

Question 5: Growth Options

50103

Consultee

Title

First Name Melanie

Surname Atwell

Position

Organisation

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50103-9

Option 1/option 5/

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50103-10

I would not like too many large settlements that changed the feel of villages.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50113

Consultee

Title
First Name
Surname B.S. Pension Fund Trustee Ltd
Position
Organisation c/o agent

Agent

Title Miss
Name Marcia
Surname Whitehead
Position
Organisation Hallam Land Management Ltd

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50113-2

The growth options themselves need to be explored through the emerging Local Plan process but what is clear is the importance of the Market Towns in Fenland in terms of providing a focus and hub for local employment and housing opportunities which must not be lost through any artificial settlement hierarchy. By way of example, Chatteris very much serves the southern part of Fenland, being surrounded by a number of villages and therefore as the District grows Chatteris will need to grow to continue to meet that need. In sustainability terms, focussing growth in identified locations, rather than dispersing both housing and employment sites to more remote and poorly served villages would be a retrograde step.

Current planning application F/YR10/0804/O for a mixed use development comprising residential up to 1,000 dwellings (B1, B2, B8), local centre (A1, A2, A3, A4, D1) primary school playing fields landscaping and open space new highways and associated ancillary development on the south side of Chatteris illustrates the proven and accepted ability which Chatteris has to support further development and significant infrastructure in the form of the proposed southern bypass. The masterplan for the site is attached.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50039

Consultee

Title

First Name Hilary

Surname Bailey

Position

Organisation

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50039-11

My preference is for a mix of option 1 and 3 – ie a proportionate distribution, but further weighted towards areas with adequate public transport provision and access to green space. See my own calculations below for some of the alternatives: [Table included in question - please see attached]

Option 1 or option 3 would render the need for development of the precious Wenny Road meadow unnecessary in Chatteris. I think Whittlesey needs to take significantly more of the development burden since it is well provided with railway connectivity and a nature reserve (Lattersley field)

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50039-12

Option 2 gives a disproportionate share of the development quota to Chatteris, which is utterly ignored in the current draft local transport plan and has been identified as deficient in all types of natural green space (Green Infrastructure survey, 2011).

Option 4 may have merit, but only if connected to national rail infrastructure, which would be expensive to set up

Option 5 is probably inefficient in terms of upgrading infrastructure such as drainage, etc. The current drainage around Chatteris is at capacity, and radical reform would be required to accommodate any new development

Option 6 is a nonsense unless public transport provision is the main focus, in which case, Chatteris is not on a corridor.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50039-13

See above,
namely:

Option 2 gives a disproportionate share of the development quota to Chatteris, which is utterly ignored in the current draft local transport plan and has been identified as deficient in all types of natural green space (Green Infrastructure survey, 2011).

Option 4 may have merit, but only if connected to national rail infrastructure, which would be expensive to set up

Option 5 is probably inefficient in terms of upgrading infrastructure such as drainage, etc. The

Question 5: Growth Options

current drainage around Chatteris is at capacity, and radical reform would be required to accommodate any new development

Option 6 is a nonsense unless public transport provision is the main focus, in which case, Chatteris is not on a corridor.

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

50039-14

See above,
namely:

Option 2 gives a disproportionate share of the development quota to Chatteris, which is utterly ignored in the current draft local transport plan and has been identified as deficient in all types of natural green space (Green Infrastructure survey, 2011).

Option 4 may have merit, but only if connected to national rail infrastructure, which would be expensive to set up

Option 5 is probably inefficient in terms of upgrading infrastructure such as drainage, etc. The current drainage around Chatteris is at capacity, and radical reform would be required to accommodate any

new development

Option 6 is a nonsense unless public transport provision is the main focus, in which case, Chatteris is not on a corridor.

Question 5: Growth Options

50007

Consultee

Title

First Name Serena

Surname Bailey

Position

Organisation

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50007-11

Options 4 and 6 stand out to me – new settlements would mean that a sense of space would be maintained in existing villages (rather than new houses being crammed into corners which currently serve as outdoor green space) and could allow for strategic develop of appropriate services and planning for those new settlements (however it may be a challenge to locate viable and available land for this as much of fenland is farmed agricultural land).
Option 6 sounds wise as people will need to travel for things like work, so especially focusing on ways to develop which can make use of public transport may make for a more sustainable option which leads to less congestion.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50007-12

I believe that proportional settlement will only work if it looks at the capacity of the town – a town which already uses the available space within its boundary and has existing strain on its services couldn't easily take on a further influx of houses – just because it's already a certain size doesn't mean that there's infinite scope.
Market-led town growth makes me feel uncertain. Wisbech is 4 times the size of Chatteris, but they are being classes as the same level. It seems that Chatteris would certainly struggle to take on an equal number of new houses as Wisbech

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50046

Consultee

Title

First Name Bryan

Surname Baker

Position

Organisation

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50046-11

Option 2 - Market Towns i.e. Chatteris/Whittlesey

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50046-12

All positive, no negatives

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50046-13

Option 4 - Growth will expand out of all proportion.

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

50046-14

No

Question 5: Growth Options

50111

Consultee

Title

First Name Kris

Surname Baxter

Position

Organisation Studio 11 Architecture

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50111-7

Option 1: Proportionate Settlement Growth & Option 5: Small Site Focus

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50111-8

It is a positive in supporting local communities for a proportionate settlement growth approach to be taken. Large site allocations have been an issue with the current Local Plan meaning larger developers and land owners must be involved and co-operate. Smaller sites can be brought forward more quickly and meet housing need quicker.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50111-9

Option 2: Market Town Led Growth - Whilst these settlements may be the most sustainable it restricts growth to only 4 settlements which is poor for the District as a whole.

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50059

Consultee

Title Mr
First Name Mark
Surname Behrendt
Position Planning Manager
Organisation Home Builders Federation

Agent

Title
Name
Surname
Position
Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50059-3

It is unlikely that any single option will provide the solution for delivering balanced growth across the plan period. We would expect to see elements of each of the options set out in chapter 5 that would allow for the delivery of strategic sites (either as urban extensions or new settlements) as well as medium sized and smaller allocations in a variety of settlements. The most important element of any strategy is that it is not overly reliant on a few larger sites to deliver the majority of its development. Only by providing allocations that provides a diverse range of sites in a wide range of communities will the Council be able to meet the breadth of housing needs in the Borough.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50117

Consultee

Title

First Name Sharon, Patricia Joyce and Melanie

Surname Bester, Whittlesey and Curl - C/O NYC

Position

Organisation

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

Mr

Richard

Mowat

Johnson Mowat

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50117-9

An approach similar to option 1 however with a greater focus on growth villages meeting the Council's housing requirements.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50117-10

An approach set out at 5a should be pursued.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50117-11

As per 5a. The options fail to acknowledge the importance of growth villages and more development should be focused in these settlements. People have a right to be able to live in the villages and suitable provision must be made, rather than settlement hubs.

We do not consider that Option 4 is appropriate for Fenland as previous experience indicates that new settlements take a significant amount of time to deliver and require extensive infrastructure. For this relatively rural area, we suggest that the allocation of land should seek to enhance and contribute towards improving existing infrastructure and leveraging off this, rather than diverting resources to a new town.

Whilst Option 6 is laudable, in the first instance discussions should be held with transport providers to establish whether they would be willing to extend existing service provision along these proposed corridors. It may be more beneficial to concentrate development on existing towns and villages where these services already exist and additional critical mass can help sustain these services.

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

50117-12

An approach focusing on the market towns and the growth villages. Most suitable by their definition in the settlement hierarchy.

Question 5: Growth Options

50086

Consultee

Title Mr
First Name Lee
Surname Bevens
Position
Organisation L Bevens Associates Architects Ltd

Agent

Title
Name
Surname
Position
Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50086-11

Proportionate growth, new settlements and corridor growth

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50086-12

I think that proportionate growth allows development to be controlled subject to a variety of other policies but certain towns should not see priority growth against others. New settlements will allow for more cohesive overall developments that can deliver a variety of important requirements but these will not be delivered unless investment in infrastructure takes place which has been a major issue holding back the fens.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50122

Consultee

Title

First Name Robert

Surname Boddington

Position

Organisation

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50122-11

Option 2, but to include services and infrastructure.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50122-12

Small villages should remain small.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50122-13

Option 4, agricultural land will disappear. But realistically, in 20 years time this will be the result.

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

50122-14

No

Question 5: Growth Options

50106

Consultee

Title Councillor
First Name Gavin
Surname Booth
Position
Organisation Parson Drove Parish Council

Agent

Title
Name
Surname
Position
Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50106-10

Option 1

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50106-11

Keep villages viable.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50106-12

3 - development would lead to integration of new communities.

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50029

Consultee

Title

First Name Ted

Surname Brand

Position

Organisation Brand Associates Architects

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50029-8

1 – proportionate

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50029-9

1. Enhance the rural economy
2. With internet more business people are work from home which is more sustainable

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50090

Consultee

Title

First Name

Fiona

Surname

Bryan

Position

Organisation

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50090-11

A mix of option 3, 4 and 5.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50090-12

Some towns and villages can benefit from further growth, meeting the housing needs of growing families as long as it is affordable and not exclusive housing. New settlements would provide fresh starts for planning and easier to build large numbers of houses in a managed way.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50090-13

Corridor growth will cause chaos on already busy and dangerous main roads. 90% allocation to market towns or market town led growth is unfair, putting unnecessary strain on these places - driving down house prices and increasing prices of villages where it will be more desirable to live. The housing need must be met by all and more fairly distributed.

