some smaller sites in the 200-499 range could be brought forward for full planning and time savings would be achievable. This should be assessed on a case by case basis (where appropriate), otherwise an outline planning application should be assumed.

Table 3: Strategic site build-out rate phasing assumptions example

Size band	Y 1	Y 2	Y 3	Y 4	Y 5	Y 6	Y 7	Y 8	Y 9	Y 10	Y 11	Y 12	Y 13	Y 14	Y 15	Y 16	Y 17	Y 18	Y 19	Y 20	Total	Average dwellings per annum (dpa)	Equivalent outlets
200-499	50	50	50	50	50																250	50	1.0
500-999	50	100	100	100	100	100	50														600	86	1.7
1000-1499	50	100	150	150	150	150	150	150	100	50											1200	120	2.4
1500-1999	50	100	150	200	200	200	200	200	150	100	50										1600	145	2.9
2000+ NS	50	100	150	200	250	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	250	200	150	100	50	4500	225	4.5
2000+ SUE	50	150	250	350	350	350	350	250	150	50											2300	230	4.6

Table 4: Non-strategic site lead-in time and build-out rate assumptions, by HELAA typology


Typology	Density	Low	Low-Medium	Medium-High	High	GCSP Monitoring category	Lead-in times (submission to first completion) - Full	Lead-in times (submission to first completion) - Outline	Build-out rate flats	Build-out rate houses	Notes
Central	75-225 dph	75	125	175	225	Cambridge Urban Area (City) (flats)	3	5	All built in one year	N/A	Assume outline permission sought only on the largest sites (200+ dwellings)
Suburban	40-120 dph	40	60	90	120	Cambridge Urban Area (City) (flats and houses mix)	3	5	75dpa houses and flats mix	75dpa houses and flats mix	Assume outline permission sought only on the largest sites (200+ dwellings)
Suburban	40-120 dph	40	60	90	120	Cambridge Urban Area (City) (houses)	3	5	N/A	50dpa	Assume outline permission sought only on the largest sites (200+ dwellings)

Rural connected	30-80 dph	30	40	60	80	Rural Centre (South)	3	4	All built in one year	40dpa	Assume outline if larger than 50 dwellings
Rural minor/group	30-40 dph	n/a	30	40	n/a	Minor Rural Centre (South)	3	4	N/A	40dpa	Assume outline if larger than 50 dwellings
Rural Infill	15 dph	15	n/a	n/a	n/a	Infill Village (South)	3	-	N/A	All built out in one year (small sites only)	Applications of this size unlikely to be made in outline
Large city edge / infill (<200 dwellings)	50-150 dph	50	70	100	150	Edge of Cambridge (City), Cambridge Urban Area (South)	4	6	All built in one year	40dpa	Assume outline if larger than 50 dwellings
Large city edge / infill (>200 dwellings)	50-150 dph	50	70	100	150	Strategic site	-	-	-	-	See strategic sites section.
New Settlement	40-60 dph	40	50	60	n/a	Strategic site	-	-	-	-	See strategic sites section.

Annex 2: Assessment of impact on the strategic road network

The Councils collaborated with Highways England to agree an approach to assessing the impact of proposals on the strategic road network.

This assessment was based upon the capacity of junctions, as these are the pinch points on the road network which causes traffic congestion. A catchment area or zone was agreed with Highways England, as shown on the map below. These zones are drawn around each junction on the strategic road network to reflect the catchment area or roads which feed into those junctions.



Each zone was assigned a Red, Amber, Green (RAG) score according to how the junctions perform in terms of their capacity to accommodate additional traffic. Development proposals fall within these zones and is assessed according to the criteria in the table below.

Zone	Location	RAG Score	Comment
1	Cambridge	Green	Assumed 'trip budget' approach to minimise vehicle traffic, with minimal impact on the Strategic Road Network
2	A14 West	Amber	Limited capacity for growth

Zone	Location	RAG Score	Comment
3	A14 Cambridge Northern Bypass	Red	No capacity for growth. Sites would need to ensure no net increase in vehicles trips on the Strategic Road Network.
4	A14 East	Green	Capacity for limited growth
5	A11	Green	Capacity for growth
6	A11/M11	Amber	Capacity for growth with mitigation to local road network
7	M11 South	Green	Capacity for growth
8	M11 North	Red	No capacity for growth. Sites would need to ensure no net increase in vehicles trips on the Strategic Road Network.
9	A428	Amber	Capacity for growth but with potential constraint to local road network at Madingley
10	South West	Green Amber	<2,000 dwellings / 5,000m ² employment >2,000 dwellings / 5,000m ² employment

Zones 3 'A14 Cambridge Northern Bypass' and 8 'M11 North' were considered to be the only zones with no capacity for growth, and scored Red. This does not rule out sites at this stage. However, to be acceptable in planning terms development proposals within these zones will need to demonstrate (through a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan) no net increase in vehicles trips on the strategic road network.

Similarly, proposals within Cambridge (Zone 1) will need to minimise their vehicular traffic to minimise impact on the strategic road network. This is consistent with the approach already being applied to many larger sites using a 'trip budget'.

Zone 10 'South West' is located outside the immediate catchment of the strategic road network. Therefore, particularly for smaller development proposals, there is unlikely to be a direct impact (Green score). There is potential for larger development proposals (over 2,000 dwellings or 5,000m² employment) to become a trip generator or attractor across a wider area, which is why an Amber score is applied.

Annex 3: Call for sites form

The following form was available to download on the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning website, but could also be completed online.

Greater Cambridge Local Plan

Additional Sites and Broad Locations

Response Form – Issues and Options 2020



Guidance

Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council are preparing a new joint Greater Cambridge Local Plan to provide a sustainable vision for the future of the area. This includes planning for new housing and economic development to meet our needs and protect and enhance our environment. An early step in the plan preparation process is to gather information on what land is available and suitable for development. We undertook a 'Call for Sites' in Spring 2019 and are now providing another opportunity for you to tell us about potential development sites and broad locations as part of the Issues and Options consultation.

This response form may be used to put forward potential sites and broad locations for housing or economic development across the Greater Cambridge Local Plan area which is made up of the administrative districts of Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. An understanding of land availability for development across Greater Cambridge will ensure that the new Local Plan allocates enough land in appropriate locations to meet identified needs. A Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) will be prepared to help the Councils choose the right sites from a large number of potential alternatives having assessed their suitability, availability and achievability.

Please complete a separate form for each site being submitted for consideration. For sites to be considered all of the form must be completed.

Housing development includes market housing for sale, affordable housing (including entry level exception sites), housing for rent, student housing, housing for people with disabilities, housing for people receiving care, service family housing, sites for travellers and travelling showpeople, and sites for people wishing to commission or build their own homes. It does NOT however include sites intended for the provision of rural exception site housing.

Economic development includes development for B1 (Business), B2 (General Industrial) and B8 (Storage and Distribution) uses. It does NOT include retail, hotels, leisure or recreation development.

Only submit sites and broad locations that are capable of delivering 5 or more dwellings or economic development on sites of 0.25 hectares (or 500 square meters of floor space) and above.

Please do not resubmit sites that you have already told us about through the 2019 'Call for Sites'. If you do resubmit a site with an amended site boundary or description, please let us know if this is a replacement submission or an additional submission.

If you need assistance completing the form contact the Planning Policy Team at Localplan@greatercambridgeplanning.org or call us on 01954 713183.

Completed forms must be received by 5pm on 24 February 2020

Wherever possible the Call for Sites form should be completed online at: <https://cambridge.oc2.uk>.

If you do not have access to the internet, **you can submit forms by:**

Email: Localplan@greatercambridgeplanning.org, or by **post** to:

Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Policy Team
c/o South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cambourne Business Park
Cambourne
Cambridge
CB23 6EA

For more information about the call for sites see our webpages at: www.scambs.gov.uk/gclpcallforsites and www.cambridge.gov.uk/gclpcallforsites

Data Protection

We will treat your data in accordance with our [Privacy Notices](#). Information will be used by South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council solely in relation to the SHELAA and the Greater Cambridge Local Plan. Please note that all responses will be available for public inspection and cannot be treated as confidential. Representations, including names, are published on our website. By submitting this response form you are agreeing to these conditions.

The Councils are not allowed to automatically notify you of future consultations unless you 'opt-in'.

Do you wish to be kept informed of future stages of the SHELAA and the Greater Cambridge Local Plan?

Please tick: Yes ☐ No ☐

Disclaimer: The assessment of potential housing and employment sites through the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment process and the identification of sites with the potential for development does not indicate that planning permission will be granted for development, or that the sites(s) will be allocated for development in the Greater Cambridge Local Plan (GCLP). The SHELAA will be an important evidence source to inform future plan making but it will be for the GCLP to determine which sites are most suitable to meet identified needs.

For office use only

Response number:

Date received:

A - Contact Details

Name:	Agent's name:
Name of organisation: (if applicable)	Name of Agent's organisation: (if applicable)
Address:	Agent's Address:
Postcode:	Postcode:
Email:	Email:
Tel:	Tel:

Signature:	Date:
If you are submitting the form electronically, no signature is required.	

