

Greater Cambridge Shared Planning

**Greater Cambridge Local Plan Strategic Spatial  
Options Assessment: Historic Environment  
Supplement**

August 2021

## Greater Cambridge Shared Planning

# **Greater Cambridge Local Plan Strategic Spatial Options Assessment: Historic Environment Supplement**

Approved

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A. Croft', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Andrew Croft

Position

Director

Date

18<sup>th</sup> August

2021

## **CONTENTS**

<b>1.0</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Summary Of Findings</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Assessment</b>	<b>5</b>

## **1.0 Introduction**

### **1.1 This report**

1.1.1 This **Greater Cambridge Local Plan Strategic Spatial Options Assessment: Historic Environment Supplement Report** assesses with regard to the Historic Environment, the working assumption Greater Cambridge Local Plan Preferred Option Development Strategy, and a new blended Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt Alternative, in the same way as was completed for the Strategic Spatial Options in the Strategic Heritage Impact Assessment (May 2021).

1.1.2 Alongside other evidence assessments and Sustainability Appraisal, consideration of the preferred option and Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt alternative alongside the strategic spatial options assessments ensures consideration of a range of reasonable alternative strategies.

### **1.2 Context**

1.2.1 For the strategic spatial options stage we completed assessments of the three growth levels and eight strategic spatial options (as set out in the Strategic Heritage Impact Assessment).

1.2.2 Further to this, ahead of the Preferred Options Plan consultation taking place in Autumn 2021, officers from Greater Cambridge Shared Planning (GCSP) on behalf of the two Councils shared with us a working assumption preferred option development strategy, including preferred growth level and distribution assumptions for dwellings, jobs and associated population growth.

1.2.3 Please note that use of the working assumption preferred option development strategy to inform this evidence base does not confer formal support by either Council for that strategy. No decisions will be taken on development strategy assumptions until relevant member committees meet and approve documents for the Local Plan preferred options consultation.

Such decisions will be informed by appraisal of reasonable alternatives. Setting out working assumptions in this and other notes does not prejudice those decisions.

### **1.3 Growth level**

- 1.3.1 Following consideration of the Strategic Spatial Options Evidence Bases (including the Strategic Heritage Impact Assessment) and the Sustainability Appraisal, Greater Cambridge Shared Planning have determined that the medium level of homes associated with the central employment scenario represents the objectively assessed need for homes in Greater Cambridge. Having determined this, the previously assessed alternative growth options of minimum and maximum are no longer considered to represent reasonable alternatives.
- 1.3.2 Further to the above, the Greater Cambridge Local Plan Preferred Option growth level is the medium homes level, including a 1:1 commuting ratio for housing growth generated by additional jobs above those supported by the Standard Method, in line with the councils' aims of limiting longer distance commuting and thereby limiting carbon emissions (described as medium+). We, and other evidence base consultants, did not assess the medium+ level of growth for the Strategic Spatial options, but we do not consider that rerunning the evidence testing of the strategic spatial options against a new medium+ housing figure would result in materially different outcomes to our previous conclusions.
- 1.3.3 Drawing on the above, we are testing the new spatial options of preferred option and Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt based on the medium+ growth level, and have not assessed the impacts of the previous alternative growth levels in relation to these new spatial options.

## **1.4 Spatial distribution**

1.4.1 The Councils' working assumption preferred option is a blended strategy including a number of broad supply locations. To ensure that the preferred option is tested against reasonable alternatives, an assessment of the preferred option blended strategy has been completed, so that it can be compared against:

- the strategic spatial options tested previously
- other reasonable alternative blended strategies.

1.4.2 Some of the previously tested spatial options were blended strategies and others not. The Councils reviewed the previously tested strategic spatial options to see whether these included a range of reasonable alternative blended strategies, noting that they don't need to test every possible reasonable alternative. The conclusion to this assessment was that the only alternative blended strategy not yet tested was one including development at Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt. The Councils therefore identified a blended strategy development distribution for this spatial option, which is directly comparable to the preferred option and broadly comparable to the strategic spatial options from November 2020.

## **1.5 Spatial options tested**

- Preferred option growth level: preferred options spatial strategy
- Preferred option growth level: Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt

## **1.6 Methodology**

1.6.1 This Supplement Report assesses the above spatial options using the same methodology as completed for the Strategic Heritage Impact Assessment. See that report for further detail.

## 2.0 Summary Of Findings

### 2.1 Summary and Conclusion

2.1.1 The following provides a short summary of the potential issues and risks of the two options. Further detail can be found in Section 3.0.