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

50090-14

Growth could also be achieved through more innovative ways than building lots of houses. I like the idea of building apartments on top of businesses, such as supermarkets and the regeneration of derelict buildings.

Question 5: Growth Options

50060

Consultee

Title

First Name Nicole

Surname Burnett

Position Senior Planner

Organisation Gladman

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50060-9

The consultation document sets out the following six growth options in order to deliver the necessary scale of development:

- Option 1 – proportionate settlement growth
- Option 2 – Market town led growth
- Option 3 – Strategic Growth at one or more settlements
- Option 4 – New Settlement(s)
- Option 5 – Small site focus
- Option 6 – Corridor Growth

Gladman's view regarding the spatial strategy for growth is that no one of these options in isolation would be appropriate and that the most appropriate approach is likely to be a hybrid strategy combining elements from a number of these options.

The growth strategy should not be a politically driven decision but should be based in part on evidence of need and availability of land. There are a vast number of factors that should be considered when determining the overall growth strategy and no one option should be progressed in isolation. An over reliance on one option for growth may result in the plan falling short in delivering the necessary scale of growth.

In relation to the growth strategy, in allocating sites the Council should be mindful that to maximize housing supply the widest possible range of sites, by size and market location are required so that house builders of all types and sizes have access to suitable land in order to offer the widest possible range of products. The key to increased housing supply is the number of sales outlets. The maximum delivery is achieved not just because there are more sales outlets but because the widest possible range of products and locations are available to meet the widest possible range of demand. In summary, a wider variety of sites in the widest possible range of locations ensures all types of house builder have access to suitable land which in turn increases housing delivery.

Furthermore, in allocating sites the FLP needs to ensure that it provides sufficient contingency and flexibility for occasions when allocations do not come forward as planned. From our experience, with regards to other Local Plans, Gladman recommend that the plan should include a 10-20% flexibility factor. This will help ensure the plan is effective and the necessary scale of housing is delivered over the plan period.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50070

Consultee

Title

First Name C

Surname Burrell

Position

Organisation

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50070-2

6 3

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

50083

Consultee

Title

First Name Andrew

Surname Burrell

Position

Organisation

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50083-9

Option 2

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50083-10

Options 5 and 6 would ruin the makeup of the fens

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50022

Consultee

Title Mr
First Name Adrian
Surname Cannard
Position
Organisation Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Com

Agent

Title
Name
Surname
Position
Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50022-6

As a matter of principle, the distribution of future growth should take into account proposals and policies of the emerging Local Transport Plan, which sets the strategic approach to transportation and movement. It should also take into account the strategic infrastructure improvements that the Combined Authority is progressing.

No comment is made on any preference between the individual options.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50027

Consultee

Title

First Name

Surname Cannon Kirk

Position

Organisation

Agent

Title

Name Andrew

Surname Hodgson

Position

Organisation Pegasus Group

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50027-10

A combination of Options 1 and 2 would allow for flexible sustainable growth in order to deliver housing to meet the challenging housing target.

Option 1: Proportionate Settlement Growth allows for each settlement to accommodate growth which will ensure that growth is evenly spread and all settlements benefit from investment from new growth.

Option 2: Market Towns Led Growth ensures that new development is mainly directed to market towns. This approach is also encouraged as it is considered the most sustainable approach to direct growth to the major settlements with a range of services and facilities. However, this approach needs to be finely balanced with allowing adequate growth at smaller settlements to ensure that they can grow and thrive especially where this supports local services in accordance with the 2019 Framework (p.78).

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50027-11

As above

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50027-12

As above

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

50027-13

As above

Question 5: Growth Options

50066

Consultee

Title

First Name James

Surname Carney

Position

Organisation

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50066-11

Options 1 & 2

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50066-12

Market towns traditionally act as the 'go to' place in a rural area and Fenland is no different. However, with High Streets in decline perhaps it is time to redefine the role of a market town. Therefore the positives would be as there is the potential for new investment in facilities and services with the arrival of new job and housing and perhaps lead to a re-invigoration of our towns. The negative would be unless serious thought and action is given to upgrade our local infrastructure, the area may not be able to properly support said new development.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50066-13

Option 4 - new settlements would lead to a loss of prime agricultural land and with the imminent possibility of Brexit, we may or may not need to be more self sufficient with the UK's food production. Option 3 - because I would be wary that the two larger market towns would take precedence over the two smaller towns - no names need naming to guess where!

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50115

Consultee

Title

First Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

Clifton Homes Ltd

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

Mr

Matthew

Kendrick

Grass Roots Planning

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50115-9

We consider that a combination of Options 2 and 5 would be the most appropriate for distributing growth across Fenland. Given the District's relatively rural nature, growth should be directed towards the most sustainable settlements first, followed by distributing the remainder of growth between smaller sites. This is the most suitable option as delivery on smaller sites is likely to come forward quicker than large-scale allocations; creates more diversity in the housing market with small and medium-scale house builders; and provides a critical mass necessary to sustain existing facilities and services in the area.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50115-10

We discuss this within the other questions under this section.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50115-11

We do not consider that Option 1 is appropriate as focus should be given to the most sustainable settlements first. Although an existing settlement may have a large population, it may not have existing facilities and services which make it a sustainable location for development.

3.15 We do not consider that Option 4 is appropriate for Fenland as previous experience indicates that new settlements take a significant amount of time to deliver and require extensive infrastructure. For this relatively rural area, we suggest that the allocation of land should seek to enhance and contribute towards improving existing infrastructure and leveraging off this, rather than diverting resources to a new town.

3.16 Whilst Option 6 is laudable, in the first instance discussions should be held with transport providers to establish whether they would be willing to extend existing service provision along these proposed corridors. It may be more beneficial to concentrate development on existing towns and villages where these services already exist and additional critical mass can help sustain these services.

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

50115-12

We are of the opinion that a range of reasonable alternatives have been considered. We consider that not meeting the housing requirement is not a reasonable alternative in light of the housing affordability crisis and the national agenda to increase the supply of homes.

Question 5: Growth Options

50110

Consultee

Title

First Name Steve

Surname Count

Position

Organisation

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50110-6

4, if a suitable area is found

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50110-7

Proportionate growth. Takes intelligent thinking out of the equation just because it is easy to justify.

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50067

Consultee

Title

First Name John

Surname Covill

Position

Organisation

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50067-10

1 or 2

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50067-11

1 will ensure new homes will not be too dominant

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50067-12

4 tend to take up too much farm land.

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50099

Consultee

Title

First Name

Mark

Surname

Deas

Position

Organisation

Cambridgeshire ACRE

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50099-7

Cambridgeshire ACRE has no specific preference but whichever option is chosen must allow scope for sustainable development in all villages where appropriate.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50124

Consultee

Title

First Name Charlotte

Surname Dew

Position

Organisation Larkfleet Homes

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50124-10

Larkfleet Homes prefer option 2-Market Towns Led Growth.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50124-11

As per the core theme of the NPPF (2019) sustainable development is an important principle for any future development. The market towns of Whittlesey, March, etc., have multiple facilities, services, employment opportunities and sustainable methods of transport. These towns are holistically and sustainably more suitable for future housing development. Nevertheless, paragraph 78 of the NPPF (2019) also recognises the importance of enhancing and maintaining the vitality of smaller village communities for the future. We agree that some development should also take place in smaller villages, however, the majority of new development should take place in areas of high sustainability within the district.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50124-12

Option 5-Small Site Focus.

Delivering smaller scaled sites of less than 15 units is generally more expensive. Delivering a multitude of small sites will not provide the quantum of housing needed. The key is to provide a wide range of sites of different sizes so that all sizes of house building firms have sufficient supply of sites for their needs as well as those of the market.

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50121

Consultee		Agent	
Title		Title	
First Name	Anne	Name	
Surname	Dew	Surname	
Position	Development Planning Manager - East	Position	
Organisation	Persimmon Homes	Organisation	

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50121-11

2 – Market Towns Led Growth – New Development is mainly directed to the market towns of Wisbech, March, Whittlesey and Chatteris, with the remainder distributed across villages. For example, 90% of growth is allocated to the market towns, 10% for villages.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50121-12

Positives

- Focuses development within sustainable locations, which benefit from existing local services and facilities which have capacity to be further enhanced with future development.
- Limited growth in villages will protect their character whilst also helping to maintain existing services and facilities within these settlements.
- Protect the open countryside
- More opportunities for non reliance on the private car

Negatives - none

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50121-13

Option 1 (Proportional Settlement Growth) – Development needs to be focused on settlements which are sustainable and have existing services and facilities to support sustainable growth. A settlement which may contain 5% of the population may not have a suitable level of services and facilities to accommodate the proportionate increase in population. In addition there may be other constraints within a particular settlement which would mean this level of development would not be forthcoming.