B - Your status

Status (please tick all that apply):
☐ Landowner ☐ Land Agent ☐ Planning Consultant ☐ Developer ☐ Registered Provider (Housing Association) ☐ Other, please indicate:

C - Land Ownership

If you are not the landowner, please provide the details of all landowners:

(If there are more than two landowners please provide the contact details of the additional landowners on a separate sheet)

Landowner 1:	
Title:	First Name: Last Name:
Organisation (if applicable):	
Address:	
Postcode:	Telephone Number:
Email:	
Landowner 2:	
Title:	First Name: Last Name:
Organisation (if applicable):	
Address:	
Postcode:	Telephone Number:
Email:	

Non landowner	
If you are not the landowner, please confirm the landowner(s) has been informed of this submission:	☐ Yes ☐ No
Does the landowner(s) support the submission? If yes, please provide evidence of their support e.g. a letter.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Don't know
Are there any issues that would prevent officers of the Council undertaking a site visit unaccompanied? A site visit may be required to enable a full assessment of the site. Site visits will be conducted unaccompanied wherever possible.	☐ Yes ☐ No
If necessary, please provide details of the person to be contacted to arrange access to the site or for an accompanied site visit:	
Title:	First Name: Last Name:
Organisation (if applicable):	
Address:	
Postcode:	Telephone Number:
Email:	

D - Site details

Site details	
Site location, address and post code:	
Site Area:	in hectares
<p>Site Map: Provide a location map clearly showing site boundaries and land ownership. The site to be edged in red and include all land necessary for the proposed development. Any other land in the same ownership close to or adjoining the site to be edged in blue.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Without a map we will not be able to consider this site</p>	

E - Current and recent land uses

Current and most recent use	
What is the current use of the site?	
If the site is developed but not currently in use, what was the last use of the site and when did it cease?	
Please provide details of any relevant historic planning applications including application number if known	
Is the site previously developed land, greenfield or a mixture?	

F - Proposed future uses

Description of your proposed development:	
Please indicate which of these uses you consider suitable for the future use of the site or broad location:	
Use	Yes or No
Market and affordable housing	
Key worker housing	
Older persons housing	
Residential care home	
Student accommodation	
Custom or self-build housing	
Other forms of housing (please specify)	
Gypsy and traveller pitch	
Travelling showpeople pitch	
Employment (B1) office	
Employment (B1b) research and development	
Employment (B1c) light industrial	
Employment (B2) general industrial	
Employment (B8) storage and distribution	
Employment (other)	
What accompanying uses are you proposing:	
Schools and education	
Public open space	
Community facilities	

Recreation and leisure	
Healthcare	
Hotel	
Retail	
Other	
Please describe any benefits to the local area that the development could provide:	
Please provide and explain your estimate of the potential number of residential units of all types and / or potential employment floor space in square meters that can be accommodated:	

G - Suitability – site features and constraints

Site features and constraints

Are you aware of any physical or environmental or other limitations which may constrain development of the site? If so, describe the extent of the constraint and whether it can be addressed or mitigated to enable the site to be suitable for development:	Proposed mitigation (please attach any available evidence such as studies or surveys)
Site access Is there a current means of vehicular access to the site from the public highway and does this access need to be improved or an additional access created to enable development? Yes: ☐ (please give details) No: ☐ Details: (Indicate the location of the access on the site map)	
Physical constraints Are there any slopes, significant changes in ground levels or unstable ground on the site which could constrain its development in whole or part? Yes: ☐ (please give details) No: ☐ Details:	

<p>Environmental constraints</p> <p>Is the site affected by flood risk, drainage, contamination, biodiversity, heritage or other constraint or risk which could constrain its development in whole or part?</p> <p>Yes: ☐ (please give details) No: ☐</p> <p>Details:</p>	
<p>Infrastructure</p> <p>Does the site have access to key utilities? Will provision need to be made or capacity created or reinforced to enable development? (mains water supply, mains sewerage, electricity supply, gas supply, broadband internet).</p> <p>Is the site crossed or adjacent to a key utility such as a pipeline or by pylons? (Indicate the location of the constraint on a map).</p> <p>Yes: ☐ (please give details) No: ☐</p> <p>Details:</p>	

H - Availability

When could the site become available for development?	Available now ☐	Next 5 years ☐	Next 6-10 years ☐	10+ years ☐
Please give your reasons:				
Please choose the most appropriate category to indicate what level of market interest there is / has recently been on the site:	☐ Site owned by a developer ☐ Site is being marketed ☐ Site is under option by a developer ☐ Enquiries received ☐ None ☐ Don't know			
In your opinion, what is the market attractiveness of the site at the current time?				
Are there any legal / land ownership constraints on the site that might prohibit or delay development (such as ransom strips, unresolved multiple ownerships, covenants or long tenancies)				

If the site has been allocated for development in previous Local Plans and remains undeveloped or has a record of unimplemented planning permissions please provide the reasons why.	
--	--

I - Deliverability

Please indicate the likely year when the proposed development will begin to deliver completed buildings, and the year when the development is likely to be completed.	Start of delivery: Completed development: Development period in years:
To the best of your knowledge, are there abnormal cost factors which could affect delivery of the site? (such as site preparation costs, infrastructure costs, demolition or ground conditions).	☐ Yes ☐ No
How could any issues be overcome?	

J - Viability

Do you consider that the site is currently viable for its proposed development taking into account any and all current planning policy considerations and known development costs associated with the site?	☐ Yes ☐ No
---	---

K - Supporting evidence

Is there any other factual information regarding the site that we should be aware of?

Guidance Notes

A	Contact details	Please include details of the person who should be the main contact regarding the site if we have any queries.
C	Land ownership	If there are multiple owners provide details for them all on attached sheets.

D	Site details	Make sure that we can accurately locate the site and understand its boundaries. Do not assume we have as much local knowledge as you do.
F	Proposed future uses	If you have any evidence or studies to support your use preferences and site capacity estimates please provide a copy as an attachment.
G	Suitability	It would be helpful if you could provide details of proposed mitigations to overcome identified constraints.
H	Availability	Only select 'available now' if the site is vacant and unused and has no constraints on its development.
I	Deliverability	Please be as realistic as possible when estimating when development can start and be completed.
J	Viability	If you have any evidence or studies regarding the viability of the site please provide a copy as an attachment.

Annex 4: Review of Other Sources of sites

Cambridge SHLAA

The Cambridge Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) was undertaken between 2011 and 2013, and involved an iterative process of identifying, testing and filtering out sites to identify potential allocations.

At the beginning of this process the Council identified 891 sites, but this was quickly reduced to 184 sites when sites capable of accommodating less than 10 dwellings and sites already being built were excluded. 60 of these were considered potentially developable, but after further scrutiny this was reduced to 28. Following a further call for sites process a further process of review led to an outcome of 18 sites. Many of these eventually became part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

A review has been carried out to see if any sites in the SHLAA not already identified from other sources warrant testing. This has been done in three ways:

- Review of sites considered suitable (Table 4 SHLAA Deliverability & Developability of Initial Sites Considered Suitable) [Microsoft Word - SHLAA PART 1 Main Report May 2013 & Annexes 1-12 FINAL.doc \(cambridge.gov.uk\)](#). Most of the sites identified as being deliverable became allocations in the local plan. This review checked if any that did not become allocations warranted testing.
- Review of the list of undeliverable sites included in The SHLAA 2013 annex 15 [Microsoft Word - Annex 15 SHLAA March 2013 Technical Appendix.doc \(cambridge.gov.uk\)](#)
- Review of small sites – a review of the small sites rejected at an early stage was also undertaken, as the SHLAA process has a slightly lower dwellings threshold meaning that slightly smaller sites could be included. Sites over 0.1 hectare were reviewed. This yielded some potential sites for testing, but these were rejected.

Cambridge SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Ward	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 561	Garages west of 23 to 27 Parsonage Street	Market	0.05	This site is considered to be suitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 556	Car park west of Wesley Church	Market	0.06	The site is considered to be unsuitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 524	Open space opposite 177 to 201 St Matthew's Gardens	Petersfield	0.08	The site is considered to be unsuitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 336	Car park at Havenfield	West Chesterton	0.09	This site is not considered to be suitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 139	Lock-up garages adjacent to 11 Pamplin Court	Cherry Hinton	0.09	The site is considered to be suitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 547	Car Parks south of Angus Close	Petersfield	0.09	The site is considered to be unsuitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 504	Car Park to front of Varsity House	Petersfield	0.09	The site is considered to be unsuitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing

Cambridge SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Ward	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 220	Car park of Buchan House	Kings Hedges	0.09	This site is not considered to be suitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 244	Car park between Faringford Close and Chatsworth Avenue	Castle	0.09	This site is considered to be suitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 695	Open space south of 11 Leyburn Close	Cherry Hinton	0.09	The site is considered to be unsuitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 566	Churchyard of former All Saints Church	Market	0.09	The site is considered to be unsuitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 157	Lock-up garages to R/O 6 - 20 Acrefield Drive.	West Chesterton	0.09	This site is considered to be unsuitable for residential development.	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 653	Garages east of 38 to 46 William Smith Close	Romsey	0.09	This site is considered to be suitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 289	Garages south east of 237 and 259 Campkin Road	Kings Hedges	0.09	This site is not considered to be suitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing

Cambridge SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Ward	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 792	Open space east of 3 to 10 Trevone Place	Coleridge	0.10	The site is considered to be unsuitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 552	Garages behind 37 to 41 Hills Road	Petersfield	0.10	The site is considered to be unsuitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 367	Garages at Chesterton Towers	East Chesterton	0.11	This site is not considered to be suitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 654	Garages south of 15 to 57 William Smith Close	Romsey	0.11	The site is considered to be unsuitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 760	Ventress Farm Court Garages	Cherry Hinton	0.11	The site is considered to be unsuitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 622	Car park and building	Romsey	0.11	The site is considered to be unsuitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 761	Garages to rear of 1-15 Greystoke Road	Cherry Hinton	0.11	The site is considered to be unsuitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 762	Roundabout Greystoke Road	Cherry Hinton	0.11	This site is considered to be suitable for development	No	Protected open space

