

APPENDIX 1
SA SCREENING TABLES

How the SA has addressed each issue is listed below. Rows that are greyed out are those issues where it is proposed that an SA is not needed at this stage. The SA at this stage will focus on areas where genuine options are proposed.

Element of the plan	SA approach
<p>Issue: Naming the Plan</p> <p>Question 1: Do you agree with changing the name of the plan to the 'North East Cambridge Area Action Plan'?</p>	SA not undertaken. This is a question posed for consultees rather than an issue that can be tested.
<p>Issue: North East Cambridge AAP Boundary</p> <p>Question 2: Is the proposed boundary the most appropriate one for the AAP?</p>	<i>SA provided as part of this stage of the assessment. A commentary on the effects of the policy approach has been included in section 5.</i>
<p>Issue: The physical characteristics of North East Cambridge area</p> <p>Question 3: In this chapter have we correctly identified the physical characteristics of the North East Cambridge area and its surroundings?</p>	SA not undertaken. This is a question posed for consultees rather than an issue that can be tested.
<p>Issue: Existing Constraints</p> <p>Question 4: Have we identified all relevant constraints present on, or affecting the North East Cambridge area?</p>	SA not undertaken. This is a question posed for consultees rather than an issue that can be tested.
<p>Issue: Future Vision for the North East Cambridge area</p> <p>Question 5: Do you agree with the Vision for the future of the North East Cambridge area? If not, what might you change?</p>	<i>SA provided as part of this stage of the assessment. The vision has been assessed along with the objectives.</i>
<p>Issue: Overarching Objectives</p> <p>Question 6: Do you agree with the overarching Objectives? If not, what might you change?</p>	
<p>Issue: Indicative Concept Plan</p> <p>Question 7: Do you support the overall approach shown in the Indicative Concept Plan? Do you have any comments or suggestions to make?</p>	<i>SA provided as part of this stage of the assessment. Please see the assessment matrix in Section 5.</i>
<p>Issue: Creating a Mixed Use City District</p> <p>Question 8: Do you agree that outside of the existing business areas, the eastern part of the North East Cambridge (i.e. the area east of Milton Road) should provide a higher density mixed use residential led area with</p>	These issues are addressed as part of the SA of the indicative concept plan above.

Element of the plan	SA approach
<p>intensified employment, relocation of existing industrial uses and other supporting uses?</p> <p>Question 9: Should Nuffield Road Industrial Estate be redeveloped for residential mixed use development?</p> <p>Question 10: Do you agree that opportunities should be explored to intensify and diversify existing business areas? If so, with what sort of uses?</p> <p>Question 11: Are there any particular land uses that should be accommodated in the North East Cambridge area?</p>	
<p>Issue: District Identity</p> <p>Question 12: What uses or activities should be included within the North East Cambridge AAP area which will create a district of culture, creativity and interest that will help create a successful community where people will choose to live and work and play?</p>	SA not undertaken. This is a question posed for consultees rather than an issue that can be tested.
<p>Issue: Creating a healthy community</p> <p>Question 13: Should the AAP require developments in the North East Cambridge AAP area to apply Healthy Towns principles?</p>	SA provided as part of this stage of the assessment. A commentary on the effects of the policy approach has been included in section 5.
<p>Issue: Cambridge Regional College</p> <p>Question 14: How should the AAP recognise and make best use of the existing and potential new links between the AAP area and the CRC?</p>	SA not undertaken. This is a question posed for consultees rather than an issue that can be tested.
<p>Issue: Building Heights and Skyline</p> <p>Question 15: Should clusters of taller buildings around areas of high accessibility including district and local centres and transport stops form part of the design-led approach to this new city district?</p>	SA provided as part of this stage of the assessment. A commentary on the effects of the policy approach has been included in section 5.
<p>Issue: Local movement and connectivity</p> <p>Question 16: Should the AAP include any or a combination of the options below to improve pedestrian and cycling connectivity through the site and to the surrounding area?</p> <p>A – Create a strong east-west axis to unite Cambridge North Station with Cambridge Science Park across Milton Road. This pedestrian and cycle corridor would be integrated into the wider green infrastructure network to create a pleasant and enjoyable route for people to travel through and</p>	SA provided as part of this stage of the assessment. Please see the assessment matrix in Section 5.