Option 3 (Strategic Growth at one or more Settlements) – Primarily relying on strategic growth in 1 or more settlements is too restrictive and is more likely to result in housing allocations not coming forward. Strategic allocations are required, however they should not be limited to 1 or 2 locations and instead should be spread across all sustainable locations. Option 4 (New Settlements) – Existing market towns within Fenland have the capacity to accommodate further growth and further enhance existing local services and facilities. Developing new settlements will take significant time to come forward and will not bring forward the houses which are required now.

Option 5 (Small Site Focus) - Whilst small sites have a contribution to make, on their own they would not bring forward the level of housing required within the district. Adopting a small site approach would significantly limit the market, as large developers, such as Persimmon Homes, are unlikely to pursue such options.

Option 6 (Corridor Growth) – There is some logic to following such an approach, however this is not our preferred option. Following this option may not always direct development to the most sustainable locations.

Question 5: Growth Options

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

50121-14

No other alternative options should be considered.

50009

Consultee

Title

First Name

Lesley

Surname

Dorling

Position

Organisation

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50009-9

Option 1

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50009-10

Fairness to smaller villages as well as ensuring our larger towns do not miss out on much needed investment.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50009-11

4 and 6. Option 4 - New settlements will be detrimental to our roads causing congestion and wear and tear. Option 6 - Increase congestion on already busy routes.

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50010

Consultee

Title

First Name Eamonn

Surname Dorling

Position

Organisation

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50010-11

Option 3

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50010-12

Tends to gravitate towards the Market Towns and develops existing and potentially enhance infrastructure in a balanced way. It provides the opportunity to develop where it will do most good.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50010-13

Option 5 – Indiscriminate and not co-ordinated

Option 6 – Would require significant extra cost to develop

Option 4 – Waste of agricultural land and the cost of linking to existing facilities/employment

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

50010-14

No, this reflects other Combined Authority work which is sound.

Question 5: Growth Options

50018

Consultee

Title Councillor
First Name James
Surname Downes
Position
Organisation Leverington Parish Council

Agent

Title
Name
Surname
Position
Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50018-11

Options 2 and 3

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50018-12

All positive (Options 2 and 3), thus preventing smaller developments.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50018-13

Option 5 - keeping small site focus. Keeping villages as villages. Worst idea is new settlements.

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

50018-14

No

Question 5: Growth Options

50127

Consultee

Title

First Name Valerie

Surname Emmons

Position

Organisation

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50127-10

Option 1

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50127-11

Option 2 - All Market Towns aren't equal in size, facilities or desirability. Chatteris is deficient in everything – particularly public transport. Buses are infrequent and there is no railway station. The other Market Towns are much better served by buses and all have railway stations. Chatteris, therefore, should not be expected to provide the same number of new houses as the other Market Towns.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50100

Consultee

Title

First Name Susanah

Surname Farmer

Position

Organisation

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50100-11

Option 3/4 new town or new town adjacent to old town

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50100-12

Trying to fit 21st century needs into 18th century towns does not work. People want access. Building a new town which addresses needs of retail, housing, access, transport (including rail at Wisbech), parking etc would allow for the old town to retain it's heritage charm with smaller shops and restricted access to vehicles - this would probably require incentives for retailers/residents to allow for the change.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50100-13

Trying to cram more into old towns creates problems (traffic, parking, people, bins, access, heritage building issues).

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50031

Consultee

Title Mr
First Name Colum
Surname Fitzsimons
Position
Organisation Cambridgeshire County Council

Agent

Title
Name
Surname
Position
Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50031-6

In terms of delivering infrastructure concentrating growth in market towns (Option 2) and Option 3 are preferred. These settlements already relatively self-sufficient in services and facilities and are better placed new strategic scale development to expand and complement these. Providing a proportionate amount of jobs in parallel to housing will help increase self-sufficiency and result in more sustainable patterns of development than Option 1 in particular. Option 4 (new settlements) could be a possibility although providing infrastructure especially in the early years of new settlements can be problematic. LLFA Growth should be distributed across areas with the lowest risk of flooding (e.g. inland areas and higher land). Although Chatteris and Whittlesey are situated further inland, they are also located almost entirely within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Where it is absolutely unavoidable to develop in areas at risk of flooding, appropriate flood resilient measures should be incorporated.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50031-7

The LLFA does not believe that Option 5 is a good option. This pattern of growth would rely on a significant number of smaller sites which would make implements SuDS more problematic. Consequently we may lose The County Council opposes Option 1 and Option 2 as it spreads development very thin across a large number of settlements. This then becomes difficult to expand rural facilities. The LLFA does not believe that Option 5 is a good option. This pattern of growth would rely on a significant number of smaller sites which would make implements SuDS more problematic. Consequently we may lose the potential to mitigate the cumulative impact of these sites on flood risk.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50114

Consultee

Title

First Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

Foster Property Developments Ltd

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

Matt

Hare

Carter Jonas LLP

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50114-9

The selected distribution of growth must be based on the delivery of sustainable development including meeting identified development needs in full, and taking into account any environmental and infrastructure constraints that may restrict development in certain locations.

Paragraph 8 of the NPPF identifies the three dimensions of sustainable development, which are economic, social and environmental roles. Paragraph 59 seeks to boost significantly the supply of housing. Paragraph 68 requires Local Plans to include allocations for small and medium sites. Paragraph 78 acknowledges that housing in rural areas can support rural communities and existing services and facilities in villages. Paragraph 102 seeks to promote walking, cycling and public transport, and Paragraph 103 expects patterns of growth to be managed to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport. Chapter 14 of the NPPF provides guidance on flooding and drainage. Chapter 15 seeks to protect the natural environment, including designated sites. Chapter 16 seeks to protect the historic environment, including Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas.

It is clear that meeting the housing needs of rural areas is related to the delivery of sustainable development. It is the case that housing and affordable housing needs exist in all settlements within Fenland, and the existing services and facilities within villages could be supported by further housing development. There are environmental, historic and infrastructure constraints that may prevent development from being located in certain locations. The larger settlements are served by public transport.

Taking into account the above, we support the following options: Option 1: Proportionate Settlement Growth Option 2: Market Towns Led Growth Option 6: Corridor Growth

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50114-10

We do not support Option 4 'New Settlements'. Such growth models have extremely long lead in times, require significant levels of infrastructure and as a consequence of the latter often fail to deliver sufficient levels of affordable housing. The latter problem would be particularly manifest within Fenland given the general issues with development viability in the area. In addition, much of the District lies within flood zones 2 and 3, which would act as a constraint to the location of a new settlement.

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50101

Consultee

Title

First Name Roger

Surname George

Position

Organisation

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50101-11

Option 4 - new settlements.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50101-12

1 - bad. Makes larger even more proportionately larger and removes character, whilst leaving smaller struggling to support services such as doctor, shop, schools etc.. 2 - My 2nd choice but needs retail and services developed alongside housing. 3 - very much depends on the settlements chosen. Would totally change the character of the chosen settlement. Most Fenland villages have already filled the properly usable solid ground for foundations, which limits the options for further large development. 4 - My 1st choice, providing a suitable location can be found. 5 - Might help small sites grow to a size that allows for support services, such as doctor, shops, school etc. 6 - No. Puts too much pressure on those corridors, which are already congested and with too many road accidents. Would need to be alongside major investment in roads and rail.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50101-13

See 5b).

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

50101-14

Not that I can think of.

Question 5: Growth Options

50061

Consultee

Title

First Name Dave

Surname Gibbs

Position

Organisation

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50061-7

Options 1, 4 and 5.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50061-8

Option 1 is fair and equitable, easily understood and monitored. Option 4 is interesting, but raises questions of what and where. It could, however, make a significant contribution and should not be dismissed. Option 5, combined with a redrafting of the settlement hierarchy and a meaningful dialogue with Parish Councils could deliver quick wins for new dwellings offering a high quality of life on hundreds of small sites right across the district.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50061-9

Option 2 abandons the villages, Option 3 risks abandoning one or more of the market towns, and Option 6 ignores vast swathes of the district.

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50032

Consultee

Title Mr
First Name Iain
Surname Green
Position Senior Public Health Officer
Organisation Cambridgeshire County Council (Publi

Agent

Title
Name
Surname
Position
Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50032-11

We prefer option 2 (Market towns led growth), Option 3: (Strategic growth at one or more settlements) and option 6 (Corridor Growth).

New developments have to be large enough (sustainable) to be able to provide/support health care delivery, and support/create a sense of community. Small scale development can lead to additional pressures on local services without financial support through developer contributions.

Growth linked to market towns enables existing health and social care infrastructure centred around these areas to be utilised, rather than requiring additional investment. It is important that new housing also has good transport links to access employment, services and open space.