Cambridge SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Ward	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 467	Garages on Regatta Court	Abbey	0.11	This site is considered to be unsuitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 155	Lock-up garages opposite 37 - 51 Franks Lane.	East Chesterton	0.11	The site is considered to be suitable for development	No	Already developed
Site 668	Open space and car park west and south of 195 Perne Road	Romsey	0.12	The site is considered to be unsuitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 72	Avis Car Hire, 245 Mill Road	Romsey	0.12	The site is considered to be suitable for development	No	Active business, no evidence of availability
Site 385	Open space north of 213 Histon Road	Castle	0.12	This site is not considered to be suitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 806	Sorrento Hotel	Coleridge	0.12	Site 806 can be considered to be developable	No	Existing business, subject to a previous residential permission but no evidence of availability
Site 37	Land to the r/o 1a Green End Road	East Chesterton	0.12	The site is considered to be suitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 34	Victoria Road	West Chesterton	0.12	The site is considered to be suitable for development	No	Multiple ownerships, gardens, existing business in situ and no evidence of availability

Cambridge SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Ward	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 658	Garages at Hope Street Yard	Romsey	0.12	The site is considered to be unsuitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 586	Car park north of 15 Shaftesbury Road	Trumpington	0.12	This site is considered to be suitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 598	Car park north of 1 Winchmore Drive	Trumpington	0.12	This site is considered to be suitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 158	Lock-up garages adjacent to 57 Acrefield Drive.	West Chesterton	0.12	The site is considered to be suitable for development	No	Flood zone 3, poor access, small size
Site 739	Car parks and open space north of 20 to 34 Chequers Close	Cherry Hinton	0.12	The site is considered to be unsuitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 595	Garages east of Gilmerton Court	Trumpington	0.13	The site is considered to be unsuitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 306	Open space to the south of Harvey Goodwin Gardens	Arbury	0.13	This site is not considered to be suitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 147	Land to R/O 24 - 38 Whitehill Road	Abbey	0.14	This site is considered to be unsuitable for residential development.	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing

Cambridge SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Ward	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 321	Garages and builders yard between Primrose Street and Green's Road	West Chesterton	0.14	This site is not considered to be suitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 41	Garages and houses at 61 and 63 Kinross Road	East Chesterton	0.14	The site is considered to be suitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 591	Car park north of Lockton House	Trumpington	0.14	The site is considered to be unsuitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 308	Car park behind St Luke's Church	Arbury	0.14	This site is not considered to be suitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 468	Open space with pond in Regatta Court	Abbey	0.15	This site is considered to be unsuitable for development	No	Loss of open space
Site 430	Catholic Church of St Vincent de Paul	Abbey	0.16	This site is considered to be suitable for development	No	In church use
Site 98	Land adjacent to 89 Greystoke Road	Cherry Hinton	0.16	The site is considered to be suitable for development	No	Church car park in active use with no evidence of availability

Cambridge SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Ward	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 480	Open space at the end of Silverwood Close	Abbey	0.16	This site is considered to be unsuitable for development	No	Loss of landscaped area would impact on townscape
Site 119	Surface car park adjacent to Colleges Nursery, Campkin Road	Kings Hedges	0.16	The site is not considered to be suitable for development	No	loss of car parking could have a negative impact on the adjacent community facilities
Site 313	Car park behind The Grape Pub	Arbury & Castle	0.16	This site is not considered to be suitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 731	Car park north of the pub at 20 and 22 Mill End Road	Cherry Hinton	0.17	The site is considered to be unsuitable for development	No	Significant impact on listed building
Site 455	Open space in front of 9 to 23 Rawlyn Road	Abbey	0.17	This site is considered to be unsuitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 855	Telephone Exchange south of 1 Ditton Lane	Abbey	0.17	The site is considered to be unsuitable for development	Yes	
Site 150	Lock-up garages adjacent to 1 Rutland Close	Arbury	0.17	This site is considered to be unsuitable for residential development.	No	Garages serving adjoining flats, not currently available

Cambridge SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Ward	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 197	38 Queen Ediths Way	Queen Ediths	0.18	The site is considered to be suitable for development	No	Fragmented land ownership including existing dwellings
Site 565	Car park behind 1 Regent Street	Market	0.19	The site is considered to be unsuitable for development	No	Car park serving the adjoining office and commercial premises
Site 63	Lock up garages adjacent to 2 Derwent Close	Coleridge	0.19	The site is considered to be suitable for development	No	Issues related to car parking, site contamination and overlooking onto neighbouring properties
Site 471	Depots west of 18 Stanley Road	Abbey	0.19	This site is considered to be unsuitable for development	No	Currently in active use as an employment site and an electricity substation adjoins
Site 691	Open space south west of 85 to 95 Kelsey Crescent	Cherry Hinton	0.19	The site is considered to be unsuitable for development	No	Loss of open space
Site 67	Land to the south of Ridgeons, Cavendish Road	Romsey	0.20	The site is considered to be suitable for development	No	Part of on-going development
Site 379	Petrol station and garage, Elizabeth Way	East Chesterton	0.21	This site is considered to be suitable for development	No	Site in commercial use, no evidence of availability
Site 329	Open space on Mulberry Close	West Chesterton	0.21	This site is considered to be suitable for development	No	Loss of open space

Cambridge SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Ward	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 48	Bungalows, gardens and garages on Chantry Close	West Chesterton	0.22	The site is considered to be suitable for development	No	Fragmented land ownership including existing dwellings
Site 389	Garages east of 37 to 48 Sherlock Close	Castle	0.22	This site is considered to be suitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 66	Garages to the r/o 47 Glisson Road	Trumpington	0.23	The site is considered to be suitable for development	No	Plot capacity too small to warrant further testing
Site 196	31 Queen Ediths Way	Queen Ediths	0.23	The site is considered to be unsuitable for development.	No	Fragmented land ownership including existing dwellings
Site 338	Open space west of College Fields	West Chesterton	0.28	This site is considered to be suitable for development	No	Loss of open space
Site 121	Broadwinds, Hauxton Road	Trumpington	0.28	The site is considered to be suitable for development	No	Single large dwelling, no evidence of availability
Site 337	Open space east of College Fields	West Chesterton	0.28	This site is considered to be suitable for development	No	Loss of open space
Site 647	Area of trees.	Romsey	0.29	The site is considered to be unsuitable for development	No	Contains a functional floodplain and contributes to the character and amenity of the local area

Cambridge SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Ward	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 29	Croftgate, Fulbrooke Road	Newnham	0.30	This site can only be considered to be suitable for development if it can pass the sequential test in relation to flood risk	No	Fragmented land ownership including existing dwellings
Site 68	Railway depot adjacent to 125a Cavendish Road	Romsey	0.30	The site is considered to be suitable for development	No	Access and noise issues. No evidence of availability
Site 850	Play area north of 25 to 37 Godwin Way	Queen Edith's	0.32	The site is considered to be unsuitable for development	No	Access issues and loss of community facility
Site 316	Car park and land behind Arundal House Hotel	Arbury	0.35	This site is considered to be suitable for development	No	In use as hotel car park and issue with overlooking from hotel

Cambridge SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Ward	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 863	Warehouse north of 133 Ditton Walk	Abbey	0.38	The site is considered to be developable, only if it involved a conversion of the former Maltings building. This would be an exception to the Council's normal planning policy of retaining existing B1, B2 & B8 Class uses. Whilst this site is used for such	No	Employment land review recommends retention as employment site
Site 140	Lock-up garages to R/O 33 -56 Eltisley Avenue	Newnham	0.39	This site is considered to be unsuitable for residential development.	No	Highway access unsuitable for scale of development. Site in active employment use
Site 587	Car park south and east of Eastbrook	Trumpington	0.41	The site is considered to be unsuitable for development	No	car parking area serving adjoining offices
Site 484	Car parks at Thirkill Court	Newnham	0.44	This site is considered to be unsuitable for development	No	Incompatible with surrounding university uses

Cambridge SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Ward	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 522	Communal open space in the centre of St Matthew's Gardens	Petersfield	0.44	The site is considered to be unsuitable for development	No	Loss of open space
Site 27	Apple Court, Newton Road	Trumpington	0.61	Site 27 can only be considered to be suitable for development if the sequential test in relation to flood risk can be passed	No	Fragmented land ownership including existing dwellings
Site 322	Victoria Homes, Victoria Road	West Chesterton	1.01	This site is considered to be suitable for development	No	Protected open space
Site 879	72-76 St Andrew's Road	East Chesterton	1.31	This site is not considered to be suitable for development	No	Site in active employment use, with limited expansion potential due to flood zone

South Cambridgeshire SHLAA

The South Cambridgeshire SHLAA was prepared between 2011 and 2013, with the report informing the plan making process for the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

A review was undertaken to identify:

- Sites that had been submitted through the call for sites process (and were therefore already being tested);
- Sites that had been allocated for development, had gained planning permission, or were under construction / built;
- Sites smaller than 0.125ha (and not considered large enough to warrant testing).

Sites were then reviewed to consider whether they warranted testing in the HELAA. In particular, the previous key reasons for rejection were re-assessed. The reasons for not testing in the HELAA have been documented in the table below.

South Cambs SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 156	Balsham Buildings, 7 High Street, Balsham	0.83	Site with limited development potential. This does not include a judgement on whether the site is suitable for residential development in planning policy terms, which will be for the separate plan making process.	No	Now built out as residential development.
Site 236	Land at Linton Road, Balsham	1.62	Site with no development potential	No	Development of the site would have a significant adverse effect on the townscape of Balsham because it would introduce a non-linear form of built development into the village.
Site 215	Land north of Glebe Road, Barrington	5.22	Site with no development potential.	No	Significant townscape and landscape impacts. It is not possible to provide safe highway access to the site.
Site 272	Hillside Farm Buildings, Orwell Road, Barrington	0.50	Site with no development potential.	No	Significant townscape and landscape impacts. Development would very visible the northern approach to the village, which it would not be possible to mitigate.

