

PHYSICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS - amended schedule (changes to the original schedule have been made for reasons of clarity. The changes are highlighted)

A score of '0' indicates less suitable for development while a score of '10' indicates more suitable for development. NB There is no relationship (e.g. weighting) between columns A and B. They are different assessments.

APPENDIX 1

Col A - if the constraint does not apply enter '10'
Col B - if a constraint applies indicate the % of the site affected. If none affected enter '0%'

TRANSPORT				
Constraint	Value	Criteria and Value Explanation	Value Scores	% ha
Main Road Network				
Roads	1	Although the MoD land contains some internal roads and the former runway there are no trunk road or indeed other public highways within the site.	10	0%
Rail Network				
Constraint	Value	Criteria and Value Explanation		
Railways	1	The Cambridge to Ely railway line abuts the site to the east, but this is not contained within the site and it is therefore not intended to build upon this.	10	0%
Airport Infrastructure				
Constraint	Value	Criteria and Value Explanation		
Airport	1	The MoD airfield contained within the site closed in 1966, when the site transferred from the RAF to the Army and has not therefore been used for some considerable time.	10	0%
Airport Public Safety Zones and safeguarded expansion areas	1	The site is not affected by any Airport Public Safety Zones.	10	0%
Airport Noise Levels (Stansted)	1 (category D) 5 (category C)	The site is not affected by airport noise relating to Stansted Airport.	10	0%
Transport Total			50	0%

UTILITIES				
Constraint	Value	Criteria and Value Explanation	Value Scores	% ha
400kV Overhead Power line	0	None of the site is within a 200m buffer of a 400Kv Overhead Power Line.	10	0%
Nuclear power stations	0	The site does not come within 1,500m of a nuclear power station.	10	0%
Existing wind farms	2	The site does not come within 500m of an existing wind farm.	10	0%
Potential locations for wind farms	2	There have been no applications for wind farm development on or close to the site. It is intended that the scope for wind power generation associated with the new settlement be fully investigated as a means of assisting to meet renewable energy targets. In this regard the findings of the recent study into renewable energy targets and options for the East of England are considered helpful to this objective.	10	0%
Gas pipelines	1 5 10	Waterbeach is currently served by medium pressure gas mains, which would not therefore represent a constraint.	10	0%
Gas infrastructure (higher tier COMH sites)	0	None in vicinity.	10	
Oil infrastructure (higher tier COMH sites)	0	None in vicinity.	10	
Gas infrastructure (lower tier COMAH sites)	0	None in vicinity.	10	
Oil infrastructure (lower tier COMAH sites)	0	None in vicinity.	10	
Power stations (excluding nuclear, oil and gas)	(0, 4 for a 200 metres	None in vicinity.	10	
Sewage/ water treatment works (higher tier COMAH sites)	0	None in vicinity.	10	
Sewage/ water treatment works (lower tier COMAH sites)	0	None in vicinity.	10	
Sewage/ water treatment works (other)	0 (5 for a 200 metres buffer)	The value given reflects the intended approach that the existing WWTW is relocated east of railway line - 500 m from the nearest part of the development.	10	
Other top tier COMAH sites	0	There are no top tier COMAH sites in the Waterbeach area.	10	
Other lower tier COMAH sites	0	There are no lower tier COMAH sites in the Waterbeach area.	10	
Utilities Total			150	0%
AGRICULTURAL LAND				
Constraint	Value	Criteria and Value Explanation	Value Scores	% ha
General Considerations – The Best and Most Versatile Land (BMV agricultural land) is land in Grades 1, 2 and 3a, poorer quality land is in Grades 3b, 4 and 5. PPS 7 requires that Local Planning Authorities should seek to use poorer quality agricultural land in preference to that of a higher quality and where significant development of agricultural land is unavoidable, areas of poorer quality land should be used in preference to that of a higher quality, except where this would be inconsistent with other sustainability considerations				
Grades 1 and 2	2	Grade 2 agricultural land is present within the site. There is no Grade 1 land present.	2	38.60%
Grade 3	4	Grade 3 agricultural land is present within the site.	4	11.10%