Option 6 should prioritise growth around the most sustainable transport links i.e. rail to avoid over reliance on the car.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50032-12

Option 1 – Proportionate settlement growth – We believe that this is not a good option because we think good transport links to access existing health facilities is vital. Option 2 – Market towns led growth – this would be our preferred option as facilities are already focused around these settlements and it would best use existing resources. Option 3 – strategic growth at one or more settlements – providing these were attached to sites with existing facilities then we would support this option. Option 4 – New settlements – We would not wish to see this as it is likely that the settlements would need additional newly built facilities unless they were close to existing facilities. Option 5 – Small site focus – We would not wish to see this as we think it is important that new housing has good transport links to be able to reach facilities. Option 6 – Corridor growth – We would be supportive of this option where there were good transport links to the necessary public services and these transport link prioritize sustainable and public transport such as rail to prevent an over reliance on the car.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50032-13

Option 1 – Proportionate settlement growth – We believe that this is not a good option because good transport links to access existing health facilities is vital. Option 4 – New settlements – We would not wish to see this as it is likely that the settlements would need additional newly built facilities unless they were close to existing facilities. Option 5 – Small site focus – We would not

Question 5: Growth Options

wish to see this as we think it is important that new housing has good transport links to be able to reach facilities

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

50032-14

Public Health have no views on alternative options

50123

Consultee

Agent

Title

Title

First Name

Name

Kate

Surname

Greystoke Land (option holder) and M

Surname

Wood

Position

Position

Organisation

Organisation

Pegasus Group

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50123-2

We support the growth of Market Towns and Growth Villages, but also retaining flexibility for the sustainable growth of villages that are lower in the hierarchy to ensure economic benefits are facilitated throughout the District.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50080

Consultee

Title

First Name M J

Surname Hawkins

Position

Organisation

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50080-9

Option 2 is best.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50080-10

Option 2 produces development that is more sustainable. Re Option 3: The District is too disparate for 'Strategic Growth' too have beneficial effect across the whole District.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50080-11

The new settlement option seems the worst. Given that the District is low-lying, where is there sufficient land at the appropriate height above sea level to permit substantial development? And what connection does it have to the road network and other communications? There is also the possibility that such a development would harm existing settlements. I'm not sure what Option 6 would look like but the foregoing points would also apply. Would such an approach also spread development across the District?

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50033

Consultee

Title Mr
First Name Mark
Surname Hemment
Position
Organisation

Agent

Title
Name
Surname
Position
Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50033-9

A combination of options 1 and 3. While growth should (in general) be proportionate to existing population (option 1), there should be a weighting which favours growth at the settlements with strong transport links (eg. railway station). This combination of options would focus growth on the market towns of March and Whittlesey.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50033-10

Option 2 would, without considering other factors, place a burden on Chatteris which lacks good public transport links. Chatteris is hardly mentioned in the draft "The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport Plan" (2019). Option 4 would require the building of completely new infrastructure (eg. water treatment). Both options 5 and 6 do not meet a goal of increased use of public transport and moving commuters from road to rail.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50033-11

see above

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

50033-12

see above

Question 5: Growth Options

50012

Consultee

Title Mrs
First Name M Sadie
Surname Heritage
Position
Organisation

Agent

Title
Name
Surname
Position
Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50012-10

Option 2

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50012-11

Some show growth that would ruin the rural atmosphere

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50012-12

4 and 6

New Towns would be difficult to integrate into Fenland District Council
Corridor growth would make using the roads very industrialised and crowded

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50128

Consultee

Title

First Name Stephen

Surname Hodson

Position

Organisation Hodsons

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50128-9

Option 3.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

50112

Consultee

Title Cllr

First Name Samantha

Surname Hoy

Position

Organisation FDC/WTC

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50112-10

1,2 and 6

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50112-11

option 3 because one area may feel they have been dumped on

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50003

Consultee

Title Ms
First Name Ruth
Surname Hufton
Position
Organisation Doddington Parish Council

Agent

Title
Name
Surname
Position
Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50003-10

Preferment for options 2 and 4

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50003-11

Option 2 – put housing where jobs and travel infrastructure is available.
Option 4 – New settlement would give required growth but in an area where it could achieve Maximum opportunity for cohesion with surrounding large towns like Peterborough, travel infrastructure and availability of jobs.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50003-12

Proportional settlement growth – this would mean that growth villages take more of the allocation Again.

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50056

Consultee

Title Ms
First Name Shanna
Surname Jackson
Position Chartered Town Planner
Organisation Swann Edwards Architecture Limited

Agent

Title
Name
Surname
Position
Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50056-10

Option 1: Proportionate Settlement Growth would be most appropriate as it would allow for all existing settlements to grow which would help to sustain the existing settlements and their amenities. It would also seem that there is more market appetite for new dwellings/plots within the villages.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50056-11

If there is a focus on the Market Towns/corridors or new settlements, the existing facilities within the villages are likely to be lost as there would be little new investment to help sustain them. We believe this would cause unnecessary harm to existing residents. It would also result in the loss of the charm of many of these typical fen villages.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50056-12

We dislike options 2, 3 4 and 6 for the reasons set out above.

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50069

Consultee

Title Mr
First Name Simon
Surname King
Position
Organisation

Agent

Title
Name
Surname
Position
Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50069-8

Option 1 and option 4 (the creation of a Wisbech Garden Town)

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50125

Consultee

Title

First Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

Kings Dyke Business Park Ltd

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

Mr

Ed

Durrant

Pegasus Group

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50125-9

We have no comment to make on the three options that are proposed for growth. However, restricting growth to specific percentages as per the adopted Local Plan risks acceptable sites in sustainable locations not being delivered where the prescribed percentages of development have already been met for certain settlements. The approach of focussing growth on the District's most sustainable rural communities such as Whittlesey is supported and as with the adopted Local Plan the growth of new homes should be matched by the provision of a sufficient range of employment opportunities to meet existing and future residents' needs.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50125-10

Whilst we have no real preferences over the three growth options, which would all look to allocate growth to Whittlesey, option 1 is likely to result in less sustainable forms of development in some of the smaller settlements.

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50079

Consultee

Title Mr
First Name Peter
Surname Lankfer
Position
Organisation

Agent

Title Mr
Name Tom
Surname Nellist
Position
Organisation Trundley Design

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50079-11

Strategic growth

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50079-12

Positive of strategic is that itâ€™s been well planned and therefore should work better

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50079-13

Proportionate. It may result in growth in areas that donâ€™t want/need or are compatible with it

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50116

Consultee

Title

First Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

Lifecrown Investments

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

Jacob

Lawrence

Geraint John Planning

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50116-6

The Council has proposed six growth options in total to deliver future growth in Fenland which we have reviewed in turn below. Our preference is Option 2: Market Towns Led Growth followed by Option 1: Proportionate Settlement Growth and Option 6: Corridor Growth. We consider it is Representations to Fenland Council Issues & Options November 2019 Land West of Wisbech Rd, Westry Lifecrown Investments Page 3 of 5

strategically worthwhile exploring all three options with the potential to combine all into one suitable growth option for the district.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50116-7

Option 1: Proportionate Settlement Growth

We support the strategy of each settlement receiving growth which is proportionate to the size of its population. This option ensures the correct amount of growth is distributed to the settlements accordingly and therefore does not overpower or isolate any settlements. We would suggest Market Towns are provided with the majority of growth, due to their ability to accommodate larger volumes of development, followed by Growth Villages and Limited Growth Villages.

Option 2: Market Towns Led Growth

Given that the current Market Towns of Wisbech, March, Chatteris and Whittlesey contain the highest population with the most establish services and transport links, it is a logical option to promote the growth of these settlements to deliver the majority of the housing and employment needs. This concentration of growth would result in the creation of strategic development and transport hubs which will serve the remainder of the district.

Option 3: Strategic Growth at One or More Settlements

We would welcome this growth option of focusing development in one or more existing settlements. If this growth option was explored further, we would support the significant growth of one or two of the listed market towns, including March. The negatives of this growth option, however, includes the concentration of growth to only one or two areas which would consequently limit growth at the remaining settlements. In order for the Council to meet its housing targets we consider this growth option may not be the best strategic option.

Option 4: New Settlement (s)

Question 5: Growth Options

The growth option of concentrating growth at one or more entirely new settlement does not seem the most logical approach for development within the district. Although the Council would still allow for small development at existing towns and villages, it is considered these existing settlements will not gain the volume of growth they require. We would not be in support of this option.

Option 5: Small Site Focus

We would not be in support of the growth option of small site development. Although this option provides a short-term solution to a small amount of housing growth, it does not provide for sustainable and strategic growth. This option contains the risk of piecemeal development being approved in an attempt to meet the development targets. It is considered a growth option of both larger strategic sites and a limited number of small-scale sites would provide a more sustainable and logical method of development.

Option 6: Corridor Growth

This growth option of directing development to settlements located along main transport routes is supported. We consider the development of sustainable transport routes an important element of the emerging Local Plan. The Market Towns, including March, contain a number of transport services which can be further developed to provide district transport hubs which will connect these settlements to the surrounding areas. The development of these transport hubs would help to connect the secondary villages of the district to vital local services.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50116-8

Option 3: Strategic Growth at One or More Settlements

We would welcome this growth option of focusing development in one or more existing settlements. If this growth option was explored further, we would support the significant growth of one or two of the listed market towns, including March. The negatives of this growth option, however, includes the concentration of growth to only one or two areas which would consequently limit growth at the remaining settlements. In order for the Council to meet its housing targets we consider this growth option may not be the best strategic option.