South Cambs SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 222	Land north of 6-14 Comberton Road, Barton	2.61	Site with no development potential	No	Adverse townscape and landscape impacts.
Site 223	Land north of 18 Comberton Road, Barton	2.69	Site with no development potential	No	Adverse townscape and landscape impacts.
Site 066	Land off the Causeway, Bassingbourn	1.03	Site with no development potential.	No	Impacts on the townscape and landscape, and the settings of the listed buildings.
Site 084	45 High Street, Bourn	0.64	Site with no development potential.	No	Significant historic environment, townscape and landscape impacts. Development would have a detrimental impact on the setting of several Listed Buildings, including the Grade I church, and Conservation Area, which it would not be possible to mitigate.
Site 010	Rear of 104 West Drive, Caldecote	3.26	Site with no development potential.	No	Important gap between Caldecote and Bourn Airfield new settlement
Site 011	Rear of 10 West Drive, Caldecote	0.82	Site with no development potential.	No	Important gap between Caldecote and Bourn Airfield new settlement

South Cambs SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 167	Land south of Homers Lane & West of High Street, Castle Camps	2.24	Site with no development potential	No	Development of this site would have an adverse effect on the landscape setting of Castle Camps because it would impact on the existing soft edge of the village created by existing gardens adjoining farmland. It would be contrary to the existing linear built form of the village
Site 193	Bartlow Road, Castle Camps	0.43	Site with no development potential	No	Adverse effect on the landscape because there could be the loss of a significant wooded backdrop to the rural edge of the village and potentially a loss of mature hedgerows that create a rural character to this approach into Castle Camps. Adverse effect on conservation area and listed buildings.

South Cambs SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 004	Land adj (north) to 69 Long Road, Comberton	0.32	Site with development potential. This does not include a judgement on whether the site is suitable for residential development in planning policy terms, which will be for the separate plan making process.	Yes	
Site 088	Land south and east of 42 Swaynes Lane, Comberton	2.25	Site with no development potential.	No	Important Countryside Frontage. Development of this site would cause a loss of enclosed fields and paddocks which form a transition between the village and the large arable fields to the south, introduce development behind the single depth development on this part of Swaynes Lane, and block the open views south from Swaynes Lane which would have an adverse effect on the landscape setting and townscape of Comberton

South Cambs SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 234	Land at the junction of Long Drove and Beach Road, Cottenham	1.64	Site with development potential. This does not include a judgement on whether the site is suitable for residential development in planning policy terms, which will be for the separate plan making process.	No	Now built out as residential development
Site 241	The Woodyard, Cottenham	1.23	Site with no development potential.	No	Site lies adjacent to the Cottenham Conservation Area and several Listed Buildings nearby. Detrimental impact on the setting of Grade I Listed church and Conservation Area, which it would not be possible to mitigate. Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Cottenham.

South Cambs SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 092	The Paddock, End of Mangers Lane, Duxford	0.41	Site with no development potential.	No	Protected Village Amenity Area. The development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the townscape of Duxford, and be harmful to its character, amenity, and tranquillity
Site 286	Land adjoining The Green, Duxford	0.81	Site with no development potential	No	Protected Village Amenity Area. The development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the townscape of Duxford, and be harmful to its character, amenity, and tranquillity
Site 115	Blue Lion PH, 2 Horningsea Road, Fen Ditton	0.38	Site with limited development potential. This does not include a judgement on whether the site is suitable for residential development in planning policy terms, which will be for the separate plan making process.	No	Now built out as residential development

South Cambs SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 175	Moores Farm, Fowlmere Road, Foxton	0.69	Site with limited development potential. This does not include a judgement on whether the site is suitable for residential development in planning policy terms, which will be for the separate plan making process.	No	Now built out as residential development
Site 173	Land off Honey Hill, Gamlingay	4.53	Site unlikely to have any development potential.	No	Adverse effect on Conservation Area and Listed buildings, Development of this site would have an adverse impact on the landscape setting of Gamlingay by bringing the village down from the ridge into open countryside so increasing its visibility from the south and by detracting from the landscape and townscape value of the Listed Building at 61 Mill Street aka 6 Honey Hill which looks to the south down Mill Lane.

South Cambs SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 018	Town End, Duck End, Girton	0.37	Site with no development potential.	No	Significant historic environment, townscape and landscape impacts on this historically sensitive part of the village. Development would have a direct impact on the setting of two Grade II Listed Buildings and water pump, which it would not be possible to mitigate. not possible to provide suitable vehicular access to the site without detrimental impact.to adjoining Listed Buildings, as access can only be achieved via a narrow driveway between the properties.

South Cambs SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 203	Land off Duck End, Girton	3.42	Site with no development potential	No	Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Girton as even a small scale of development will be harmful to the small scale and intimate character of Duck End. A smaller ribbon development along the perimeter of the site, consistent with the existing properties in Duck End would not be of sufficient scale to allocate.
Site 031	The Railway Tavern, Station Road, Great Shelford	0.12	The site has planning permission for 13 dwellings. (S/0133/11). Development completed	No	Now built out as residential development
Site 187	29 - 35 and 32 London Road, Great Shelford	0.55	Site with development potential. This does not include a judgement on whether the site is suitable for residential development in planning policy terms, this is for the separate plan making process.	No	Now built out as residential development

South Cambs SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 221	Land fronting Trap Road, Guilden Morden	2.11	Site with no development potential	No	Development of this site would extend the eastern boundary of the village into open countryside and not be typical of the linear nature of the village
Site 118	Land to the east of Button End and South of Beech Farm Cottages, Harston	0.58	Site with no development potential.	No	Significant historic environment, townscape and landscape impacts on this historically sensitive part of the village. Development would have a detrimental impact on the setting of several Grade II* Listed buildings and the Important Countryside Frontage to the south, which it would not be possible to mitigate.
Site 164	158 High Street, Harston	0.72	Site with limited development potential. This does not include a judgement on whether the site is suitable for residential development in planning policy terms, which will be for the separate plan making process.	No	Now built out as residential development

South Cambs SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 013	Land rear of 59 & 61 Cottenham Road, Histon	1.73	Site with no development potential.	No	Development of this site would have a significant adverse impact on the setting of two Grade II Listed buildings, which it would not be possible to mitigate, and impact on the wider landscape and townscape setting of Histon. There are noise issues from the adjacent farm complex, which it is unlikely can be adequately addressed by on-site measures alone. Highway access to the site is unsuitable
Site 046	Land at SCA Packaging Ltd, Villa Road, Impington	2.26	Site with development potential. This does not include a judgement on whether the site is suitable for residential development in planning policy terms, which will be for the separate plan making process.	No	Now built out as residential development.

South Cambs SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 308	Land at Former Bishops Hardware Store, Histon	0.22	Site with development potential. This does not include a judgement on whether the site is suitable for residential development in planning policy terms, which will be for the separate plan making process.	No	Site has planning permission for residential development
Site 015	1 Horseheath Road, Linton	0.28	The mitigation necessary makes the site too small to be considered as a site option in the SHLAA or for allocation in the Local Plan.	No	Site has planning permission for residential development
Site 152	Land east of Station Road, Linton	1.79	Site with limited development potential. This does not include a judgement on whether the site is suitable for residential development in planning policy terms, which will be for the separate plan making process.	Yes	Within the Linton Special Policy Area (Policy CH/10) – Policy seeks to restrict further residential development to the south of the A1307 due to the segregation from the main part of the village and further development in this area would not be sustainable. It is proposed to retain such a policy.

South Cambs SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 028	Bancroft Farm, Church Lane, Little Abington	0.42	Site without development potential.	No	Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the townscape and landscape setting of Little Abington because the site has a distinctly rural character and would result in the loss of an open space within the village
Site 244	Land West of Over Road, Longstanton	4.10	Updated August 2013: Site with limited development potential. This does not include a judgement on whether the site is suitable for residential development in planning policy terms, which will be for the separate plan making process.	Yes	

South Cambs SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 257	Land off Clive Hall Drive, Longstanton	0.26	Site with no development potential.	No	Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Longstanton. There is a clear edge to the village in this location, with Mills Lane becoming increasingly rural in character beyond Clive Hall Drive to the east. The importance of keeping this land open has been emphasised both by the Inspector considering the appeal of recent planning applications, and also by the Inspectors considering the Northstowe AAP.
Site 130 & 131	Land to Rear of Victoria Way, off New Road, Melbourn	3.01	Site potentially suitable for development. This does not include a judgement on whether the site is suitable for residential development in planning policy terms, which will be for the separate plan making process.	No	Now built out as residential development

South Cambs SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 235	36 New Road, Melbourn	0.71	Site potentially suitable for development. This does not include a judgement on whether the site is suitable for residential development in planning policy terms, which will be for the separate plan making process.	No	Now built out as residential development
Site 055	Land at Whitecroft Road, Meldreth	0.98	Site with no development potential	No	Site has planning permission for residential development
Site 132	The Former EDF Depot & Training Centre, Ely Road, Milton	8.55	Site with development potential. This does not include a judgement on whether the site is suitable for residential development in planning policy terms, which will be for the separate plan making process.	No	Now built out as residential development

Site 266	Cave Industrial Estate, Chesterton Fen Road, Milton (G&T Site)	1.68	Rejected: The site is on the north-eastern outskirts of Cambridge. The site is adjacent to Chesterton sidings and mainline railway line. There are proposals to develop a new interchange in this location, together with stabling facilities for freight trains. Noise and vibration is a material consideration. It is unlikely that mitigation measures on the site alone can provide an acceptable ambient noise environment. The possibility of land contamination may need remediation. SHLAA (August 2013) Appendix 5 - Sites Proposed for Gypsy and Traveller Use Edge of Cambridge Page 78 Site 266 - Land at Cave Industrial Estate, Chesterton Fen Road, Milton The highway authority would seek that the proposed vehicular movements from any proposed change of use	No	In active employment use. Concern regarding additional traffic relying on railway crossing
----------	--	------	---	----	--

South Cambs SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
			do not exceed those generated by the existing lawful use. The highway authority is concerned about increasing vehicle movements to this area, as the only access is through a busy urban neighbourhood. The site is in close proximity to 151 existing pitches (125 permanent pitches, 26 pitches undeveloped with permanent consent.) In addition, two sites with 48 temporary pitches, have been tested and have also been subject to consultation in the issues and options 2 report. One unauthorised site was also identified as a rejected option.		