#### **Preferred option growth level: preferred options spatial strategy**

2.1.2 This approach focuses development on the edge of Cambridge (including North East Cambridge, North West Cambridge and Cambridge Airport); and around Cambourne. It also includes some dispersed small-scale developments in village sites and in Cambridge itself. All sites lie outside of the greenbelt.

2.1.3 The concentration of development at Cambourne, the NEC and Airport should enable the management of risk through appropriate design responses e.g. height, massing, landscape etc. The Cambourne area poses lower inherent risks with regard to Cambridge and designated heritage assets than many other sites.

2.1.4 The remaining allocation of development to smaller sites in and around Cambridge and in the wider villages poses some risks, but these should be largely manageable through appropriate site selection and design mitigation in the form of the scale of development, height, massing, landscape etc.

2.1.5 In summary the risk scores are as follows:

<b>Potential Impacts on Cambridge and its Setting</b>	<b>Potential Impacts on other assets</b>	<b>Summary</b>
Low / Moderate	Low / Moderate	Low / Moderate

## **Preferred option growth level: Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt**

- 2.1.6 This option differs from the previous option solely in the fact that there would be no development around Cambourne with a lower quantum of development proposed in the Greenbelt around Cambridge instead.
- 2.1.7 The scale of development proposed for the greenbelt poses a greater risk of policy conflict in relation to the historic environment than the previous option due to the relationship between the greenbelt and the setting of Cambridge and the quantity of designated heritage assets in the Greenbelt. While it may be possible to address some of these risks through appropriate siting and design, a heightened risk of significant policy conflict remains. Consequently, the overall risk score is higher than the previous option.

<b>Potential Impacts on Cambridge and its Setting</b>	<b>Potential Impacts on other assets</b>	<b>Summary</b>
Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

### **Conclusion**

- 2.1.8 In terms of the Historic Environment, the **Preferred option growth level: preferred options spatial strategy** is the better performing of the two options due to its focus on development at Cambourne rather than in the Greenbelt around Cambridge, a location which brings heightened risks of policy conflicts.

## **3.0 Assessment**

### **3.1 Introduction**

- 3.1.1 The following provides an assessment of two Options. The findings are necessarily limited by the degree of detail available regarding the location and extent of proposed development.



### 3.2 Preferred option growth level: preferred options spatial strategy

3.2.1 This approach focuses development on the edge of Cambridge (including North East Cambridge, North West Cambridge and Cambridge Airport); and around Cambourne. It also includes some dispersed small-scale developments in village sites and in Cambridge itself. All sites lie outside of the greenbelt.

Potential Impacts on Cambridge and its Setting	Potential Impacts on other assets	Summary
<p>High density development of the NEC site, including taller buildings, has the potential to affect the character and setting of Cambridge in a number of ways particularly in terms of impacts on the character of the Cam Corridor and views from it, and potentially appearing in backdrops of key views particularly VP1 and VP3. It could also change the character of views and approaches to Cambridge from the north and east and the relationship between the City, Girton, Milton and Histon although these are lesser issues.</p> <p>Potential conflicts at the NEC site could be largely addressed through management of the height of</p>	<p>Tall development on the NEC site has the potential to affect the setting and significance of a number of assets including Fen Ditton with its conservation area and listed buildings. Initial analysis has indicated that any such impacts would be limited and could be addressed through design measures.</p> <p>Development of Cambridge Airport may affect the Teversham Conservation Area and listed buildings in it, as well as the LB in the airport and others in the environs. There may also be risks with impact on the setting of the Anglesey Abbey RPG.</p> <p>Cambourne itself contain limited designated assets. Nearby villages and the wider landscape are host to</p>	<p>Appropriate design responses in terms of building heights and layout at the key sites at NEC, Airport and Cambourne will reduce risks. For other smaller dispersed sites, location and scale will be important matters. Overall, no significant risks are anticipated that</p>

