

3.3 Options Summary

3.3.1 Please summarise why the preferred option, with the requested HIF funding, has been chosen and why the other shortlisted options have been discounted – this should make reference to advantages and disadvantages of the options in relation to scheme objectives and CSFs.

Performance of Options against Strategic Objectives

Objective	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
1. Relocate the CWRC to a suitable new site.	Met.	Not met – CWRC is not relocated	
2. Unlock 47ha of fully serviced brownfield land for residential-led mixed use development within the Core Site.	Able to be met.	Not able to be met – land is unable to be released for housing because CWRC remains in situ.	
3. Deliver 5,600 homes within the Core Site by 2035.	Able to be met.	Not able to be met – only employment uses allowed on Core Site.	
4. Deliver a further 3,025 homes across the wider CNFE area over the Area Action Plan Period.	Able to be met.	Not able to be met – only employment uses likely to be allowed in wider CNFE area over Plan period.	
5. Transport-neutral growth across the CNFE area	Able to be met.	Not able to be met – growth does not occur on a significant scale and is employment-dominated, making trip internalisation/ reduction unachievable.	
6. Deliver a new city quarter achieving exemplary standards of design and sustainability.	Able to be met.	Partly able to be met – design and sustainability standards could be applied to employment-led development within CNFE, but cannot be a 'new city quarter'.	
7. Create a mixed community with good homes for all.	Able to be met.	Not able to be met – scope for housing development severely limited.	

Performance of Options against Critical Success Factors

Critical Success Factor	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
<i>Recycling brownfield land for housing development</i>	Success – target would be met.	Failure – target could not be met as CWRC land could not be recycled.	
<i>Enabling rapid additional large-scale housing delivery</i>	Success – target could be met.	Failure – target could not be met as no new housing would be enabled.	
<i>Maximising social, economic and environmental benefits relative to costs</i>	Success – benefit to cost ratio achievable.	Failure – no housing would likely be delivered.	Not applicable – nothing delivered and no cost incurred.
<i>Maximising the number of dwellings delivered for the level of public investment</i>	Success – cost-per-unit benchmark could be reached.	Failure – no housing would likely be delivered.	Not applicable – nothing delivered and no cost incurred.
<i>Facilitating operational continuity of water recycling for Greater Cambridge</i>	Success – provision of new CWRC facility.	Success – operational continuity of existing CWRC facility.	
<i>Releasing a development opportunity that the private sector is able to deliver</i>	Success – modelling shows required level of private investment would be viable.	Not applicable – no development opportunity released. Private sector likely to be able to deliver residual employment-led development.	
<i>Public funding requirement is focused specifically on the relocation/remediation of the CWRC</i>	Success – modelling shows 100% of non-CWRC cost commercially fundable.	Failure – level of public funding would not achieve relocation.	Not applicable – no public funding deployed.
<i>Public funding is affordable from available sources of finance</i>	Success – funding requirement is less than upper limit.	Failure – level of public funding would not achieve relocation.	Not applicable – no public funding deployed.
<i>Deliverable by the partners involved</i>	Success – capability exists to deliver.	Failure – partners could not deliver with the level of funding.	Not applicable – no change to existing CWRC arrangements
<i>Private sector delivery capacity for housing</i>	Success – master developer already identified.	Failure – private sector capacity would not come forward as CWRC would remain to be relocated.	