South Cambs SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 067	Land at Manor Farm Close, Oakington	2.22	Site with no development potential.	No	Significant historic environment, townscape and landscape impacts on this historically sensitive part of the village. Development would have a detrimental impact on the setting of Oakington Conservation Area and several Grade II and a II* Listed Buildings. It is also within the green separation to Northstowe. unclear whether appropriate access can be secured to the site as it is not linked to the adopted public highway

Site 184	Land at Kettles Close, Oakington (G&T Site)	0.60	Rejected: The site lies on the eastern edge of Oakington, surrounded on three sides by residential development. It is currently in use for agricultural business and storage. The whole site is currently identified as being within flood zone 3, which would rule it out from further assessment. According to PPS25 caravans and mobile homes intended for SHLAA (August 2013) Appendix 5 - Sites Proposed for Gypsy and Traveller Use Oakington Page 82 Site 184 - Land at Kettles Close permanent residential use are classified as highly vulnerable, and should not be allocated in flood zone 3. The Environment Agency would object to the allocation of the site. The site is within the green belt. The site is currently open and development would impact on the landscape setting of the	No	Flood Zone 3. Approximately half of the site is within Anglian Water's cordon sanitaire for pumping station, and will not be suitable for residential development. Landscape impacts.
----------	---	------	--	----	---

			<p>area. There is currently a clear edge to the built-up part of the village. Nearly half of the site is within Anglian Water's cordon sanitaire and will not be suitable for residential development. Oakington currently has relatively poor access to services and facilities, relying on nearby villages for key services such as doctors surgery and food shopping. Therefore a site would not currently meet the site accessibility criteria regarding key services. However, it is in the vicinity of the proposed Northstowe new town, which will provide a greater range of services and facilities Access to the land is only achievable via Kettles Close, a residential cul-de-sac, which is unsuitable.</p>		
Site 185	Land at Kettles Close, Oakington	0.60	Site with no development potential.	No	Flood Zone 3. Approximately half of the site is within Anglian Water's cordon sanitaire for pumping station, and will not be

South Cambs SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
					suitable for residential development. Landscape impacts.
Site 275	Old East Goods Yard, Station Road, Oakington	0.59	Site with no development potential.	No	Parts of site including entrance in flood zone 3. This is a long thin site and mitigating noise impacts will leave an unsuitable site area to create a good design of development compatible with its surroundings
Site 007	Land rear of 38 Mill Road, Over	1.43	Site with no development potential.	No	Unclear whether appropriate access can be secured to the site without removing further property from the road frontage. Historic environment, townscape and landscape impacts. Development would have a detrimental impact on the setting of Grade II Listed Building and would be a substantial development out of character with the linear village.

South Cambs SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 017	Land off Randalls Lane, Over	1.06	Site with no development potential.	No	Significant heritage, townscape and landscape impacts. It would not be possible to mitigate any impact on the historic environment as the site forms an important part of the setting of a Grade I Listed church, several Grade II Listed Buildings and the Conservation Area. It is not possible to provide safe highway access to the site
Site 097	Land at and to the rear of 16 The Lanes, Over	1.12	Site with no development potential.	No	Significant historic environment, townscape and landscape impacts on this historically sensitive part of the village. Development would have a detrimental impact on the setting of a Grade I Listed church, several Grade II Listed Buildings and the Conservation Area, which it would not be possible to mitigate

South Cambs SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 127	Land at Mill Road, Over	1.60	Updated August 2013 (for consistency with Sustainability Appraisal Annex B – Summary of SHLAA and SA Summary Tables): Site with limited development potential. This does not include a judgement on whether the site is suitable for residential development in planning policy terms, which will be for the separate plan making process.	No	Site has planning permission for residential development
Site 138	Land east of Station Road, Over	0.86	Site with no development potential.	No	Significant historic environment, townscape and landscape impacts on this historically sensitive part of the village. Development would have a detrimental impact on the setting of a Grade I Listed church, several Grade II Listed Buildings and the Conservation Area, which it would not be possible to mitigate

South Cambs SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 165	Land off Meadow Lane, Over	3.13	Site with no development potential.	No	Large parts in flood zone 2 and 3. Unclear how access would be achieved. The site forms part of the setting of a Grade I Listed church, several Grade II Listed Buildings and the Conservation Area
Site 151	Papworth Hospital, Papworth Everard	5.25	Site with development potential. This does not include a judgement on whether the site is suitable for residential development in planning policy terms, which will be for the separate plan making process.	No	Subject to site specific policy seeking health or employment uses in preference to residential
Site 116	Land Rear of 41 Mill Lane, Sawston	1.60	Site with limited potential suitability for development. This does not include a judgement on whether the site is suitable for residential development in planning policy terms, which will be for the separate plan making process.	No	Now built out as residential development.

South Cambs SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 209	Land north of Bogs Gap Lane, Steeple Morden	0.48	Site with no development potential	No	Now built out as residential development.
Site 237	Land east of Hay Street, Steeple Morden	0.33	Site with no development potential	No	Surface water flood risk. Townscape impact
Site 008	Land adj to 79 Middlewatch, Swavesey	0.26	Site with no development potential.	No	Now built out as residential development
Site 083 (part a)	Land south of Whitton Close & west of Boxworth End, Swavesey	5.00	Site with limited development potential. This does not include a judgement on whether the site is suitable for residential development in planning policy terms, which will be for the separate plan making process.	No	Site has planning permission for residential development

South Cambs SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 083 (part r)	Land south of Whitton Close & west of Boxworth End, Swavesey	2.68	Site with limited development potential. This does not include a judgement on whether the site is suitable for residential development in planning policy terms, which will be for the separate plan making process.	No	Development of this site would have an adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Swavesey. Development on this site would be very large scale and harmful to the character of this compact, linear village. It would constitute substantial back land development, poorly related to the existing built-up part of the village, significantly extending the village to the west.

South Cambs SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 062	Land west of Rectory Farm, Middle Street, Thriplow	2.45	Site with no development potential	No	Development of the site would have a significantly adverse effect on the landscape setting of Thriplow because it would result in the loss of a significant area of open countryside within the core of the historic village. It would alter the existing character of the built form of the village which is linear with interspersed open space. It would greatly impact the setting of numerous listed buildings including Manor House and Thriplow Bury which are Grade II* listed buildings.

South Cambs SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 063	Land east of Farm Lane, Thriplow	4.41	Site with no development potential	No	Development of the site would have a significantly adverse effect on the landscape setting of Thriplow because it would result in the loss of a significant area of open countryside within the core of the historic village. It would alter the existing character of the built form of the village which is linear with interspersed open space. It would greatly impact the setting of numerous listed buildings including Manor House and Thriplow Bury which are Grade II* listed buildings.
Site 001	Land off Lode Avenue, Waterbeach	0.59	Site with limited development potential. This does not include a judgement on whether the site is suitable for residential development in planning policy terms, which will be for the separate plan making process.	Yes	

South Cambs SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 206	Land at Bannold Road and Bannold Drove, Waterbeach	1.78	Site with no development potential (as a result of the allocation of Waterbeach new town in the Proposed Submission Local Plan, and proposed extension of the Green Belt between the new town site and Waterbeach village in the vicinity of Bannold Road.)	No	Now built out as residential development
Site 270	Land off Gibson Close, Waterbeach	0.69	Site with no development potential.	No	Now built out as residential development, with the remainder of the site being woodland
Site 179	Land west of Whittlesford	23.37	Site with no development potential.	No	Significant townscape and landscape impacts. Development is of a very large scale out of proportion to the village, located in an exposed area, which it would not be possible to mitigate.
Site 285	Land adj to 83 Moorfield Road, Whittlesford Bridge	0.64	Site with no development potential.	No	Now built out as residential development

South Cambs SHLAA 2013 Site Number	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Status in SHLAA 2013	Does it merit Re-Assessment?	Reasons
Site 045 (parts a and r)	Land east of Rockmill End, Willingham (land east of 39-65 Rockmill End, Willingham)	3.42	Site with limited development potential. This does not include a judgement on whether the site is suitable for residential development in planning policy terms, which will be for the separate plan making process.	No	Now built out as residential development
Site 058	Land South of 77 Station Road, Willingham	0.41	Site with no development potential.	No	Now built out as residential development
Site 279	Land at Black Pit Drove / Rampton Road, Willingham	0.85	Site with no development potential.	No	Significant townscape and landscape impacts due to the backland nature of the site and it is unlikely to be possible to mitigate the noise impacts from the adjoining nurseries