Grade 4	6	There is no Grade 4 agricultural land present within the site.	10	0%
Grade 5	8	There is no Grade 5 agricultural land present within the site.	10	0%
Agricultural Land Total	<i>Note: A score of 6.2 has been arrived at (on the advice of officers at EERA) on the following basis. 2 x 38.6% = 0.8; 4 x 11.1% = 0.4; 10 x 50.3%=5.0. The total therefore equals 6.2. This reflects the fact that some 50.3% of the site is not classified as agricultural land. The site percentage stated as agricultural land is therefore 49.7%.</i>		6.2	49.70%
MINERALS				
Constraint	Value	Criteria and Value Explanation	Value Scores	% ha
Allocated sites for mineral development	0	The site does not contain any areas allocated for mineral development in the Local Plan/LDF.	10	0%
Possible minerals sites	1 (4)	The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Preferred Options 2 (Development Plan Document) September 2008 , the consultation for which has recently finished, does not list any existing or proposed sites directly on the site. The Landbeach Lakes area on the west side of the A10 (owned by M Dickerson Ltd) is part of this development plan. Although a narrow buffer strip within the Mineral Consultation Zone extends onto the site this does not affect any land proposed for development and relates to the safeguarded setting to Denny Abbey only.	10	0%
Minerals Total			20	0%
TOPOGRAPHY				
Constraint	Value	Criteria and Value Explanation	Value Scores	% ha
Gradients 1:60 or less and from 1:59 to 1:40	10	No constraints.	10	0%
Gradients from 1:39 to 1:20	7	None present.	10	0%
Gradients higher than 1:20	4	None present.	10	0%
Topography Total			30	0%
WATER NETWORK				
Constraint	Value	Criteria and Value Explanation	Value Scores	% ha
Main rivers and waterways	0	There are no Main Rivers on or adjacent to the site.	10	0%
Reservoirs	0	There is no land on the site in use as a reservoir under the the Reservoirs Act 1975.	10	0%
Water Network Total			20	0%
FLOOD ZONES				
Constraint	Value	Criteria and Value Explanation	Value Scores	% ha
General Considerations - PPS 25 requires flood risk to be taken into account in order to avoid inappropriate development in areas at risk from flooding and to direct development away from areas of highest risk. LPAs should apply a sequential test to demonstrate that there are no reasonably available sites in areas with a lower probability of flooding that would be appropriate to the type of development or land use proposed. Where there are large areas within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and it is not possible, consistent with wider sustainability objectives, for the development to be located in zones of lower probability of flooding, Local Planning Authorities can apply the Exception Test set out in the PPS. The Exception Test only applies after the Sequential Test and in the circumstances when 'more vulnerable' development and 'essential infrastructure' cannot be located in Zones 1 or 2 and 'highly vulnerable' development cannot be located in Zone 1. It should not be used to justify 'highly vulnerable' development in Flood Zone 3a, or 'less vulnerable'; 'more vulnerable'; and 'highly vulnerable' development in Flood Zone 3b. The Exception Test must, inter alia, demonstrate that the wider community and sustainability benefits of the development outweigh the flood risk and a flood risk assessment must demonstrate that the development will be safe.				
Flood Zone 3b (Functional Floodplain)	0	None of the site is within Flood Zone 3b.	10	0%
Flood Zone 3a	1	10.3% of the site falls within Flood Zone 3a. Proposed development in this area prioritises commercial uses at ground floor level, whilst further mitigation measures are also planned.	1	10.30%
Flood Zone 2	4	8.2% of the site falls within Flood Zone 2. Proposed development in this area prioritises commercial uses at ground floor level, whilst further mitigation measures are also planned.	4	8.20%
Flood Zone 1	10	81.5% of the site falls within Flood Zone 1.	10	81.50%
Flood Zone Total	<i>Note: The score of 8.6 represents assessment of the site as it currently exists. A flood risk assessment (FRA) has been discussed and agreed with the Environment Agency. Under this, the flood mitigation strategy is for all development land to be raised above the current and future 1% Annual Exceedance Probability flood levels, allowing for the impact of climate change over the next 100 years.</i>		8.6	10.30%

