| Adopted Development Plan Policies Comment 2025 | Development of the site has some potential policy constraints, but these could be overcome through the planning application process. |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Flood Risk RAG Assessment 2025 | Amber |
| Flood Risk Officer Comment 2025 | Flood zone: Wholly in Flood Zone 1; Surface water flooding: 6% lies in a 1 in 100 year event and 26% lies in a 1 in 1000 year event |
| Flood Risk RAG Assessment 2023 | - |
| Flood Risk Officer Comment 2023 | - |
| Flood Risk RAG Assessment 2021 | - |
| Flood Risk Officer Comment 2021 | - |
| Landscape RAG Assessment 2025 | Amber |
| Landscape Comment 2025 | The primary constraints on the site are the existing mature trees and open space (non-designated). The proposed uplift of 37 dwellings through redevelopment will put pressure on these resources and must be carefully managed, ensuring trees of higher quality and amenity uses are retained. The surrounding townscape has a strong character that is sensitive to unsympathetic change. |
| Landscape RAG Assessment 2023 | - |
| Landscape Comment 2023 | - |
| Landscape RAG Assessment 2021 | - |
| Landscape Comment 2021 | - |
| Biodiversity and Geodiversity RAG Assessment 2025 | Green |
| Biodiversity and Geodiversity Officer Comments 2025 | A development of the size and scale described would not provide any specific ecological risks to statutory or non-statutory designated sites. However, this does not remove the likelihood of protected and priority species being impacted, nor that a development of the type described would likely be eligible for mandatory biodiversity net gain. |
| Biodiversity and Geodiversity Guideline Comments 2025 | Development of the site would not have a detrimental impact on any designated site, or those with a regional or local protection. |
| Biodiversity and Geodiversity RAG Assessment 2023 | - |
| Biodiversity and Geodiversity Officer Comments 2023 | - |
| Biodiversity and Geodiversity Guideline Comments 2023 | - |
| Biodiversity and Geodiversity RAG Assessment 2021 | - |

| Biodiversity and Geodiversity Officer Comments 2021 | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Biodiversity and Geodiversity Guideline Comments 2021 | - |
| Policy RAG Rating 2025 | Green |
| Policy Officer Comment 2025 | Site is not on protected open space designation. Any impact of the proposed development could be reasonably mitigated or compensated. |
| Historic Environment RAG Assessment 2025 | Amber |
| Historic Environment Comments 2025 | The site is within the New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area. There is a building of local interest immediately adjacent on George VI Street and listed buildings nearby on Hills Road. Development of the site could have a detrimental impact on these heritage assets but the impact could be reasonably mitigated through design, massing and landscaping. |
| Historic Environment RAG Assessment 2023 | - |
| Historic Environment Comments 2023 | - |
| Historic Environment RAG Assessment 2021 | - |
| Historic Environment Comments 2021 | - |
| Archaeology RAG Assessment 2025 | Amber |
| Archaeology Officer Comment 2025 | - |
| Archaeology RAG Assessment 2023 | - |
| Archaeology Officer Comment 2023 | - |
| Archaeology RAG Assessment 2021 | - |
| Archaeology Officer Comment 2021 | - |
| Accessibility RAG Assessment 2025 - Automated | Green |
| Accessibility RAG Assessment 2025 - Officer Verified | - |
| Accessibility Comment 2025 | Good accessibility to key local services, transport, and employment opportunities. Proposed development would not require delivery of accompanying key services |
| Site Access RAG Assessment 2025 | Amber |
| Site Access Officer Comment 2025 | The site has been scored as Amber. The site is acceptable in principle, subject to further detail and consultation at the planning application stage. |