Lapsed, Withdrawn and rejected planning source

Planning application number	Status	Location	Does it merit Assessment?	Reasons
16/1555/FUL	Withdrawn	43 Elizabeth Way Cambridge CB4 1DB	No	Assessed as over development. Smaller scheme likely to fall below HELAA threshold
18/1912/FUL	Withdrawn	3-4 Market Hill Cambridge CB2 3NJ	No	Listed building conversion. Not suitable for allocation
S/2409/19/FL	Withdrawn	Land At Moorfield Road & Knights Orchard Whittlesford CB22 4AG	No	Size, location and configuration of plot means does not merit further assessment
16/1108/FUL	Withdrawn	Cherry Hinton Constitutional Club 142 - 144 Cherry Hinton Road Cambridge CB1 7AJ	No	Significant impact on heritage
S/1616/19/FL	Refused	Trinity School 8 Station Road Foxton Cambridge CB22 6SA	No	Refused for 7 dwellings. Site with limited capacity does not merit further assessment
S/3749/19/FL	Withdrawn	29 High Street Melbourn SG8 6EB	No	Size, location and configuration of plot means does not merit further assessment
16/1423/FUL	Withdrawn	322-324 Histon Road Cambridge CB4 3HT	No	Assessed as over development. Smaller scheme likely to fall below HELAA threshold
19/0711/FUL	Withdrawn	Land At Lilac Court Cambridge	No	Subsequent application (20/01738/FUL) refused

Planning application number	Status	Location	Does it merit Assessment?	Reasons
S/0536/15/OL	Refused	Former Waste Treatment Facility Cambridge Road, Hauxton CB22 5HT	No	Subsequent application (S/2184/16/OL) permitted
S/4744/18/FL	Refused	Land To East Of Cody Road And North Of Bannold Road Waterbeach	No	Subsequent application (20/02460/FUL) permitted
18/0993/FUL	Refused	Building To Rear Of 56 - 58 Cherry Hinton Road Cambridge CB1 7AQ	No	Subsequent applications awaiting decision (19/0687/FUL) and (21/01521/FUL)
S/0641/13	Lapsed	Granta Processors, Mill Lane, Whittlesford, CB22 4XL	No	No activity since S/3002/14/VC granted 16/02/15
C/0398/15	Lapsed	Regency Autos, 8, Cheddars Lane, CAMBRIDGE, CB5 8LD	No	Industrial site in active use
C/0720/16	Lapsed	The Brunswick, 73, Newmarket Road, CAMBRIDGE, CB5 8EG	No	Site now has planning permission
C/1369/15	Lapsed	149, Histon Road, CAMBRIDGE, CB4 3JD	No	Built
S/1771/08	Lapsed	Land to South of, STATION ROAD, GAMLINGAY	Yes	Area permitted for B1 still undeveloped
S/1965/16	Lapsed	Equestrian Site, Rampton Road, Willingham, CB24 8QF	No	Small site. No evidence currently available
15/0945/FUL	Refused	23-25 Hills Road Cambridge CB2 1NW	No	Subsequent permission granted (17/0265/FUL)

Planning application number	Status	Location	Does it merit Assessment?	Reasons
15/1462/FUL	Withdrawn	3 Barton Road Cambridge CB3 9JZ	No	Subsequent permission granted (15/1879/FUL)
16/0163/FUL	Refused	34 Mill Road Cambridge CB1 2AD	No	Dismissed at appeal
17/1771/FUL	Refused	The Tivoli 16 Chesterton Road Cambridge CB4 3AX	No	Demolition of pub contrary to policy and housing use deemed unacceptable
S/0670/19/FL	Refused	Land Rear Of 24-27 Paynes Meadow Linton CB21 4JP	No	Appeal decision pending but inappropriate to allocate RES site
S/0759/19/FL	Refused	4 Vinter Close Papworth Everard CB23 3RU	No	Too small - 117 sq m
S/4071/18/FL	Withdrawn	Rear Of 133 The Causeway Bassingbourn Cum Kneesworth SG8 5JD	No	Subsequent permission granted (S/1754/19/FL)
S/1144/17/OL	Refused	Land Off Grafton Drive Caldecote CB23 7UE	No	SHLAA site 010. Important gap between Caldecote and Bourn Airfield new settlement
15/0932/FUL	Withdrawn	Land Rear Of 208 And 208A Cherry Hinton Road Cambridge	No	Objections from EH, Highways and urban design
15/1855/FUL	Refused	1 Fitzwilliam Road Cambridge CB2 8BN	No	Subsequent permission granted (19/1141/FUL)

Planning application number	Status	Location	Does it merit Assessment?	Reasons
16/1529/FUL	Refused	115-117 Grantchester Meadows Cambridge CB3 9JN	No	Dismissed at appeal - loss of family housing
16/1932/FUL	Refused	Kings College 1 Cranmer Road Cambridge	No	Subsequent permission granted (17/1905/FUL)
17/0957/FUL	Refused	190-192 Mill Road And 2B Cockburn Street Cambridge CB1 3LP	No	Net increase of 9 had detrimental impact on living standards
18/0506/FUL	Refused	18 Chesterton Road Cambridge CB4 3AX	No	Unsustainable - Appeal inspector rejected on multiple grounds
S/0191/16/OL	Refused	Site South Of Thompsons Meadow Trap Road Guilden Morden SG8 0JE	No	Subsequent permission for 16 dwellings (S/3077/16/OL)
S/0267/19/FL	Withdrawn	Land Rear Of 160 Histon Road Cottenham	No	Subsequent permission for smaller development (20/02751/FUL)
S/0404/16/FL	Refused	184 Cambridge Science Park Milton Cambridge CB4 0GA	No	Flooding and loss of trees
S/0677/15/OL	Refused	Land South Of Kettles Close Oakington	No	Appeal inspector dismissed on multiple grounds including green belt
S/0719/19/OL	Withdrawn	Land Adjacent 120 Hay Street Steeple Morden SG8 0PD	No	SHLAA 2013 site 237.

Planning application number	Status	Location	Does it merit Assessment?	Reasons
S/0894/18/OL	Refused	Land Adjacent To 62A Fowlmere Road Foxton CB22 6RX	No	Over-development. Smaller scheme would be <5
S/0904/18/FL	Refused	Land North Of Fen Road Milton CB24 6AD	No	Impact on heritage assets.
S/1695/16/FL	Withdrawn	Welfare Office And Community Building Capper Road Waterbeach CB25 9LY	No	Has subsequent permission for 16 dwellings (S/3865/17/FL)
S/2109/15/OL	Refused	1 Horseheath Road Linton Cambridge CB21 4LU	No	Over-development. Acceptable scheme may be <5
S/2123/19/FL	Refused	Former Marley Building Materials Ltd West Way Dales Manor Business Park Sawston CB22 3TJ	No	Part of H1(a) allocation for housing
S/2482/16/OL	Refused	Land At Mills Lane Longstanton CB24 3DT	No	Appeal inspector found impact on CA and landscape setting
S/2817/15/OL	Refused	West Farm Potton End Eltisley PE19 6TH	No	Impact of rural character and nearby Listed Building
S/2822/19/FL	Refused	7-13 The Causeway Bassingbourn Cum Kneesworth SG8 5LG	No	Access issues
S/3774/18/FL	Refused	Land At Rear Of 10A Rosemary Road Waterbeach CB25 9NB	No	Refused on multiple grounds including impact on CA and II* Listed Building
S/3292/16/FL	Withdrawn	Land West Of Balsham Road Fulbourn CB21 5BZ	No	Subsequent permission for 14 dwellings (S/3396/17/FL)
S/2677/19/FL	Refused	Plot 4 Westside St Neots Road Caldecote	No	resubmitted as 20/01544/FUL. Currently being determined

Planning application number	Status	Location	Does it merit Assessment?	Reasons
20/01717/FUL	Refused	523 Coldhams Lane Cambridge CB1 3JS	No	Overdevelopment. Smaller development probably <5
16/0904/FUL	Withdrawn	6 - 18 King Street Cambridge CB1 1LN	No	Subsequent application won on appeal (17/1497/FUL)
16/0942/FUL	Withdrawn	51 - 53 Argyle Street Cambridge CB1 3LS	No	Subsequent permission granted (19/1444/FUL)
16/1181/FUL	Withdrawn	Field At Corner Of Norman Way And Hatherdene Close Cambridge	No	Subsequently permitted (16/0746/REM)
16/1243/FUL	Refused	Albert House Young Street Cambridge CB1 2LZ	No	Over-development. Only net 5 gain. Scaling down would take it below HELAA threshold
16/2145/FUL	Withdrawn	2 Park Terrace Cambridge CB1 1JH	No	Too small scale for HELAA
17/1339/FUL	Withdrawn	18 Panton Street Cambridge CB2 1HP	No	Appear to be many constraints
S/1447/15/FL	Refused	Land Off Whaddon Road Meldreth	No	Subsequent permission granted (S/2939/16/FL)
S/1916/17/OL	Refused	Land To Rear Of 111 Station Road & 103 Station Road Willingham CB24 5HG	No	Impact on character of area and flood risk

Planning application number	Status	Location	Does it merit Assessment?	Reasons
S/2078/18/OL	Withdrawn	36 New Road Melbourn SG8 6BY	No	Subsequent permission for 22 dwellings (S/2424/18/FL)
S/2430/19/FL	Withdrawn	Beach Farm Green End Landbeach	No	Subsequent application for 2 dwellings on large part of site currently being determined (20/03981/FUL)
S/3232/18/OL	Refused	Land To The Rear Of 131 The Causeway (Phase 2) Bassingbourn Cum Kneesworth SG8 5JB	No	Subsequent permission for 20 dwellings (S/1199/13/OL & S/2253/16/RM)
S/3884/17/FL	Withdrawn	Land At 36 New Road Melbourn SG8 6BY	No	Duplicate of row 62 (S/2078/18/OL)
14/0848/FUL	Refused	57 Hartington Grove Cambridge CB1 7UB	No	Harm found to the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of the future occupiers of the proposed bedsits
15/1654/FUL	Withdrawn	11 Brookside Cambridge CB2 1JE	No	Below HELAA threshold
17/1032/FUL	Refused	Former Hamilton Lodge Hotel 156 - 160 Chesterton Road Cambridge	No	Subsequent permission granted (18/1245/FUL)
18/1059/FUL	Withdrawn	Carlyle Lodge 71A Chesterton Road Cambridge CB4 3AN	No	Subsequent permission granted (18/1684/FUL)