FLOOD STORAGE AREAS				
Constraint	Value	Criteria and Value Explanation	Value Scores	% ha
Flood storage area	1	Flood compensation storage areas have been identified outside the development boundary - as part of the FRA, and agreed with the EA.	10	0%
Flood Storage Areas Total			10	0%
PROJECTED FLOODPLAIN WITH CLIMATE CHANGE				
Constraint	Value	Criteria and Value Explanation	Value Scores	% ha
Projected flood plain with Climate Change (100 years)	0	A flood risk assessment (FRA) has been discussed and agreed with the Environment Agency. Under this, the flood mitigation strategy is for all development land to be raised above the current and future 1% Annual Exceedance Probability flood levels, allowing for the impact of climate change over the next 100 years.	10	0%
Projected flood plain with Climate Change (100 years) Total			10	0%
PROTECTED GREEN SPACE AND NATURE CONSERVATION				
Constraint	Value	Criteria and Value Explanation	Value Scores	% ha
General Considerations - PPS9 seeks to prevent harm to biodiversity interests. Appropriate weight should be attached to maintaining designated sites of international, national, regional and local importance. Development which would result in significant harm should not take place unless it cannot reasonably be located on any alternative sites that would result in less or no harm. An Appropriate Assessment would be necessary for development in proximity to a scheduled site of international importance (Ramsar, SPA or SAC). Buffer zones are proposed to protect the setting / context of the site.				
Ramsar sites	0 (3 for a 300 metres ecological buffer around the area)	There are no Ramsar sites within 300m of the site.	10	0%
SPA (existing and proposed)	0 (3 for a 300 metres ecological buffer around the area)	There are no SPAs within 300m of the site.	10	0%
SAC (existing and proposed)	0 (3 for a 300 metres ecological buffer around the area)	There are no SACs within 300m of the site.	10	0%
National Nature Reserve	1 (4 for a 300 metres ecological buffer around the area)	There are no National Nature Reserve sites within 300m of the site.	10	0%
SSSIs	1 (4 for a 300 metres ecological buffer around the area)	There are no SSSIs within 300m of the site.	10	0%
National Park	1	The site is not within a National Park.	10	0%
Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty	1	The site is not within an AONB.	10	0%
Ancient Woodland	2 (4 for a 300 metres ecological buffer around the area)	There is no Ancient Woodland within 300m of the site.	10	0%
County wildlife sites	8	There are no County Wildlife Sites (CWS) within the site.	10	0%
Community Forests	8	There are no Community Forests within the site.	10	0%

Areas of Tranquillity	8	There are no Areas of tranquillity within the site.	10	0%
Green Belt	8	The site is not designated as Green Belt.	10	0%
Protected green space and nature conservation Total			130	0%
HISTORIC LANDSCAPE				
Constraint	Value	Criteria and Value Explanation	Value Scores	% ha
Historic Landscape	3	There are no historic landscapes, including registered parks and gardens, battlefields and locally designated areas of historic value, defined within the site. The Historic Landscape Characterisation database (HLC) of Cambridgeshire is currently being undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as part of a national project developed by English Heritage. In the absence of this information, it is not possible to identify specific constraints to development	10	0%
Scheduled Monuments	0	Denny Abbey is designated as a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM). However the SAM itself would not be harmed by the scheme and it is not proposed that development would take place within the vicinity of this site. Indeed a substantial area around the Abbey (90 ha) has been set aside for protection, and improvement of the setting of the SAM.	10	3%
Historic Landscape Total			20	0%