Option 4: New Settlement (s)

The growth option of concentrating growth at one or more entirely new settlement does not seem the most logical approach for development within the district. Although the Council would still allow for small development at existing towns and villages, it is considered these existing settlements will not gain the volume of growth they require. We would not be in support of this option.

Option 5: Small Site Focus

We would not be in support of the growth option of small site development. Although this option provides a short-term solution to a small amount of housing growth, it does not provide for sustainable and strategic growth. This option contains the risk of piecemeal development being approved in an attempt to meet the development targets. It is considered a growth option of both larger strategic sites and a limited number of small-scale sites would provide a more sustainable and logical method of development.

Question 5: Growth Options

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

50095

Consultee

Title

First Name Barrie

Surname Luck

Position

Organisation

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50095-10

Proportionate growth for homes, but Market Town led for jobs.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50095-11

Proportionate growth for jobs is an unhelpful concept, in a village with, say, 5 jobs, where a modest % increase equals either a fraction of a person (which is impossible) or 1 person (which is pointless).

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50095-12

New settlements is "pie in the sky".

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50089

Consultee

Title

First Name Karen

Surname Luck

Position

Organisation Romain

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50089-8

Option 1 Option 2

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50089-9

Option 1 People dislike change but proportional amount of change for everyone seems fair. Option 2 Developing Market Towns carefully could improve local facilities that villages could access too.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50089-10

Corridor growth. It just creates a place with no centre, where everyone simple travels through. It puts any communal places such as hall, schools or public house at a ever increasing distance from the majority.

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50044

Consultee

Title Ms
First Name Debbie
Surname Mack
Position Historic Environment Planning Adviser
Organisation Historic England

Agent

Title
Name
Surname
Position
Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50044-5

Historic England has no preference on the specific geographical spilt or type of housing required, however we recommend that the density, scale, character and detailed designed of new housing be appropriate for its context. The capacity for an area to accommodate new housing development whilst maintaining its historic environment should be a key consideration, so that the quality and character of neighbourhoods, towns and villages is conserved. Integrating consideration of the historic environment into plan making alongside other considerations is a key principle of sustainable development.

Allocation of new housing sites should be considered in the most sustainable locations and densities and character should reflect that of the surrounding area. This approach will require a careful and detailed analysis of locations to ensure that distribution of housing is appropriate. The historic environment is a critical factor in this analysis in terms of considering the ability of sites and locations to accommodate new housing without undue harm to heritage assets and their settings.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50035

Consultee

Title Mr
First Name Tim
Surname Marks
Position
Organisation MVV Environment Ltd

Agent

Title
Name
Surname
Position
Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50035-6

Option 2: Market Towns Led Option 3: Strategic Growth at One or More Settlements – Wisbech
Option 6: Corridor Growth

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50042

Consultee

Title

First Name Jane Ann

Surname Mason

Position

Organisation

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50042-9

I prefer option 3.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50042-10

The positive aspects of option 3 are that growth can be concentrated in settlements where there are good transport links, such as March, which has a train station and is therefore more attractive to commuters. The negative aspects are that towns without good transport links will be left behind.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50042-11

I dislike Option 5. This option would necessitate a vast network of interconnecting roads which would carve up the beauty of the Fenland landscape and leave no space for wildlife and water mitigation.

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

50042-12

Why do we need constant growth? The world is only so big.

Question 5: Growth Options

50038

Consultee

Title Mr
First Name Ian
Surname Mason
Position
Organisation

Agent

Title
Name
Surname
Position
Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50038-8

Option 3. For March, Manea and Whittlesey where there is some level of public transport and opportunity to expand with occupation increases.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50038-9

Where the Transport Local Plan is taken into account and something already exists that can be expanded there is a positive to be used. If no plan exists through till 2050 and there is no current reliable service then negative results are all that can be expected.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50074

Consultee

Title

First Name Geoffrey Mathias

Surname Mathias

Position

Organisation

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50074-8

5

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50074-9

1. IMPRACTICAL BECAUSE POPULATIONS CHANGE CONSTANTLY. THEREFORE TARGETS WOULD HAVE TO BE CONSTANTLY CHANGED IN ORDER TO BE UP TO DATE 2. OBVIOUSLY THE MARKET TOWNS WILL PLAY AN IMPORTANT PART IN DELIVERING THE HOUSING TARGET BUT DEVELOPMENT IN OTHER AREAS WILL BE REQUIRED IN ORDER TO MEET THE TARGET 3. TOO RESTRICTIVE AND UNFAIR 4. TAKE TOO LONG TO GET OFF THE GROUND 5. SYMPATHETICALLY HANDLED THERE IS ROOM FOR CONSIDERABLE DEVELOPMENT THAT WILL NOT ADVERSELY IMPACT ON THE LOCAL ENVIRONMENT AND THESE OPPORTUNITIES MUST BE TAKEN 6. A NON STARTER. THE ROAD SYSTEM NEEDS UPGRADING IN ORDER TO SUPPORT THE ECONOMIC GROWTH OF THE AREA. WISBECH WILL NEED TO BE BY- PASSED DURING THE CURRENCY OF THE NEW PLAN

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50074-10

1,3,4 AND 6 - REASONS SEE 5B

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50073

Consultee

Title Mr
First Name John
Surname Maxey
Position
Organisation Maxey Grounds

Agent

Title
Name
Surname
Position
Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50073-11

I support a combination of options 1 2 and 3 The Market Towns must continue to grow but growth has failed under the current plan because the scale of allocations has exceeded the capacity of most developing locally. As a result the villages have seen significant successful growth largely on small to medium sites for which there is demand. The significant demand for and duty to provide self build opportunities has been experienced in most settlements. Suggest continued focus of 80% of growth in Market Towns but increased growth 20% in villages with targets of 20% increase in growth villages, 10 - 15% in limited growth and 5-10% in small villages would be a suitable distribution balancing demand with the need for development to be sustainable.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50073-12

Proportionate satisfies market demand. Market town led maximises sustainability but has not led to delivery because of large allocation size and cost of infrastructure. Strategic increases the number of growth settlements and spreads growth across the district

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50073-13

New settlements - would increase even further infrastructure costs. Corridor Growth suggests an expectation of out commuting from the District which is not health for the local economy. Small site focus beyond the level suggested is less sustainable, although there does need to be a supply of small sites within the strategy as noted above.

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

50073-14

No

Question 5: Growth Options

50129

Consultee

Title Mrs
First Name J
Surname Melton
Position
Organisation Chatteris Town Council

Agent

Title
Name
Surname
Position
Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50129-11

Option 2 - Market town led.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50126

Consultee

Title

First Name Alan

Surname Melton

Position

Organisation Manea Parish Council

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50126-11

Proportionate settlement growth

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50126-12

Growth and infrastructure would be spread more evenly.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50126-13

Strategic growth in one or more settlements. Too much resource in one place i.e. Wisbech!

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

50126-14

No

Question 5: Growth Options

50021

Consultee		Agent	
Title		Title	
First Name	Elizabeth	Name	
Surname	Mugova	Surname	
Position	Sustainable Places Planning Advisor	Position	
Organisation	Environment Agency	Organisation	

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50021-4

In general, we would support the option that ensures the least number of houses were located in FZ2 and 3. Where possible, development should be located at areas of lowest flood risk.

Option 1 Option 1 will pose issues when trying to carry out a sequential approach to the allocations. Some larger settlements are located at unsustainable locations at high risk of flooding and should have minimum development.

Option 2 We consider that option 2 is likely to be preferable from a flood risk perspective as the existing market towns (with the exception of Wisbech) are built on areas of higher ground and are primarily shown to be within Flood Zone 1 on our Flood Map for Planning. Care will need to be taken if only flood zones are used as a deciding factor in the sequential approach to any site allocations. Our flood zones do not identify the future risk of flooding, taking into account the effects of climate change, and only demonstrate undefended fluvial and tidal flood risks. Other sources of flood risk, such as a failure of flood defences and surface water flood risk, will further limit the available space for any allocations.

Concentrating allocations into larger development sites will enable a more strategic approach to be taken to flood risk management. Smaller scale developments offer limited opportunities for this.

Option 3 There is no single (or two) existing market towns that can support the level of development required to meet the housing requirement without placing them within an area of flood risk.

We note that Wisbech is given an example of a market town where strategic growth could be located. It should be borne in mind that the majority of Wisbech is in FZ3 and therefore focusing growth in Wisbech goes against the proposed sustainability objective to “Minimise and wherever possible remove the vulnerability of people, places and property to the risk of flooding from all sources”.

Option 4 If option 4 is taken forward then it will need to be demonstrated that any new settlement passes the flood risk sequential test, taking into account all sources of flood risk. It is unlikely that a new settlement could be located entirely within flood zone 1 or 2. It will need to be demonstrated that the residual risk in the event of a breach or overtopping of any flood defences can be safely managed, taking into account the effects of climate change. It would also need to be demonstrated that a sequential approach has been taken to the proposed settlement layout, with more vulnerable development located within the parts of the settlement at lowest risk of flooding.