Element of the plan	SA approach
<p>around the site. The route could also allow other sustainable forms of transport to connect across Milton Road.</p> <p>B – Improve north-south movement between the Cowley Road part of the site and Nuffield Road. Through the redevelopment of the Nuffield Road area of the NEC, it will be important that new and existing residents have convenient and safe pedestrian and cycle access to the services and facilities that will be provided as part of the wider North East Cambridge proposals.</p> <p>C – Upgrade connections to Milton Country Park by both foot and cycle. This would include improving access to the Jane Coston Bridge over the A14, the Waterbeach Greenway project including a new access under the A14 (see Transport Chapter), as well as the existing underpass along the river towpath.</p> <p>D – Provide another Cambridge Guided Bus stop to serve a new District Centre located to the east side of Milton Road.</p> <p>E - Increasing ease of movement across the sites by opening up opportunities to walk and cycle through areas where this is currently difficult, for example Cambridge business park and the Cambridge Science Park improving access to the Kings Hedges and East Chesterton areas as well as the City beyond.</p>	
<p>Issue: Crossing the railway line</p> <p>Question 17: Should we explore delivery of a cycling and pedestrian bridge over the railway line to link into the River Cam towpath?</p>	<p><i>SA provided as part of this stage of the assessment. A commentary on the effects of the policy approach has been included in section 5.</i></p>
<p>Issue: Milton Road interface</p> <p>Question 18: Which of the following options would best improve connectivity across Milton Road between Cambridge North Station and Cambridge Science Park?</p> <p>A - One or more new 'green bridges' for pedestrians and cycles could be provided over Milton Road. The bridges could form part of the proposed</p>	<p><i>SA provided as part of this stage of the assessment. Please see the assessment matrix in Section 5.</i></p>

Element of the plan	SA approach
<p>green infrastructure strategy for the NEC, creating a substantial green/ecological link(s) over the road.</p> <p>B - Subject to viability and feasibility testing, Milton Road could be 'cut-in' or tunnelled below ground in order to create a pedestrian and cycle friendly environment at street level. This option would allow for significant improvements to the street which would be more pleasurable for people to walk and cycle through.</p> <p>C - Milton Road could be significantly altered to rebalance the road in a way that reduces the dominance of the road, including rationalising (reducing) the number of junctions between the Guided Busway and the A14 as well as prioritising walking, cycling and public transport users.</p> <p>D - Connectivity across Milton Road could be improved through other measures. We would welcome any other suggestions that would improve the east-west connectivity through the site.</p> <p>E - Other ways of improving connections (please specify)</p>	
<p>Issue: Development on Milton Road</p> <p>Question 19: Should development within the North East Cambridge area be more visible from Milton Road, and provide a high quality frontage to help create a new urban character for this area?</p>	<p>SA not undertaken. This is a question posed for consultees rather than an issue that can be tested. The SA of the next stage of the AAP will pick up potential impacts and this is expected to include a positive impact on SA Objective 6: Maintain and enhance the diversity and local distinctiveness of landscape and townscape character.</p>
<p>Issue: Managing car parking and servicing</p> <p>Question 20: Do you agree with proposals to include low levels of parking as part of creating a sustainable new city district focusing on non-car transport?</p> <p>Question 21a: In order to minimise the number of private motor vehicles using Milton Road, should Cambridge Science Park as well as other existing employment areas in this area have a reduction in car parking provision from current levels?</p>	<p><i>SA provided as part of this stage of the assessment. Please see the assessment matrix in Section 5.</i></p>