| Site Access RAG Assessment 2023 | - |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Access Officer Comment 2023 | - |
| Site Access RAG Assessment 2021 | - |
| Site Access Officer Comment 2021 | - |
| Transport and Roads RAG Assessment 2025 | Amber |
| Transport and Roads Guideline Comments 2025 | Any potential impact on the functioning of trunk roads and/or local roads could be reasonably mitigated. |
| | The development would need to provide mitigation to reduce the vehicle impact and encourage active travel and public transport use. |
| | A Transport Assessment and a Travel Plan will be required. |
| Transport and Roads RAG Assessment 2023 | - |
| Transport and Roads Guideline Comments 2023 | - |
| Transport and Roads RAG Assessment 2021 | - |
| Transport and Roads Guideline Comments 2021 | - |
| Noise, Vibration, Odour and Light Pollution RAG Assessment 2025 | Green |
| Noise, Vibration, Odour and Light Pollution Guideline Comments 2025 | Having regard to the nature, size, scale, location and character of the area, considered a negligible / low adverse noise constraint impact / effect risk on proposed residential occupiers having regard to existing noise sources - no objection. Demolition and construction impacts and potential operational noise for example Air Source Heat Pump/s (ASHP/s) etc a constraint but manageable to acceptable levels / effects via noise conditions. |
| Noise, Vibration, Odour and Light Pollution RAG Assessment 2023 | - |
| Noise, Vibration, Odour and Light Pollution Guideline Comments 2023 | - |
| Noise, Vibration, Odour and Light Pollution RAG Assessment 2021 | - |
| Noise, Vibration, Odour and Light Pollution Guideline Comments 2021 | - |
| AQMA RAG Assessment 2025 | Amber |

| Air Quality Officer Comment 2025 | The site has been scored as Amber. The site falls within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) and therefore inherent/intrinsic designed-in air quality mitigation measures and conditions will be required to offset impacts on the designated AQMA. |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| AQMA RAG Assessment 2023 | - |
| Air Quality Officer Comment 2023 | - |
| AQMA RAG Assessment 2021 | - |
| Air Quality Officer Comment 2021 | - |
| Contaminated Land RAG Assessment 2025 | Amber |
| Contaminated Land Officer Comments 2025 | Brownfield site, contamination expected, conditions required |
| Contaminated Land RAG Assessment 2023 | - |
| Contaminated Land Officer Comments 2023 | - |
| Contaminated Land RAG Assessment 2021 | - |
| Contaminated Land Officer Comments 2021 | - |
| Overall Suitability Score | Amber |
| Further constraints | - |
| Agricultural Land Classification Grade 1 | 0 |
| Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 | 0 |
| Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3 | 0 |
| Agricultural Land Classification Grade 4 | 0 |
| Agricultural Land Classification Non Agricultural | 0 |
| Agricultural Land Classification Urban | 100 |
| Source Protection Zone | 0 |
| Highways England Zones | Cambridge |
| Available | - |
| Is the site controlled by a developer or landowner who has expressed an intention to develop? | The site was submitted by the landowner and/or site promoter who has confirmed that the site is available for development in the timescales indicated. |
| Are there known legal or ownership impediments to development? | No |

| Is there planning permission to develop the site? | No relevant recent planning history |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| When will the site be available for development? | 0 to 5 years |
| Available RAG | Amber |
| Achievable | - |
| Is there a reasonable prospect that the site will be developed? | 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 development is likely to be economically viable |
| Achievable RAG | Green |
| Capacity | - |
| Prevailing Density (weighted) (dwellings per ha) | 30 |
| Residential capacity at prevailing density | 22 |
| Estimated employment space (m2) | 0 |
| Estimated start date | 0-5 Years |
| Estimated annual build-out rate (pa) | 40-75 |
| Development completion timescales (years) | 6-10 Years |