Option 5 & 6 Options 5 and 6 are unlikely to be sustainable as most of the villages in Fenland are located in Flood Zone 3 and it would therefore be difficult to demonstrate that development in these rural areas will pass the sequential test. If Option 6 is taken forward then we consider that the North – South route between Wisbech, March and Chatteris is preferable as this route includes a greater area of land within Flood Zone 1 than the other routes mentioned.

Question 5: Growth Options

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

50051

Consultee

Title Mr
First Name E
Surname Murat
Position Parish Council Clerk
Organisation Parson Drove Parish Council

Agent

Title
Name
Surname
Position
Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50051-6

We would prefer Option 1: Proportionate Settlement Growth

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50015

Consultee

Title Mr
First Name Geoff
Surname Newham
Position
Organisation

Agent

Title
Name
Surname
Position
Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50015-11

I'm averse to there being a strict apportionment according to what's in the area already. That's a recipe for upsetting a vast swathe of the residents in small communities. There has to be a more sensitive approach. Since the suggested apportionment is quite low for rural communities, why not leave those numbers out of the plan when aiming for the 550 per year, but allow, say, in-filling builds, or redevelopment only. That way, you have the numbers you need in larger towns, but can exceed them when small developments are brought into the reckoning.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50015-12

see 5a

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50015-13

see 5a

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

50015-14

see 5a

Question 5: Growth Options

50023

Consultee

Title Ms
First Name Janet
Surname Nuttall
Position Sustainable Land Use Advisor
Organisation Natural England

Agent

Title
Name
Surname
Position
Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50023-2

Natural England believes that priority should be given to targeting growth in the most sustainable locations i.e. where impacts to the natural environment, through development and associated infrastructure, can be avoided and where maximum enhancements can be achieved by that development.

Natural England advises that the Plan's vision and emerging development strategy should address impacts on and opportunities for the natural environment and set out the environmental ambition for the Plan area. The plan should take a strategic approach to the protection and enhancement of the natural environment, including providing a net gain for biodiversity, considering opportunities to enhance and improve connectivity. We welcome reference in the Natural Environment section of the Issues and Options document to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Biodiversity Group's mapped opportunities for habitat creation and the statement that the new Local Plan can support opportunities for create new habitats. Our advice is that as part of the Local Plan evidence base the Council should prepare a map of the existing ecological network including designated sites, priority habitats and other important green spaces to identify key areas for protection and delivery of strategic / landscape-scale enhancements. This should not be an onerous task given the availability of information through the following sources:

☐ Natural England's Impact Risk Zones (IRZs) available through Magic; ☐ The Cambridgeshire Biodiversity Partnership's Mapping Natural Capital and Opportunities for Habitat Creation in Cambridgeshire (May 2019); ☐ Combined Authority Doubling Nature Investment Plan; ☐ Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Non-Statutory Strategic Spatial Framework; ☐ the objectives and projects in the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy (2011); ☐ Natural England's Cambridgeshire Analysis of Accessible Natural Greenspace 2010; ☐ Cambridgeshire Rights of Way Improvement Plan.

This should be used to develop a strategy to inform the appropriate location of site allocations and to identify opportunities for delivery of biodiversity and green infrastructure enhancement projects through the Plan's major development and biodiversity and green infrastructure policies. This could then be used to prepare a Fenland Green Infrastructure Strategy / SPD or an update to the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy.

The Local Plan should be underpinned by up to date environmental evidence. This should include an assessment of existing and potential components of local ecological networks. This assessment should inform the Sustainability Appraisal, ensure that land of least environment value is chosen for development, and that the mitigation hierarchy is followed and inform opportunities for enhancement as well as development requirements for particular sites.

Natural England suggests that cross-cutting issues should be identified at this early stage. For example, transport infrastructure, water and sewerage, air quality, flood protection and recreation and leisure requirements can have potential implications for the natural environment and policies to deliver these requirements will need to ensure its protection and enhancement. Key issues for Fenland's natural environment include the loss and degradation of peat soils and the need for

Question 5: Growth Options

accessible open space to meet people's recreational needs and reduce pressure on more sensitive designated sites; useful reference could be made to the findings of the East Anglian Fens Peat Pilot Study when they emerge.

The plan should recognise that social and economic benefits can be delivered through environmental gains, in addition to enhancing biodiversity. Natural England has a significant evidence base for this, including the Microeconomic Evidence for the Benefits of Investment in the
Page 3 of 11

Environment 2 (MEBIE2).

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50037

Consultee

Title

First Name Stewart

Surname Patience

Position Spatial Planning Manager

Organisation Anglian Water Services Ltd

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50037-3

Anglian Water as infrastructure provider does not have a preference in relation to the scale of housing growth to be identified in the Local Plan Review. Dependant upon the scale and location of proposed development it would have different implications for Anglian Water's existing water and water recycling infrastructure including water resources infrastructure.

We are currently in discussion with the Government in relation to the implications of further growth above that in the adopted and emerging Local Plans within the Oxford-Cambridge Arc. We would welcome further discussion with Fenland District Council in relation to the preferred growth scenario following the current consultation.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50037-4

Option 1: Proportionate settlement growth – a more dispersed option which includes proportionate growth at both market towns and villages and rural areas could potentially increase the need to invest at existing WRCs rather than focused on a more limited number of WRCs.

Option 2: Market towns led growth– the focus on the market towns would have a greater impact on existing water supply, sewerage infrastructure and the receiving WRCs in these locations and more limited impacts elsewhere in the district.

Option 3: Strategic growth at one or more settlement – the focus on one settlement would have a greater impact on existing water supply, sewerage infrastructure and the receiving WRC in that location and more limited impacts elsewhere in the district.

Option 4: New settlement option – dependant upon its location a new settlement could potentially be physically remote from existing water supply and sewerage infrastructure. This would have to be considered as part of the viability of any new settlement including the development of an on-site WRC as an alternative to draining to an existing WRC.

Option 5: Small site focus – a more dispersed option which is more focused on villages and rural areas could potentially increased the need to invest at existing WRCs rather than focus on a more limited number of WRCs. Dependant upon its location smaller sites in villages or rural areas could potentially be physically remote from existing water supply and sewerage infrastructure. This would have to be considered as part of any smaller sites. (Sites within existing settlements in rural locations which are closely related to existing water supply and sewerage infrastructure would not

Question 5: Growth Options

have the same viability issues).

Option 6: Corridor growth – this option would be expected to have similar impacts to options 1 and 2. The specific impacts would be dependant upon scale of growth within each corridor and whether it is equal or varies. An example of which would be greater scale of growth for each market town within the identified corridors.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50037-5

Please see response to Question 5a)

namely:

Option 1:

Proportionate settlement growth – a more dispersed option which includes proportionate growth at both market towns and villages and rural areas could potentially increase the need to invest at existing WRCs rather than focused on a more limited number of WRCs.

Option 2: Market towns led growth– the focus on the market towns would have a greater impact on existing water supply, sewerage infrastructure and the receiving WRCs in these locations and more limited impacts elsewhere in the district.

Option 3: Strategic growth at one or more settlement – the focus on one settlement would have a greater impact on existing water supply, sewerage infrastructure and the receiving WRC in that location and more limited impacts elsewhere in the district.

Option 4: New settlement option – dependant upon its location a new settlement could potentially be physically remote from existing water supply and sewerage infrastructure. This would have to be considered as part of the viability of any new settlement including the development of an on-site WRC as an alternative to draining to an existing WRC.

Option 5: Small site focus – a more dispersed option which is more focused on villages and rural areas could potentially increased the need to invest at existing WRCs rather than focus on a more limited number of WRCs. Dependand upon its location smaller sites in villages or rural areas could potentially be physically remote from existing water supply and sewerage infrastructure. This would have to be considered as part of any smaller sites. (Sites within existing settlements in rural locations which are closely related to existing water supply and sewerage infrastructure would not have the same viability issues).

Option 6: Corridor growth – this option would be expected to have similar impacts to options 1 and 2. The specific impacts would be dependant upon scale of growth within each corridor and whether it is equal or varies. An example of which would be greater scale of growth for each market town within the identified corridors.

Question 5: Growth Options

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

50040

Consultee

Title Mrs
First Name J
Surname Richardson
Position

Agent

Title
Name
Surname
Position
Organisation

Organisation Benwick Parish Council

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50040-11

Option 6 is preferred.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50040-12

Allow the focus to be on public transport along the routes.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50040-13

Did not like Option 5 small site focus as it lacks co-ordinated vision.

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50082

Consultee

Title

First Name Bryan

Surname Rose

Position

Organisation

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50082-11

Option 2

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50082-12

Numerous empty / derelict housing. Numerous sites to facilitate new developments Infrastructure in situ to sustain & promote growth.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50082-13

Any option that does not investigate if the proposal adversely impacts the environment, increase risks to current inhabitants / businesses. Does not take into account the wishes of the local inhabitants.

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

50082-14

Do not build new homes, there are enough development sites with empty or derelict housing to meet any targets.