Element of the plan	SA approach
<p>21b: Should this be extended to introduce the idea of a reduction with a more equitable distribution of car parking across both parts of the AAP area?</p> <p>Question 22: Should the AAP require innovative measures to address management of servicing and deliveries, such as consolidated deliveries and delivery/collection hubs?</p>	
<p>Issue: Car and other motor vehicle storage</p> <p>Question 23: Should development within the North east Cambridge area use car barns for the storage of vehicles?</p>	SA not undertaken. This is a question posed for consultees rather than an issue that can be tested.
<p>Issue: Green Space provision</p> <p>Question 24: Within the North East Cambridge area green space can be provided in a number of forms including the following options. Which of the following would you support?</p> <p>A - Green space within the site could be predominately provided through the introduction of a large multi-functional district scale green space. Taking inspiration from Parker's Piece in Cambridge, a new large space will provide flexible space that can be used throughout the year for a wide range of sport, recreation and leisure activities and include a sustainable drainage function. The sustainable drainage element would link into a system developed around the existing First Public Drain and the drainage system in the Science Park. The green space could be further supported by a number of smaller neighbourhood block scale open spaces dispersed across the site.</p> <p>B - Green spaces within the site could be provided through a series of green spaces of a neighbourhood scale that will be distributed across the residential areas. These green spaces will also be connected to the green infrastructure network to further encourage walking and cycling. Again, these spaces will include a sustainable drainage function and link into the existing First Public Drain and the Science Park drainage system.</p> <p>C - Enhance connections and corridors within and beyond the site to improve the biodiversity and ecological value as well as capturing the essential Cambridge character of green fingers extending into urban areas. These corridors could also be focussed around the green space</p>	SA provided as part of this stage of the assessment. Please see the assessment matrix in Section 5.

Element of the plan	SA approach
<p>network and sustainable drainage and would reflect the NPPF net environmental gain requirement.</p> <p>D- Green fingers to unite both sides of Milton Road and capitalise on the existing green networks.</p> <p>E – Consideration of the site edges – enhancement of the existing structural edge landscape and creating new structural landscape at strategic points within and on the edge of the CNF. This would also enhance the setting to the City on this important approach into the City.</p> <p>F – Creation of enhanced pedestrian and cycle connectivity to Milton Country Park and the River Cam corridor</p>	
<p>Issue: Non-Car Access</p> <p>Question 25: As set out in this chapter there are a range of public transport, cycling and walking schemes planned which will improve access to the North East Cambridge area. What other measures should be explored to improve access to this area?</p>	SA not undertaken. This is a question posed for consultees rather than an issue that can be tested.
<p>Issue: Car usage in North East Cambridge</p> <p>Question 26: Do you agree that the AAP should be seeking a very low share of journeys to be made by car compared to other more sustainable means like walking and cycling to and from, and within the area?</p> <p>Question 27: Do you have any comments on the highway 'trip budget' approach, and how we can reduce the need for people to travel to and within the area by car?</p>	<i>SA provided as part of this stage of the assessment. A commentary on the effects of the policy approach has been included in section 5.</i>
<p>Issue: Car Parking</p> <p>Question 28: Do you agree that car parking associated with new developments should be low, and we should take the opportunity to reduce car parking in existing developments (alongside the other measures to improve access by means other than the car)?</p>	<i>SA provided as part of this stage of the assessment. A commentary on the effects of the policy approach has been included in section 5.</i>

Element of the plan	SA approach
<p>Issue: Cycle Parking</p> <p>Issue: Cycle Parking</p> <p>Question 29: Do you agree that we should require high levels of cycle parking from new developments?</p> <p>Question 30: Should we look at innovative solutions to high volume cycle storage both within private development as well as in public areas?</p> <p>Question 31: What additional factors should we also be considering to encourage cycling use (e.g. requiring new office buildings to include secure cycle parking, shower facilities and lockers)?</p>	<p><i>SA provided as part of this stage of the assessment. A commentary on the effects of the policy approach has been included in section 5.</i></p>
<p>Issue: Innovative approaches to Movement</p> <p>Question 32: How do we design and plan for a place that makes the best use of current technologies and is also future proofed to respond to changing technologies over time?</p>	<p>SA not undertaken. This is a question posed for consultees rather than an issue that can be tested.</p>
<p>Issue: Linking the Station to the Science Park</p> <p>Question 33: what sort of innovative measures could be used to improve links between the Cambridge North Station and destinations like the Science Park?</p>	<p>Impacts identified in assessment of option 13a.</p>
<p>Issue: Types of Employment Space</p> <p>Question 34: Are there specific types of employment spaces that we should seek to support in this area?</p>	<p>SA not undertaken. This is a question posed for consultees rather than an issue that can be tested.</p>
<p>Question 35: In particular, should the plan require delivery of:</p> <p>A - a flexible range of unit types and sizes, including for start-ups, and Small and Medium Sized Enterprises (SMEs);</p> <p>B - Specialist uses like commercial laboratory space;</p> <p>C - hybrid buildings capable of a mix of uses, incorporating offices and manufacturing uses.</p> <p>D - shared social spaces, for example central hubs, cafes.</p> <p>E - Others (please specify).</p>	<p><i>SA provided as part of this stage of the assessment. A commentary on the effects of the policy approach has been included in section 5.</i></p>