1 - 33 Stanton House, Christchurch Street, Cambridge assessment



A map of 1 - 33 Stanton House, Christchurch Street, Cambridge

| Site information | - |
|-----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Site ID | 116111 |
| HELAA Site ID | 200818 |
| Suitable Site Area (ha) | 0.2 |
| Ward/Parish | Market |
| Greenfield or Previously Developed? | Previously developed land |
| Category of site | Densification of existing urban areas |
| Category of settlement | Cambridge City |
| Current use(s) | Residential |
| Proposed development | Residential |
| Proposed employment floorspace (m2) | 0 |
| Proposed residential capacity | 29 |
| Suitability | - |
| Adopted Development Plan Policies RAG 2025 | Green |

| 11 (15) | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Adopted Development Plan Policies Comment 2025 | Development of the site is compatible and consistent with Development Plan policies and allocation. |
| Flood Risk RAG Assessment 2025 | Green |
| Flood Risk Officer Comment 2025 | Wholly in Flood Zone 1; Surface water flooding: No area lies within land at risk of surface water flooding |
| Flood Risk RAG Assessment 2023 | - |
| Flood Risk Officer Comment 2023 | - |
| Flood Risk RAG Assessment 2021 | - |
| Flood Risk Officer Comment 2021 | - |
| Landscape RAG Assessment 2025 | Amber |
| Landscape Comment 2025 | Providing the development is designed sympathetically to the surrounding context, including existing trees, the conservation area, existing scale, height and mass, re-development of this site would be acceptable. |
| Landscape RAG Assessment 2023 | - |
| Landscape Comment 2023 | - |
| Landscape RAG Assessment 2021 | - |
| Landscape Comment 2021 | - |
| Biodiversity and Geodiversity RAG Assessment 2025 | Green |
| Biodiversity and Geodiversity Officer Comments 2025 | A development of the size and scale described would not provide any specific ecological risks to statutory or non-statutory designated sites. However, this does not remove the likelihood of protected and priority species being impacted, nor that a development of the type described would likely be eligible for mandatory minimum biodiversity net gain. |
| Biodiversity and Geodiversity Guideline Comments 2025 | Development of the site would not have a detrimental impact on any designated site, or those with a regional or local protection. |
| Biodiversity and Geodiversity RAG Assessment 2023 | - |
| Biodiversity and Geodiversity Officer Comments 2023 | - |
| Biodiversity and Geodiversity Guideline Comments 2023 | - |
| Biodiversity and Geodiversity RAG Assessment 2021 | - |

| Biodiversity and Geodiversity Officer Comments 2021 | - |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Biodiversity and Geodiversity Guideline Comments 2021 | - |
| Policy RAG Rating 2025 | Green |
| Policy Officer Comment 2025 | Site is not on protected open space designation. Any impact of the proposed development could be reasonably mitigated or compensated. |
| Historic Environment RAG Assessment 2025 | Amber |
| Historic Environment Comments 2025 | Directly adjacent to Grade II listed Christ Church, Grade II listed parish room, churchyard wall and railings, and the Kite Conservation Area. In close proximity to several other heritage assets including the Grade II* listed Arts Theatre workshop and store, other Grade II listed buildings and Buildings of Local Interest. Development of the site could have a detrimental impact on a designated or non-designated heritage asset or their settings, but the impact could be reasonably mitigated in the form of careful massing, design and landscaping. |
| Historic Environment RAG Assessment 2023 | - |
| Historic Environment Comments 2023 | - |
| Historic Environment RAG Assessment 2021 | - |
| Historic Environment Comments 2021 | - |
| Archaeology RAG Assessment 2025 | Amber |
| Archaeology Officer Comment 2025 | - |
| Archaeology RAG Assessment 2023 | - |
| Archaeology Officer Comment 2023 | - |
| Archaeology RAG Assessment 2021 | - |
| Archaeology Officer Comment 2021 | - |
| Accessibility RAG Assessment 2025 - Automated | Green |
| Accessibility RAG Assessment 2025 - Officer Verified | - |
| Accessibility Comment 2025 | Good accessibility to key local services, transport, and employment opportunities. Proposed development would not require delivery of accompanying key services |
| Site Access RAG Assessment 2025 | Amber |