Planning application number	Status	Location	Does it merit Assessment?	Reasons
18/1953/FUL	Withdrawn	Land At Hudson Close Hudson Close Cambridge CB2 8HD	No	Subsequent permission granted (19/1568/FUL)
S/0831/17/FL	Refused	Longacre Farm Chesterton Fen Road Milton	No	Flood zone.
S/1092/15/PM	Refused	Agricultural Building Arnold's Farm Shelford Bottom CB22 3AB	No	Below HELAA threshold (446.5 sq m)
S/1279/15/OL	Refused	14 Brook Street Elsworth Cambridge CB23 4HX	No	Harm identified to the setting and significance of the heritage assets and the character and appearance of the area and the surrounding landscape, together with the potential harm to protected species and in respect of flood risk, would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the collective benefits of the proposal when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole
S/1818/15/OL	Refused	Land Off Rampton Road Cottenham Cambridge CB24 8TJ	No	Subsequently granted permission (S/1411/16/OL)
S/1823/18/FL	Refused	16-22 (Including Michael's Close) High Street Girton CB3 0PU	No	Net gain (+10) over-development. Smaller scheme likely to be unviable or below HELAA threshold

Planning application number	Status	Location	Does it merit Assessment?	Reasons
S/2440/19/PA	Refused	Kingston Pastures Old Wimpole Road Kingston	No	Acceptable scheme likely to fall below HELAA threshold
S/2909/17/FL	Refused	116 Station Road Steeple Morden SG7 5RS	No	Loss of community facilities
S/3647/16/FL	Withdrawn	Land Off Fen End Over CB24 5NE	No	Subsequently granted permission (S/2577/17/FL)
S/3983/18/FL	Refused	Western Side Of Land Parcel Com 4 Orchard Park Neal Drive Cambridge	No	Subsequent application awaiting decision (S/4243/19/FL) - approved 14/10/20
20/01936/PRI03Q	Withdrawn	New Barns Farm Huntingdon Road Conington CB23 4LU	No	Below HELAA threshold
16/0847/FUL	Refused	Land Adjacent To 52 Victoria Road Cambridge CB4 3DU	No	Principle of development acceptable but over-development. Acceptable scheme likely to fall below HELAA threshold
16/1413/FUL	Refused	207 Green End Road Cambridge CB4 1RJ	No	Subsequent permission granted for 7 flats (17/1023/FUL)
17/1578/FUL	Withdrawn	25A Mowbray Road Cambridge CB1 7SR	No	Subsequent permission for net +4 dwellings 19/0698/FUL
S/0483/16/FL	Refused	29 Cambridge Science Park Milton Cambridge CB4 0DW	No	Subsequent permission (S/1405/16/FL)

Planning application number	Status	Location	Does it merit Assessment?	Reasons
S/0646/17/OL	Withdrawn	Land Adjacent To The Old Police House Linton Road Horseheath CB21 4QF	No	Subsequent application (S/2745/17/OL) Refused at appeal on grounds of impact on open rural character
S/1431/15/OL	Refused	Land North Of Bannold Road Waterbeach	No	Subsequent permission through various applications
S/1901/16/OL	Refused	Eternit UK Whaddon Road Meldreth SG8 5RL	No	Appeal inspector determined site unsuitable for housing
14/2027/FUL	Refused	Royal British Legion Hall 58 Fishers Lane Cambridge CB1 9HR	No	Subsequent permission (15/1111/FUL)
14/1940/FUL	Withdrawn	G P Motors Car Sales Eltisley Avenue Cambridge CB3 9JG	No	Subsequent permission (15/1599/FUL)
15/0606/FUL	Withdrawn	Hayling House Fen Road Cambridge CB4 1UN	No	Subsequent permission (16/0617/FUL)
15/1842/FUL	Withdrawn	34 Elizabeth Way Cambridge CB4 1EE	No	Subsequent permission (15/2297/FUL)
16/0531/FUL	Withdrawn	34-36 Madingley Road Cambridge CB3 0EX	No	Subsequent permission (17/0172/FUL)
16/1012/FUL	Withdrawn	49 - 53 Regent Street Cambridge CB2 1AB	No	Already had permission under previous application so withdrew (05/1361/FUL)

Planning application number	Status	Location	Does it merit Assessment?	Reasons
17/0219/FUL	Withdrawn	339 Milton Road Cambridge CB4 1XL	No	Subsequent permission (17/1282/FUL)
17/0869/FUL	Refused	19 - 21 Godesdone Road Cambridge CB5 8HR	No	Adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, including the CA and inappropriate private recreation area
17/0912/FUL	Withdrawn	57 Ditton Walk Cambridge CB5 8QD	No	Subsequent application (18/0168/FUL) also Withdrawn but below HELAA threshold
17/1614/FUL	Withdrawn	103 Mill Road Cambridge CB1 2AZ	No	Subsequent application being determined although Planning Officer has advised withdrawal as will be recommended for Refusal (18/0846/FUL)
17/2161/FUL	Withdrawn	53 Carlyle Road Cambridge CB4 3DH	No	Two subsequent applications Refused, each getting smaller (18/1788/FUL & 19/1362/FUL)
18/0202/B1C3	Withdrawn	National Institute Of Agricultural Botany Huntingdon Road Cambridge CB3 0LE	No	Prior approval for 68 dwellings (20/01501/PRI030)
18/1427/FUL	Withdrawn	51-55 Elizabeth Way Cambridge CB4 1DB	No	Subsequent permission granted (19/0819/OUT)
18/1601/FUL	Refused	35 - 37 Russell Street Cambridge CB2 1HT	No	Refused on multiple grounds including poor living standards

Planning application number	Status	Location	Does it merit Assessment?	Reasons
19/0051/PIP	Withdrawn	Cambridge And Huntingdon Health Authority 18 Vinery Road Cambridge CB1 3DX	No	PIP granted for 9 dwellings (19/0769/PIP)
18/0993/FUL	Withdrawn	56-58 Cherry Hinton Road Cambridge CB1 7AQ	No	Subsequent application awaiting decision (19/0687/FUL)
19/1516/FUL	Withdrawn	196 Green End Road Cambridge CB4 1RL	No	Over-development - revised scheme likely to be submitted but likely to be below HELAA threshold
S/0710/19/OL	Refused	160 Histon Road Cottenham CB24 8UG	No	Appeal decision, development would harm the character and appearance of the area.
S/0994/18/FL	Withdrawn	5 High Street Rampton Cambridge CB24 8QE	No	Subsequent (smaller, 4 dwellings) application Refused due to over-development and impact on CA (S/4451/19/FL)
S/1594/17/FL	Withdrawn	Land Between 23 And 25 Ermine Street North Papworth Everard CB23 3RH	No	Below HELAA threshold
S/1735/18/OL	Refused	Leylands Highfields Road Caldecote CB23 7NX	No	Subsequent permission granted for replacement dwelling.
S/1809/16/FL	Withdrawn	Land To The Rear Of 35-37 Pepys Way Gorton Cambridge CB3 0PA	No	Subsequent permission granted

Planning application number	Status	Location	Does it merit Assessment?	Reasons
S/3083/19/OL	Refused	Fireworks Store Comberton Road Little Eversden CB23 1EW	No	At appeal. Refused due to inappropriate development in green belt and multiple other reasons
S/2820/15/FL	Withdrawn	The Railway Tavern Station Road Great Shelford CB22 5LR	No	Subsequent permission granted at appeal (S/0291/15/FL)
S/2995/17/OL	Withdrawn	Land Next/East 198 Barton Road Comberton CB23 7BU	No	Isolated site between villages.
S/3961/19/FL	Refused	Nightingales Garage London Road Pampisford CB22 3EF	No	Subsequent permission granted (20/01181/FUL)
S/1641/19/PA	Withdrawn	Barn At Church Lane Comberton CB23 7ED	No	Inappropriate to allocate. Likely to come forward as a class Q development
S/2999/16/FL	Refused	Land To The West Desmonds Close Hauxton	No	Subsequent permission granted (S/1824/17/FL)
17/0645/FUL	Withdrawn	64 Coleridge Road And Land To The Rear Of 62 And 60 Coleridge Road Cambridge CB1 3PJ	No	Over-development. Revised scheme likely to fall below HELAA threshold
17/2243/FUL	Refused	50 St Stephens Place And 51 Canterbury Street Cambridge CB3 0JE	No	Subsequent permission granted (18/0907/FUL)

Planning application number	Status	Location	Does it merit Assessment?	Reasons
19/1283/FUL	Refused	Chartwell House 620 - 622 Newmarket Road Cambridge CB5 8LP	No	Subsequent application Refused and appeal lodged (20/01862/FUL). Revised scheme falls below HELAA threshold
20/0053/OUT	Refused	The Seven Stars Public House 249 Newmarket Road Cambridge CB5 8JE	No	Over-development. Any successful application would fall below HELAA threshold
S/1210/17/FL	Refused	129 Cambridge Road Great Shelford Cambridge CB22 5JJ	No	Subsequent permission granted (S/2256/17/FL)
S/1723/16/FL	Refused	Unit F Broad Lane Industrial Estate Broad Lane Cottenham CB24 8SW	No	Subsequent permission granted (S/3703/19/FL)
S/2535/19/FL	Withdrawn	Antenova Ltd Farfield House Albert Road Stow Cum Quy CB25 9AR	No	Below HELAA threshold (136 sq m)
S/3135/19/FL	Refused	Papworth Hall Ermine Street South Papworth Everard CB23 3RD	No	Pending appeal. Impact on heritage assets
S/3184/17/FL	Refused	Borly House 1 Horseheath Road Linton CB21 4LU	No	Subsequent permission granted (S/0793/18/FL)
S/3328/19/OL	Refused	1 Over Road Longstanton CB24 3DW	No	Subsequent application awaiting decision (20/02270/FUL) for change of use to B1 but below HELAA threshold (320 sq m)