Element of the plan	SA approach
<p>Issue: Approach industrial uses</p> <p>Question 36: Which of the following approaches should the AAP take to existing industrial uses in the North East Cambridge area?</p> <p>A - seek to relocate industrial uses away from the North East Cambridge area?</p> <p>B - seek innovative approaches to supporting uses on site as part of a mixed use City District?</p> <p>Question 37: Are there particular uses that should be retained in the area or moved elsewhere?</p>	<p>SA provided as part of this stage of the assessment. Please see the assessment matrix in Section 5.</p>
<p>Issue: Housing Mix</p> <p>Question 38: Should the AAP require a mix of dwelling sizes and in particular, some family sized housing?</p> <p>Question 39: Should the AAP seek provision for housing for essential local workers and/or specific housing provided by employers (i.e. tethered accommodation outside of any affordable housing contribution)?</p>	<p>SA provided as part of this stage of the assessment. A commentary on the effects of the policy approach has been included in section 5.</p>
<p>Issue: Affordable Housing</p> <p>Question 40: Should the AAP require 40% of housing to be affordable, including a mix of affordable housing tenures, subject to viability?</p> <p>Question 41: Should an element of the affordable housing provision be targeted at essential local workers?</p>	<p>SA provided as part of this stage of the assessment. A commentary on the effects of the policy approach has been included in section 5.</p>
<p>Issue: Custom Build Housing</p> <p>Question 42: Should the AAP require a proportion of development to provide custom build opportunities?</p>	<p>SA provided as part of this stage of the assessment. A commentary on the effects of the policy approach has been included in section 5.</p>
<p>Issue: Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO)</p> <p>Question 43: Should the AAP allow a proportion of purpose built HMOs and include policy controls on the clustering of HMOs?</p>	<p>SA provided as part of this stage of the assessment. A commentary on the effects of the policy approach has been included in section 5.</p>
<p>Issue: Private Rented Sector (PRS) Housing</p>	<p>SA provided as part of this stage of the assessment. A commentary on the effects of the policy approach has been included in section 5.</p>

Element of the plan	SA approach
<p>Question 44: Should the AAP include PRS as a potential housing option as part of a wider housing mix across the North East Cambridge area?</p> <p>Question 45: if PRS is to be supported, what specific policy requirements should we consider putting in place to manage its provision and to ensure it contributes towards creating a mixed and sustainable community?</p> <p>Question 46: Should PRS provide an affordable housing contribution?</p> <p>Question 47: What 'clawback' mechanisms should be included to secure the value of the affordable housing to meet local needs if the homes are converted to another tenure?</p> <p>Question 48: What would be a suitable period to require the retention of private rented homes in that tenure and what compensation mechanisms are needed if such homes are sold into a different tenure before the end of the period?</p> <p>Question 49: What type of management strategy is necessary to ensure high standards of ongoing management of PRS premises is achieved?</p>	
<p>Issue: Other forms of specialist housing, including for older people, students & travellers</p> <p>Question 50: Should the area provide for other forms of specialist housing, either on-site or through seeking contributions for off-site provision?</p>	<p><i>SA provided as part of this stage of the assessment. A commentary on the effects of the policy approach has been included in section 5.</i></p>
<p>Issue: Quality and Accessibility of Housing</p> <p>Question 51: Should the AAP apply the national internal residential space standards?</p> <p>Question 52: Should the AAP develop space standards for new purpose built HMOs?</p> <p>Question 53: Should the AAP apply External Space Standards, and expect all dwellings to have direct access to an area of private amenity space?</p> <p>Question 54: Should the AAP apply the Cambridge Local Plan accessibility standards?</p>	<p><i>SA provided as part of this stage of the assessment. A commentary on the effects of the policy approach has been included in section 5.</i></p>