| Site Access Officer Comment 2025 | The site has been scored as Amber. The site is acceptable in principle, subject to further detail and consultation at the planning application stage. |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Access RAG Assessment 2023 | - |
| Site Access Officer Comment 2023 | - |
| Site Access RAG Assessment 2021 | - |
| Site Access Officer Comment 2021 | - |
| Transport and Roads RAG Assessment 2025 | Green |
| Transport and Roads Guideline Comments 2025 | This falls below the threshold for a Transport Assessment. |
| Transport and Roads RAG Assessment 2023 | - |
| Transport and Roads Guideline Comments 2023 | - |
| Transport and Roads RAG Assessment 2021 | - |
| Transport and Roads Guideline Comments 2021 | - |
| Noise, Vibration, Odour and Light Pollution RAG Assessment 2025 | Green |
| Noise, Vibration, Odour and Light Pollution Guideline Comments 2025 | Christ Church, Christchurch Street may be a noise source. However, having regard to the nature, size, scale, location and character of the area also existing residential, considered a negligible / low adverse noise constraint impact / effect risk on proposed residential occupiers having regard to existing noise sources - no objection. Demolition and construction impacts and potential operational noise for example Air Source Heat Pump/s (ASHP/s) etc. a constraint but manageable via conditions. |
| Noise, Vibration, Odour and Light Pollution RAG Assessment 2023 | - |
| Noise, Vibration, Odour and Light Pollution Guideline Comments 2023 | - |
| Noise, Vibration, Odour and Light Pollution RAG Assessment 2021 | - |
| Noise, Vibration, Odour and Light Pollution Guideline Comments 2021 | - |
| AQMA RAG Assessment 2025 | Amber |

| Air Quality Officer Comment 2025 | The site has been scored as Amber. The site falls within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) and therefore inherent/intrinsic designed-in air quality mitigation measures and conditions will be required to offset impacts on the designated AQMA. |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| AQMA RAG Assessment 2023 | - |
| Air Quality Officer Comment 2023 | - |
| AQMA RAG Assessment 2021 | - |
| Air Quality Officer Comment 2021 | - |
| Contaminated Land RAG Assessment 2025 | Amber |
| Contaminated Land Officer Comments 2025 | Brownfield site, contamination expected, conditions required |
| Contaminated Land RAG Assessment 2023 | - |
| Contaminated Land Officer Comments 2023 | - |
| Contaminated Land RAG Assessment 2021 | - |
| Contaminated Land Officer Comments 2021 | - |
| Overall Suitability Score | Amber |
| Further constraints | - |
| Agricultural Land Classification Grade 1 | 0 |
| Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 | 0 |
| Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3 | 0 |
| Agricultural Land Classification Grade 4 | 0 |
| Agricultural Land Classification Non Agricultural | 0 |
| Agricultural Land Classification Urban | 100 |
| Source Protection Zone | 0 |
| Highways England Zones | Cambridge |
| Available | - |
| Is the site controlled by a developer or landowner who has expressed an intention to develop? | The site was submitted by the landowner and/or site promoter who has confirmed that the site is available for development in the timescales indicated. |
| Are there known legal or ownership impediments to development? | No |

| Is there planning permission to develop the site? | Yes, Planning permission granted for i) demolition of 11-12 Burleigh Street and Abbeygate House, ii) Part demolition and alterations to the Grafton Centre, removal of existing facades, erection of new floorspace for life science use, new and replacement façades and shopfronts, provision of terraces at fourth floor level, installation of plant and enclosures, iii) Redevelopment of existing bus turning head and redundant service area to provide new hotel and leisure quarter, iv) New pedestrian access route from Christchurch Street to Burleigh Street, provision of cycle parking spaces, public realm and landscape improvements, v) Highway works to East Road providing new bus stops, pedestrian and cycle routes and other associated works. (23/02685/FUL) |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| When will the site be available for development? | 0 to 5 years |
| Available RAG | Amber |
| Achievable | - |
| Is there a reasonable prospect that the site will be developed? | 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 development is likely to be economically viable |
| Achievable RAG | Green |
| Capacity | - |
| Prevailing Density (weighted) (dwellings per ha) | 30 |
| Residential capacity at prevailing density | 6 |
| Estimated employment space (m2) | 0 |
| Estimated start date | 0-5 Years |
| Estimated annual build-out rate (pa) | 40-75 |
| Development completion timescales (years) | 0-5 Years |