Potential Impacts on Cambridge and its Setting	Potential Impacts on other assets	Summary
<p>buildings and the careful placement and design of any tall buildings.</p> <p>Development of the Airport site may have both positive and negative impacts depending on scale compared to the current hanger buildings.</p> <p>Development is however likely to affect the sense of separation between Teversham and the City (a contributory element); as well as affecting less important views from along the A14 and A1303 towards the city.</p> <p>Development around Cambourne would have no impact on Cambridge and its setting.</p> <p>Proposed development in northwest Cambridge (c. 1000 homes) and limited development within Cambridge and wider villages is unlikely to pose a significant risk to Cambridge and its setting as it should be possible to identify appropriate locations and scales of development</p> <p><b>Low / Moderate Risk</b></p>	<p>a number of conservation areas, listed buildings and registered parks and gardens.</p> <p>Development in and close to Cambourne is less likely to result in impacts on designated assets.</p> <p>Development in the villages around Cambourne may result in impacts on designated assets.</p> <p>Location and design will be key to addressing impacts.</p> <p>Smaller development sites across Cambridge (including Northwest Cambridge) and wider villages / settlements may have localised impacts on designated and non-designated assets but design and siting mitigation should address these.</p> <p>Design responses, including location, heights and landscape, are likely to be able to address many of the potential heritage issues, which reduced the risk of major policy conflict.</p> <p><b>Low / Moderate Risk</b></p>	<p>cannot be addressed through mitigation.</p> <p><b>Low / Moderate Risk</b></p>

### 3.3 Preferred option growth level: Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt

3.3.1 This approach focuses development on the edge of Cambridge including North East Cambridge, North West Cambridge; Cambridge Airport; and in the Greenbelt around Cambridge. It also includes some dispersed small-scale developments in village sites and in Cambridge itself. It does not include development at Camborne.

Potential Impacts on Cambridge and its Setting	Potential Impacts on other assets	Summary
<p>High density development of the NEC site, including taller buildings, has the potential to affect the character and setting of Cambridge in a number of ways particularly in terms of impacts on the character of the Cam Corridor and views from it, and potentially appearing in backdrops of key views particularly VP1 and VP3. It could also change the character of views and approaches to Cambridge from the north and east and the relationship between the City, Girton, Milton and Histon although these are lesser issues.</p> <p>Potential conflicts at the NEC site could be largely addressed through management of the height of</p>	<p>Tall development on the NEC site has the potential to affect the setting and significance of a number of assets including Fen Ditton with its conservation area and listed buildings. Initial analysis has indicated that any such impacts would be limited and could be addressed through design measures.</p> <p>Development of Cambridge Airport may affect the Teversham Conservation Area and listed buildings in it, as well as the LB in the airport and others in the environs. There may also be risks with impact on the setting of the Anglesey Abbey RPG.</p> <p>Villages in the Greenbelt and landscape of the Greenbelt are host to a number of conservation areas, listed buildings, scheduled monuments and</p>	<p>Appropriate design responses in terms of building heights and layout at the key sites at NEC and Airport will reduce risks for these sites. For other smaller dispersed sites, location and scale will be important matters to managing risk. Greenbelt development has a</p>

Potential Impacts on Cambridge and its Setting	Potential Impacts on other assets	Summary
<p>buildings and the careful placement and design of any tall buildings.</p> <p>Development of the Airport site may have both positive and negative impacts depending on scale compared to the current hanger buildings.</p> <p>Development is however likely to affect the sense of separation between Teversham and the City (a contributory element); as well as affecting less important views from along the A14 and A1303 towards the city.</p> <p>Development of c. 2,000 homes in the Green Belt around Cambridge poses a notable risk to the setting of Cambridge, the risk can be partially mitigated by ensuring appropriate locations are chosen for development e.g. greater concentrations the northwest and northeast compared to the southwest and southeast – but the risk of policy conflict remains significant.</p>	<p>registered parks and gardens. Development in the greenbelt is likely to result in impacts on designated assets. Location and design will be key to addressing impacts, but it is likely that policy conflict will occur.</p> <p>Smaller development sites across Cambridge (including Northwest Cambridge) and wider villages / settlements may have localised impacts on designated and non-designated assets but design and siting mitigation should address these.</p> <p>Design responses, including location, heights and landscape, are likely to be able to address many of the potential heritage issues, which reduced the risk of major policy conflict.</p> <p><b>Moderate Risk</b></p>	<p>higher risk of policy conflict. Given this it is considered that there are significant risks that are unlikely to be addressed through mitigation.</p> <p><b>Moderate Risk</b></p>

<b>Potential Impacts on Cambridge and its Setting</b>	<b>Potential Impacts on other assets</b>	<b>Summary</b>
<p>Proposed development in northwest Cambridge (c. 1000 homes) and limited development within Cambridge and wider villages is unlikely to pose a significant risk to Cambridge and its setting as it should be possible to identify appropriate locations and scales of development</p> <p><b>Moderate Risk</b></p>		