Element of the plan	SA approach
<p>Issue: Retail and Leisure</p> <p>Question 55: Do you agree with the range of considerations that the AAP will need to have regard to in planning for new retail and town centre provision on the North East Cambridge area? Are there other important factors we should be considering?</p> <p>Question 56: Should the Councils be proposing a more multi-dimensional interpretation of the role of a town centre or high street for the North East Cambridge area, where retail is a key but not solely dominant element?</p>	SA not undertaken. This is a question posed for consultees rather than an issue that can be tested.
<p>Issue: Community Facilities</p> <p>Question 57: What community facilities are particularly needed in the North East Cambridge area?</p>	SA not undertaken. This is a question posed for consultees rather than an issue that can be tested.
<p>Issue: Open Space</p> <p>Question 58: It is recognised that maximising the development potential of the North East Cambridge area may require a different approach to meeting the sport and open space needs of the new community. How might this be achieved?</p> <p>Question 59: Should open space provision within the North East Cambridge area prioritise quality and functionality over quantity?</p> <p>Question 60: Should open space provision within the North East Cambridge area seek to provide for the widest variety of everyday structured and unstructured recreational opportunities, including walking, jogging, picnics, formal and informal play, casual sports, games, dog walking and youth recreation?</p> <p>Question 61: Where specific uses are required to provide of open space as part of the development, should the AAP allow for these to be met through multiple shared use (for example school playing fields & playing pitches for the general public)?</p>	SA not undertaken. This is a question posed for consultees rather than an issue that can be tested and potential impact on a range of objectives is unknown at this stage
<p>Issue: Carbon Reduction Standards for Residential Development</p>	<i>SA provided as part of this stage of the assessment. Please see the assessment matrix in Section 5.</i>

Element of the plan	SA approach
<p>Question 62: Within this overall approach, in particular, which option do you prefer in relation to carbon reduction standards for residential development?</p> <p>A - a 19% improvement on 2013 Building Regulations (the current Cambridge Local Plan standard); or</p> <p>B - a requirement for carbon emissions to be reduced by a further 10% through the use of on-site renewable energy (the current South Cambridgeshire Local Plan standard); or</p> <p>C - a 19% improvement on 2013 Building Regulations plus an additional 10% reduction through the use of on-site renewable energy (combining the current standards in the Local Plans); or</p> <p>D - consider a higher standard and develop further evidence alongside the new joint Local Plan.</p>	
<p>Issue: Sustainable design and construction standards</p> <p>Question 63: Do you support the approach to sustainable design and construction standards suggested for the AAP?</p>	<p><i>SA provided as part of this stage of the assessment. A commentary on the effects of the policy approach has been included in section 5.</i></p>
<p>Issue: Reviewing Sustainability Standards in the future</p> <p>Question 64: Do you support the proposal for the AAP to be clear that review mechanisms should to be built into any planning permissions in order to reflect changes in policy regarding sustainable design and construction standards in local and national policy? What other mechanisms could be used?</p>	<p><i>SA provided as part of this stage of the assessment. A commentary on the effects of the policy approach has been included in section 5.</i></p>
<p>Issue: Site wide approaches to sustainable design and construction</p> <p>Question 65: Do you support the plan requiring delivery of site wide approaches to issues such as energy and water, as well as the use of BREEAM Communities International Technical Standard at the masterplanning stage?</p>	<p><i>SA provided as part of this stage of the assessment. A commentary on the effects of the policy approach has been included in section 5.</i></p>