Question 5: Growth Options

50094

Consultee

Title

First Name Gerald

Surname Seabrook

Position

Organisation

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50094-5

Option 1

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

50075

Consultee

Title

First Name Pam

Surname Shippey

Position

Organisation

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50075-6

Option1

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50075-7

Option 3 and option 6

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50043

Consultee

Title

First Name Tim

Surname Slater

Position

Organisation Peter Humphrey Associates

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50043-9

Combination of proportionate growth- option 1 and small sites option 5 as it is only these approaches that have delivered significant numbers of housing in Fenland over the last 10 years. The BCP and area of search approach adopted in the adopted local plan around the large towns have not delivered significant number of dwellings (other than Whittlesey) and in order for the plan to be sound in relation to delivery it will have to include development of a scale that can be delivered but locally active developers and include delivery mechanisms to enable coordinated development and provision for strategic infrastructure on the larger sites as fragmented land ownership and equalisation issues have proved an impediment to land assembly.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50043-10

The development market in Fenland is relatively sensitive to market viability; it is in house building Terms, a low value area as witnessed by the reluctance of the major housebuilders to enter the Fenland market as they cannot realise the return on capital that the business model requires. Therefore, the strategy must enable locally active- and relatively small-scale developers to engage and this means smaller development parcels (up to 100 plots ideally)

The BCP and Area of Search approach has not been successful in terms of implementation – however, in spatial terms the areas allocated are on the face of it generally appropriate having regard to environmental constraints and accessibility. It is suggested that these be reviewed with an aim of enabling a larger area of development to come forward in smaller pieces- with some mechanism for equalisation and provision of strategic infrastructure incorporated in to the plan or a subsequent SPD.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50043-11

Experience of the allocated BCP areas and areas of search in the main towns over the last 10 years

Question 5: Growth Options

has indicated that a strategy of concentration solely on the main towns is unlikely to be successful in delivering the level of housing required- it is noted that none of the strategic allocations or areas of search in Wisbech, March or Chatteris have been delivered.

The strategy based on communication routes makes little sense in spatial terms and would only be sustainable if these were significant public transport routes- it also ignores the significant constraint of flood risk.

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

50043-12

See response to 5a - Combination of proportionate growth- option 1 and small sites option 5 as it is only these approaches that have delivered significant numbers of housing in Fenland over the last 10 years. The BCP and area of search approach adopted in the adopted local plan around the large towns have not delivered significant number of dwellings (other than Whittlesey) and in order for the plan to be sound in relation to delivery it will have to include development of a scale that can be delivered but locally active developers and include delivery mechanisms to enable coordinated development and provision for strategic infrastructure on the larger sites as fragmented land ownership and equalisation issues have proved an impediment to land assembly.

Question 5: Growth Options

50118

Consultee

Title

First Name

Surname St John's College

Position

Organisation

Agent

Title

Name Rosanna

Surname Metcalfe

Position

Organisation Savills (UK) Ltd

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50118-2

Of the five options presented, it is considered Option 2 (Market Towns Led Growth) is the most appropriate, albeit it is acknowledged that it is important a proportion of the growth is allocated to other sustainable settlements in the District.

The market town of March in particular provides an excellent opportunity to deliver much needed employment and housing growth in a sustainable location.

The Fenland Monitoring Report (December 2013), which informed the Examination of the Local Plan 2014, anticipated that between 2014/15 and 2018/19 the strategic sites identified for March in the Local Plan would deliver 420 dwellings. At the time of writing, in accordance with the Council's online planning register, no planning applications on any of the three strategic sites have been submitted (and consequently no homes have been delivered).

Table 5 in the Council's most recent Monitoring Report 2017-18 (March 2019) confirms that just 348 dwellings have been completed in March between 2012-2018. Consequently, the town is very long way from meeting the housing target of 4,200 new homes in the adopted Local Plan.

As noted in the adopted Local Plan, Fenland is Cambridgeshire's most deprived district. However, geographically the District has strong links with Cambridge and Peterborough, and it is important the District seeks to capitalise on these links. This is particularly the case for March which is just a 30 minute train journey from the centre of Cambridge, and 15 minutes to the centre of Peterborough.

In failing to deliver new homes in March, the District has not maximised the potential of what is arguably its most sustainable settlement which contains key facilities including: primary and secondary schools, a railway station, retail facilities, doctors and dental surgeries, and numerous employment centres.

Whilst we support the principle of strategic allocations, it is important smaller sites on the edge of March are identified to meet the housing needs of the town and District. Two such sites are land north east of March which could deliver approximately 270 homes, and Land east of Elm Road which could deliver approximately 84 dwellings.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50026

Consultee

Title Mr
First Name Jonathan
Surname Stone
Position
Organisation

Agent

Title
Name
Surname
Position
Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50026-11

The CCG has discussed this with our local 'system' colleagues, including the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Sustainability and Transformation Partnership (STP) and have agreed that option 2 (Market towns led growth) is the preferred option as we would like to utilise existing health and social care infrastructure centred around these areas, rather than require additional investment. Furthermore, we think it is important that new housing also has good transport links and therefore we believe that option 6 (Corridor growth) would also allow the utilisation of existing infrastructure

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50026-12

Option 1 – Proportionate settlement growth – We believe that this is not a good option because we think good transport links to access existing health facilities is vital. Option 2 – Market towns led growth – this would be our preferred option as our facilities are already focused around these settlements and it would best use existing resources. Option 3 – strategic growth at one or more settlements – providing these were attached to sites with existing facilities then we would support this option. Option 4 – New settlements – We would not wish to see this as it is likely that the settlements would need additional newly built facilities unless they were close to existing facilities. Option 5 – Small site focus – We would not wish to see this as we think it is important that new housing has good transport links to be able to reach facilities. Option 6 – Corridor growth – We would be supportive of this option where there were good transport links to the necessary public services.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50026-13

Option 1 – Proportionate settlement growth – We believe that this is not a good option because we think good transport links to access existing health facilities is vital. Option 4 – New settlements – We would not wish to see this as it is likely that the settlements would need additional newly built facilities unless they were close to existing facilities. Option 5 – Small site focus – We would not wish to see this as we think it is important that new housing has good transport links to be able to reach facilities.

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

50026-14

The CCG has no view on alternative options.

Question 5: Growth Options

50085

Consultee

Title Mr
First Name Robert
Surname Taylor
Position
Organisation

Agent

Title
Name
Surname
Position
Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50085-11

2&3

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50085-12

Towns become larger, although more sustainable, transport is not as much of an issue.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50085-13

New settlements, soulless,

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50088

Consultee

Title

First Name Richard

Surname Tester

Position

Organisation

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50088-11

1. Option 2: Market Towns Led Growth 2. Option 3: Strategic Growth at One or More Settlements 3. Option 6: Corridor Growth

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50088-12

All of these seem to be sensible with regard to providing the necessary infrastructure for transport, healthcare and employment opportunities. The rural agricultural-based areas are not where high volume of jobs are available and therefore not so suitable for large growth as are the urban areas.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50088-13

Option 4: New settlements. By providing a new town/village would take a lot the resources away from what is needed to upgrade the current towns/villages. Also, because they would be new, more energy efficient, etc everyone is going to want to abandon the old housing areas for the new one therefore causing more problems by leaving behind homes which no-one wants. Having used up more space to build new towns many houses are going to be left, whereas looking after the areas we already have by spending more on them would be more beneficial. Option 5: Small Site Focus. Development of villages is not the way forward as they have big issues over employment, transport, healthcare provision, shops, etc.

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

50088-14

Not that I can think of.

Question 5: Growth Options

50120

Consultee

Title

First Name

Surname This Land Limited

Position

Organisation

Agent

Title

Name

Kimberley

Surname

Brown MRTPI

Position

Organisation

Carter Jonas LLP

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50120-9

The selected distribution of growth must be based on the delivery of sustainable development including meeting identified development needs in full, and taking into account any environmental and infrastructure constraints that may restrict development in certain locations.

Paragraph 8 of the NPPF identifies the three dimensions of sustainable development, which are economic, social and environmental roles. Paragraph 59 seeks to boost significantly the supply of housing. Paragraph 68 requires Local Plans to include allocations for small and medium sites. Paragraph 78 acknowledges that housing in rural areas can support rural communities and existing services and facilities in villages. Paragraph 102 seeks to promote walking, cycling and public transport, and Paragraph 103 expects patterns of growth to be managed to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport. Chapter 14 of the NPPF provides guidance on flooding and drainage. Chapter 15 seeks to protect the natural environment, including designated sites. Chapter 16 seeks to protect the historic environment, including Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas.

It is clear that meeting the housing needs of rural areas is related to the delivery of sustainable development. It is the case that housing and affordable housing needs exist in all settlements within Fenland, and the existing services and facilities within villages could be supported by further housing development. There are environmental, historic and infrastructure constraints that may prevent development from being located in certain locations. The larger settlements are served by public transport.

Taking into account the above, we support the following options as these are considered to be the most sustainable:

Option 1: Proportionate Settlement Growth Option 2: Market Towns Led Growth Option 6: Corridor Growth

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50120-10

Option 4: New Settlement(s) is not supported. This is as a result of new settlements typically having long lead in times therefore reducing the likelihood of the timely delivery of new homes; and they require significant levels of infrastructure which is costly and, consequently they tend not to deliver policy compliant levels of affordable housing. It is also considered that it would be challenging to find an appropriate location for a new settlement within the District which would not be at risk of flooding.