Planning application number	Status	Location	Does it merit Assessment?	Reasons
S/0685/19/FL	Withdrawn	Land To The Rear Of 5 & 7 Spring Lane Bassingbourn SG8 5HZ	No	Subsequent permission granted (20/01379/FUL)
20/01355/FUL	Withdrawn	Good Technology 355 Newmarket Road Cambridge CB5 8JG	No	To be written up for Refusal on multiple grounds including over-development and access
15/1940/FUL	Refused	48 New Square Cambridge CB1 1EZ	No	Subsequent permission granted (16/1942/FUL)
16/0835/FUL	Withdrawn	54 Cherry Hinton Road Cambridge CB1 7AA	No	Below HELAA threshold
16/1130/FUL	Withdrawn	Milton Library Ascham Road Cambridge CB4 2BD	No	Subsequent permission granted (16/2060/FUL)
17/1611/FUL	Refused	138 Brooks Road Cambridge CB1 3HR	No	Latest application Withdrawn (19/1505/FUL). Reduced to 5 dwellings but still concerns so likely to fall below HELAA threshold
S/0364/17/FL	Withdrawn	Land At Rampton Road Willingham CB24 5JF	No	RES proposal inappropriate for allocation
S/0628/19/OL	Refused	Land To The East Of 13 Trap Road South Cambs Guilden Morden SG8 0JE	No	Subsequent permission granted (S/4519/19/OL)

Planning application number	Status	Location	Does it merit Assessment?	Reasons
S/1019/15/FL	Withdrawn	Site Entrance Road Summersfield Development Off Ermine Street South Papworth Everard CB23 3LF	No	Subsequent permission.
S/1812/19/FL	Refused	Symonds House Symonds Lane Linton Cambridge CB21 4HY	No	Refused on multiple grounds
S/2012/15/FL	Refused	Land Adj To Grove Farm Harlton Road And Church Street Haslingfield	No	Subsequent application Refused at appeal due to inappropriate development in green belt (S/2515/16/FL)
S/2122/19/FL	Withdrawn	Former Spicers Site Sawston Bypass Sawston Cambridge CB22 3JG	No	Subsequent permission granted (S/0158/20/FL)
S/3128/17/OL	Refused	Land South Of Bartlow Road Castle Camps CB21 4SY	No	Subsequent permission granted (S/4469/17/OL)
S/3031/19/OL	Withdrawn	11 Earith Road Willingham CB24 5LS	No	Subsequent application awaiting decision but below HELAA threshold (20/01384/OUT)
S/3076/16/FL	Withdrawn	20 Cambridge Road Linton CB21 4NN	No	Subsequent permission granted (S/0163/18/FL)
S/3301/18/FL	Withdrawn	Taunus Old North Road Bassingbourn Cum Kneesworth	No	Subsequent permission granted (S/4194/18/FL)
S/0053/17/OL	Refused	Land To The Rear Of 130 Middle Watch Swavesey CB24 4RP	No	Alternative application received permission on appeal (S/1605/16/OL)

Planning application number	Status	Location	Does it merit Assessment?	Reasons
C/0337/11	Lapsed	ADKINS CORNER, PERNE ROAD, CAMBRIDGE, CAMBRIDGESHIRE, CB1 3RU	No	This permission has lapsed, but there is now a prior approval for the site C/1315/17
S/0699/11	Lapsed	Site Adj to, 6, Main Street, Caldecote, Cambridgeshire CB3 7NU	No	This has been TSS by S/2821/15, which is being implemented
S/1796/12	Lapsed	29, High Street, Melbourn, ROYSTON, SG8 6EB	No	This permission has lapsed, but the proposal has been implemented through S/2008/14
C/1720/13	Lapsed	Broadmeadows, Manhattan Drive, CAMBRIDGE, CB4 1JS	No	13/1720/COND8A discharged 13/09/19
S/1447/14	Lapsed	Land Between Huntingdon Road, Madingley Road and M11, North West Cambridge, Cambridgeshire	No	S/3314/17/DC condition discharged 16/11/17
C/1294/11	Lapsed	Travis Perkins Trading Co Ltd, Devonshire Road, CAMBRIDGE, CB1 2BJ	No	Allocated in Cambridge Local Plan 2018
S/0287/15	Lapsed	36, New Road, Melbourn, ROYSTON, SG8 6BY	No	Subsequent permission granted (S/2424/18)
S/0623/13	Lapsed	Land between Church Lane & Ermine Street South, Papworth Everard, CAMBRIDGE, CB23 3RG	No	Subsequent permission granted (S/0307/17)
S/2367/16	Lapsed	6, West Road, Gamlingay, SANDY, SG19 3JT	No	Lapsed, however there is an alternative planning permission for this site S/1338/15

Planning application number	Status	Location	Does it merit Assessment?	Reasons
C/0773/14	Lapsed	80, Maids Causeway, CAMBRIDGE, CB5 8DD	No	Series of conditions approved 21/05/18
C/1254/14	Lapsed	149, Histon Road, CAMBRIDGE, CB4 3JD	No	14/1254/COND5A approved 20/01/17 - Greengates Court 1-15. Also, committee report on 19/1179/S73 (see row 21) states it is a building site in 2017
S/2251/15	Lapsed	35, Burgess Road, Waterbeach, CB25 9ND	No	Extension to care home.
S/0790/16	Lapsed	1 Common Farm Cottages, Elsworth, CAMBRIDGE, CB23 4JU	No	Holiday lodges
S/2224/16	Lapsed	Monkfield Nutrition Ltd, Church Farm Barn, Shingay Cum Wendy, ROYSTON, SG8 0HJ	No	S/1877/19/RM granted 10/10/19. Several discharge of conditions applications awaiting decision
S/2510/15	Lapsed	Land East of Highfields Road, Highfields Caldecote, CAMBRIDGE, CB23 7NX	No	Deed of variation signed by SCDC and others 21/07/20
S/4469/17	Lapsed	Land South of Bartlow Road, Castle Camps, CAMBRIDGE, CB21 4SY	No	Conditions application awaiting decision (S/4469/17/CONDA)
S/0352/12	Lapsed	West Goods Yard, STATION ROAD, OAKINGTON AND WESTWICK, CB24 3AH	No	Conditions being discharged in 2018, e.g. S/3391/18/DC
C/0266/08/2	Lapsed	Redevelopment Station Area CB1, STATION ROAD, CAMBRIDGE	No	Part of CB1 development

Planning application number	Status	Location	Does it merit Assessment?	Reasons
C/01594/13	Lapsed	Land Off Barnwell Road (Marshall Aerospace) Peverel Road Cambridge	No	Superseded by 16/1566/FUL
S/01094/11	Lapsed	New Building Adjacent To 3, GRANTA PARK, GREAT ABINGTON,	No	partially superseded by S/1109/15/FL
S/2815/14	Lapsed	Cambridge Vacuum Engineering Ltd, Pembroke Avenue, Waterbeach, CB25 9QP	No	Extension to existing building. (Below HELAA threshold)
S/6196/03	Lapsed	Land at, Buildings 3010 and 3030, Western Spur Road, Cambourne	No	Part of Cambourne business park. Policy E/15
S/1094/11	Lapsed	New Building Adjacent To 3, GRANTA PARK, GREAT ABINGTON,	No	partially superseded by S/1109/15/FL
S/1600/15	Lapsed	Wallwork Cambridge, Buckingway Business Park, Rowles Way, SWAVESEY, CB24 4UG	No	Extension to existing unit on existing business park. Policy E/15
S/0630/15/1	Lapsed	250-289, Cambridge Science Park, MILTON, CB4 0WE	No	Part of NEECAP and densification work
C/1078/16	Lapsed	Cambridge Medipark Ltd, Cambridge Biomedical Campus Marketing Suite, Francis Crick Avenue, CAMBRIDGE, CB2 0AA	No	Part of allocation for Biomed Campus. Appeal won to remove car parking restrictions (12/1017) (Appeal Ref: APP/Q0505/W/17/3175442)

Planning application number	Status	Location	Does it merit Assessment?	Reasons
C/1183/16	Lapsed	Academy House, 136, Hills Road, CAMBRIDGE, CB2 8PA	No	Also permission to convert lower ground floor carpark to office accommodation (19/1587/FUL)
C/1518/16	Lapsed	Cambridge Railway Station, Station Road, CAMBRIDGE, CB1 2JH	No	No net increase in Business use
S/1204/09	Lapsed	Land South of Wellcome Trust Genome Campus, In the Parishes of Ickleton and Hinxton	No	Part of Genome Campus
S/2840/17	Lapsed	Plot 420, Phase VI, Cambridge Science Park, MILTON, CB4 0PE	No	Part of NECAAP

Appendices

Appendix 1: All HELAA sites

Appendix 2: Sites not currently suitable, deliverable or developable

Appendix 3: Sites discounted from the HELAA

Appendix 4: Proformas for all HELAA sites

Part A – Cambridge sites

Part B – Arrington – Guilden Morden sites

Part C – Hardwick to Wimploe and edge of Cambridge sites

Appendix 5: Greater Cambridge Typologies Study

All Appendices have been published as separate documents.