Element of the plan	SA approach
Question 66: Are there additional issues we should consider in developing the approach to deliver an exemplar development?	
Issue: Biodiversity Question 67: What approach should the AAP take to ensure delivery of a net gain in biodiversity?	<i>SA provided as part of this stage of the assessment. A commentary on the effects of the policy approach has been included in section 5.</i>
Issue: SMART technology Question 68: Should the AAP require developments in the area to integrate SMART technologies from the outset?	<i>SA provided as part of this stage of the assessment. A commentary on the effects of the policy approach has been included in section 5.</i>
Issue: Waste Collection Question 69: Should the AAP require the use of an underground waste system where is viable?	<i>SA provided as part of this stage of the assessment. A commentary on the effects of the policy approach has been included in section 5.</i>
Issue: Phasing and relocations Question 70: Do you agree that the AAP should prioritise land that can feasibly be developed early? Are there any risks associated with this proposed approach? Question 71: Should the AAP include a relocation strategy in preference of leaving this to the market to resolve?	SA not undertaken. This is a question posed for consultees rather than an issue that can be tested.
Issue: Funding & Delivery of infrastructure Question 72: Do you agree with an approach of devising a Section 106 regime specifically for the North East Cambridge area? If not, what alternative approach should we consider? Question 73: What approach do you consider the most appropriate basis on which to apportion the cost of the infrastructure requirements arising from different land uses to ensure an equitable outcome?	SA not undertaken. This is a question posed for consultees rather than an issue that can be tested.
Issue: Development viability Question 74: How should the AAP take into account potential changes over time, both positive and negative, that might affect development viability?	SA not undertaken. This is a question posed for consultees rather than an issue that can be tested.

Element of the plan	SA approach
<p>Issue: Land assembly and Compulsory Purchase Orders</p> <p>Question 75: Do you agree with the proposal to require land assembly where it can be demonstrated that this is necessary for delivering the agreed masterplan for the North East Cambridge area and/or the proper planning of development?</p> <p>Question 76: Should the AAP state that the Councils will consider use of their Compulsory Purchase powers? If so, should the AAP also set out the circumstances under which this would appropriate?</p>	SA not undertaken. This is a question posed for consultees rather than an issue that can be tested.
<p>Issue: Joint Working</p> <p>Question 77: Should the Councils actively seek to facilitate joint working between the various landowners/developers within the North East Cambridge area? If so, what specific matters could we target for joint working?</p>	SA not undertaken. This is a question posed for consultees rather than an issue that can be tested.
<p>Issue: Pre-AAP Planning Applications</p> <p>Question 78: Do you agree with the Councils' proposed approach to dealing with planning applications made ahead of the AAP reaching a more formal stage of preparation?</p>	SA not undertaken. This is a question posed for consultees rather than an issue that can be tested.
<p>Issue: Meanwhile (Temporary) Use</p> <p>Question 79: What types of 'meanwhile uses' should the AAP support for the North East Cambridge area?</p> <p>Question 80: Should there be any limit on the scale of a proposed 'meanwhile use'?</p> <p>Question 81: Do you think it appropriate to set a maximum period for how long a 'meanwhile use' could be in operation?</p> <p>Question 82: Should the AAP also include a requirement for 'meanwhile uses' to demonstrate how they will add vibrancy and interest and/or deliver on the wider development outcomes and vision for the North East Cambridge area?</p>	SA not undertaken. This is a question posed for consultees rather than an issue that can be tested.
<p>Issue: Equalities Impacts</p> <p>Question 83: What negative or positive impacts might the proposed plans have on residents or visitors to Cambridge with low incomes or who have</p>	SA not undertaken. This is a question posed for consultees rather than an issue that can be tested.

Element of the plan	SA approach
<p>particular characteristics protected under the Equality Act 2010? (The protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, and sexual orientation.)</p>	
<p>Issue: Any other comments</p> <p>Question 84: Do you have any other comments about the North East Cambridge area and/or AAP? Are there other issues and alternatives that the councils should consider? If you wish to make suggestions, please provide your comments.</p>	<p>SA not undertaken. This is a question posed for consultees rather than an issue that can be tested.</p>