Question 5: Growth Options

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50034

Consultee		Agent	
Title		Title	
First Name	Katie	Name	
Surname	Thornley	Surname	
Position	Senior Finance Manager	Position	
Organisation	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Sus	Organisation	

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50034-11

We prefer option 2 (Market towns led growth) as we would like to utilise existing health and social care infrastructure centred around these areas, rather than require additional investment. Small scale development can lead to additional pressures on local services without financial support through developer contributions. We think it is important that new housing also has good transport links to access employment, services and open space and therefore we believe that option 6 (Corridor growth) would also allow the utilisation of existing infrastructure. This should centre around sustainable transport links i.e. rail to avoid over reliance on the car.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50034-12

Option 1 – Proportionate settlement growth – We believe that this is not a good option because we think good transport links to access existing health facilities is vital. Option 2 – Market towns led growth – this would be our preferred option as our facilities are already focused around these settlements and it would best use existing resources. Option 3 – strategic growth at one or more settlements – providing these were attached to sites with existing facilities then we would support this option. Option 4 – New settlements – We would not wish to see this as it is likely that the settlements would need additional newly built facilities unless they were close to existing facilities. Option 5 – Small site focus – We would not wish to see this as we think it is important that new housing has good transport links to be able to reach facilities. Option 6 – Corridor growth – We would be supportive of this option where there were good transport links to the necessary public services.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50034-13

Option 1 – Proportionate settlement growth – We believe that this is not a good option because we think good transport links to access existing health facilities is vital. Option 4 – New settlements – We would not wish to see this as it is likely that the settlements would need additional newly built facilities unless they were close to existing facilities. Option 5 – Small site focus – We would not wish to see this as we think it is important that new housing has good transport links to be able to reach facilities.

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

50034-14

We are not putting forward any alternative options.

Question 5: Growth Options

50084

Consultee

Title

First Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

Triman Developments (UK) Limited an

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

Mr

Simon

Machen

Barmach Ltd

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50084-11

Market towns led growth

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50084-12

Option 1 takes no account of market demand, location or constraints to development and is inappropriate. Option 2 focuses growth around existing and historic larger settlements which tend to be better connected and to have a wider range of services and facilities. Option 3 would result in a lack of investment in a number of higher order settlements and their potential decline. Option 4 involves a significant lead in time that may extend beyond the plan period and poses a significant risk to delivering the housing target. It could also lead to the decline of existing settlements. Option 5 creates the challenge of economy of scale in delivering infrastructure and is unlikely to be viable. Existing higher order settlements are located on transport corridors.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50014

Consultee

Title

First Name Nolan

Surname Tucker

Position

Organisation Deloitte

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50014-10

Option 1: Proportionate Settlement Growth and Option 2: Market Towns Led Growth.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50014-11

Option 1: Proportionate Settlement Growth and Option 2: Market Towns Led Growth are sustainable options as they prioritise development in locations with a larger amount of services and greater accessibility to public transport.

Option 3: Strategic Growth at One of More Settlements is not sustainable as this will increase inequalities between different locations. This would also limit the amount of suitable sites that can be identified for development.

Option 4: New Settlement(s) and Option 5: Small Site Focus are not sustainable as these locations do not currently have access to a large amount of services and have limited access to public transport. Therefore for these options significant investment would be needed in infrastructure which is not viable.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50030

Consultee

Title

First Name Kate

Surname Waller

Position

Organisation Elm Parish Council

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50030-11

The Council's preference is for (4) New Settlements and (6) Corridor Growth

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50030-12

The Council believes that these options would focus on providing homes where there are adequate road/rail links and public transport, an infrastructure to support development, whether due to existing resources in the towns where there are major road or rail links, or the new infrastructure provided where new settlements are planned.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50030-13

The Council dislikes Option 5: Small Site Focus The significant problems in small scale village growth are of great concern to the Council.

Infill housing is blurring village identities and with inadequate support services, schools, doctors surgeries, dentists, local shops etc this is creating a significant increase in the number of vehicles travelling through villages, with many of the roads being designed for horse drawn vehicles rather than heavy goods vehicles without the necessary upgrading of road services resulting in poor road services .

This additional traffic is often heavy vehicles and speeding vehicles both of which add corresponding added risk to all road users, as well as the detriment to the environment from the additional journeys.

Additional public transport links would reduce these pressures, however this needs to be affordable, particularly for families.

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50024

Consultee

Title Mr
First Name Lawrence
Surname Weetman
Position Chairman
Organisation Chatteris Past, Present & Future

Agent

Title
Name
Surname
Position
Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50024-11

We prefer a combination of Option 1 and Option 3, in that we think proportional growth is a good idea if it takes into account other factors (rather than just a percentage of existing population) when deciding how many new dwellings a community can support.

These factors might include transport links/infrastructure, local amenities, useful/acceptable sites available for development, etc.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50024-12

- 1 ● Any negative effects of growth are spread evenly across the district.
● Fails to take into account other factors, such as access to transport, local shops and amenities, available land, how much land is above sea level, etc.
- 2 ● Protects villages ● Fails to differentiate between Chatteris and the other market towns (as outlined in our answer to 3b). ● There may be insufficient infrastructure to support this growth.
- 3 ● More strategic. ● Can take in other factors. ● Insufficient detail on methodology to make a full assessment.
- 4 ● Where would a new settlement go? ● A new settlement would have a “New Town” feel to it, which we expect will not sit well with the rest of the character of The Fens and what makes this place special. ● A new settlement would need good transport links, ideally a railway station. ● A new settlement would require a range of new amenities, including provision of NHS GP services, shops, leisure facilities, etc. ● There are few undeveloped areas in The Fens that are not very close to sea level. ● Development of a new settlement in The Fens is likely to lead to loss of farmland, which the consultation document says should be protected.
- 5 ● Local infrastructure (such as water and sewage) is likely to be stretched by new, smaller developments. ● This could lead to increased transport congestion in towns. ● This could cause loss of amenity, for example where local facilities are closed or built upon. ● This could result in overcrowding.
- 6 ● Public transport along public transport corridors is inadequate. ● Roadways between Fenland towns are insufficient.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

Question 5: Growth Options

50024-13

See the table above. We think that the last three options are unrealistic, but that the first three fail to take into account the differing growth potential between the different settlements.

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

50024-14

As stated in (5a), the Civic Society believes that Option 1 - growing market towns - combined with some thoughtful analysis on the best way to strategically grow towns based upon their available infrastructure, amenities, development opportunities, etc, is very important.

50001

Consultee

Title

First Name

Alan

Surname

Wheeldon

Position

Organisation

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50001-11

Definitely Option 4 New settlements.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50001-12

The Advantages of New settlements is that they can be constructed with little impact on disrupting current towns and villages. They will have a blank sheet and so will not be limited to try to merge with present infrastructure. New design factors can be incorporated immediately. Facilities can be incorporated to suit the size of each new development.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50001-13

Option 1 and 2 and 3 puts a strain on already stretched infrastructure and is disruptive to those living in or nearby any developments.

Option 5 Causes problems by increasing the demand for support services over a large diffuse area, e.g bus services, emergency services, refuse collection.

Option 6 Results in urban sprawl with towns and villages losing their identity, noise and pollution increases for those living along major routes.

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50107

Consultee

Title Mr
First Name Ray
Surname Whitwell
Position
Organisation

Agent

Title
Name
Surname
Position
Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50107-10

Options 1 & 6.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50107-11

Ensure town & villages grow proportionately, whilst taking advantage of road/rail connections and corridors.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50107-12

Option 4. Small site focus would not deliver the needed 11550.

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

50107-13

No

Question 5: Growth Options

50108

Consultee

Title Mr
First Name Ray
Surname Whitwell
Position
Organisation

Agent

Title
Name
Surname
Position
Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50108-11

Option 1 - Proportionate settlement growth. However provision of any new roads could open up more land in that area than would otherwise not be allowed. Option 6 - Corridor Growth, ensuring development concentrates on where there is an adequate road system.

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50108-12

Option 5 - Small site focus. Will make it difficult to achieve the 11550 target.

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50048

Consultee

Title Mrs
First Name Pat
Surname Wilkinson
Position
Organisation Newton-in-the-Isle Parish Council

Agent

Title
Name
Surname
Position
Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50048-10

Option 1 Proportionate settlement growth
Option 5 Small Site Focus

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50048-11

Positives

Natural Growth
Deliverable
Supporting and Retaining Infrastructure

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50048-12

Dislike Option 2 - Unbalanced
Dislike Option 3 – Damages other towns.

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?

Question 5: Growth Options

50047

Consultee

Title

First Name Geoff

Surname Wilkinson

Position

Organisation Wisbech St Mary Parish Council

Agent

Title

Name

Surname

Position

Organisation

5a) Which option/s do you prefer?

50047-7

Options 5 and 6

5b) What are the positive and negatives of the option/s?

50047-8

Development needs to be evenly distributed.

5c) Which option/s do you dislike and why?

50047-9

1, 2, 3 and 4 - leaves the villages to stagnate and towns to become too large.

5d) Are there alternative options, not shown above, which should be considered?
