

27: Small Villages

Title:		Position:	Spatial Planning Advisor
First Name:	Tess	Organisation:	Anglian Water Services Limited
Surname:	Saunders		

Comment **Neutral**

As already indicated in our submission, there are several settlements in these categories that are served by a vacuum sewerage system. Due to the nature of the system, upgrades may be required to accommodate any proposed development in affected locations if there is insufficient capacity or pressure to accommodate the new development. Given the complexity of these systems and the lead in times for any improvements, this could have implications for proposed allocations within several Medium and Small Villages including: Wisbech St Mary, Gorefield, Parsons Drove, Tydd St Giles, Christchurch, Murrow, Guyhirn, and Church End.

LP59: Residential site allocations in Christchurch

Title:	Mr	Position:	Clerk
First Name:	Dave	Organisation:	Christchurch Parish Council
Surname:	Gibbs		

Comment Neutral

The Parish Council considered the Draft Local Plan at their meeting on 10 October and have a number of concerns regarding the potential impact of the plan on life in Christchurch.

The restrictive nature of the new proposed settlement boundary (Inset 03) and the scarcity of available sites for future development will stifle the natural growth that is necessary for the long-term sustainability of the village. This is unacceptable. Paragraph 6.7 of the Draft Plan addresses this issue succinctly, thus: “However, it is also recognised that smaller communities should benefit from an appropriate level of growth to ensure their long-term sustainability.” Whilst at first sight the proposed settlement boundary includes four potential sites for residential development, legal hurdles and contamination may prevent two of those sites from being delivered.

The Parish Council wishes to encourage development at the northern end of the village in the vicinity of the Community Centre, with its recreation ground and children’s playground, as well as easy access to Townley School. A more flexible approach to the settlement boundary is required and the Parish Council is keen to work with officers to consider all options to facilitate this.

In order to address the Council’s concerns, members request that a senior planning officer visits Christchurch to discuss the draft proposals in more detail and to consider site-specific issues within the general policies and the new hinterland provisions to provide the Parish Council with the clarity to advise residents and to fulfil its statutory obligation as a consultee on future applications.

LP59.01

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

Comment **Neutral**

Although the grade II listed Old Post Office lies to the north east of the site, the intervening new development means that any new development of the site will have minimal impact on the setting of the Old Post Office.

Title:	Mr	Position:	
First Name:	John	Organisation:	Maxey Grounds
Surname:	Maxey		

Comment **Support**

We support the allocation of further land west of Brimstone Close and North of Fen View Christchurch. Part of this land is a commitment and already developed with 3 units. The remainder is in developers hands and negotiations are well advanced for access provision from Fen View.

We are aware the land is both available and deliverable and rounding off development in this location is appropriate in relation to the built form of the village.

LP59.01

Title:

Position:

First Name: Ben

Organisation:

Surname: Dawson

Comment **Support**

Policy LP59.01: Residential site allocation: Land north west Syringa House. Is a natural expansion of the village with residential development on 3 sides. This development will be delivered by the same development company that built Brimstone Close. The site is in flood zone 1.

Extensive research has been undertaken to purchase the land required to access the site. The purchase is now in its final stages, being dealt with by solicitors.

The safeguarding of the setting and character relating to Syringa House was fully considered, measurements taken and implement as part of the successful application for 6 bungalows. The first bungalow was built 15m from the boundary of Syringa House, to reduce the impact. Bungalows were built to reduce the height of the properties. Reclaimed tiles were used to tie in with the existing tile of Syringa House. A successful application for 3 further bungalows was granted and the reclaimed tile was similarly used. The construction of 3 further bungalows closed off the site and any further immediate impact on the listed building. The proposed site will be made up of bungalows, chalet bungalows and smaller family homes. Its is our plan to start with bungalows next to final bungalows of Brimstone Close and Fen View, we would then build up to a chalet bungalow and then the family homes which we hope will benefit the local school.

As part of the condition for the 6 plots granted an archaeological field work report was required, the trial trench valuation took place on site over 2 consecutive weeks. The report concluded that nothing of any significance was found. This thorough study should broadly eliminate the chances for items of significance being located on this site.

A landscaping and screen planting program would be welcomed.

LP59.03 and LP59.04 have successful applications that were passed some time ago but are still to be delivered. LP59.02 should this site be include and granted with road frontage, it is likely that these plots will attracted self builders and the frequently built 5-6 bed houses, which may not be readily affordable to those looking to move into the area or those that already live in the area. As part of LP59.01 we hope to build a large portion of less expensive 3-4 bed family houses.

LP59.02

Title:	Ms	Position:	Historic Environment Planning Adviser
First Name:	Debbie	Organisation:	Historic England
Surname:	Mack		
Comment	Neutral		
No comments			

LP60: Residential site allocations in Eastrea

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

There is the potential for sand and gravel to be located under LP60.01. Development should make best use of any material incidentally extracted.

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

land submission 40233

The site adjoins the existing built up settlement of Eastrea and is identified as flood zone 1 land. The site is in an accessible location and close to existing amenities including a local pub and nature reserve.

There are no technical constraints which would restrict the use of the land for residential allocation and the site is immediately available for development. For the reasons given above the land should be allocated.

LP60: Residential site allocations in Eastrea

Title:		Position:	Town Planner
First Name:	Susan	Organisation:	Brown & Co
Surname:	Shenston		

Comment	Object
---------	--------

FENLAND LOCAL PLAN 2021-2040 DRAFT LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION AUGUST 2022 – LAND SOUTH OF JONES LANE, EASTREA (40376)

Brown & Co have been instructed to submit the following representation on behalf of our client N Lindsey in respect of Land South of Jones Lane (site 40376) in light of the current Fenland Draft Local Plan Consultation. We previously put forward this site during the Issues and Options Public Consultation in 2019 and the site has been discounted.

Paragraph 69 of The National Planning Framework (NPPF) sets out that small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area and are often built out relatively quickly. Furthermore, paragraph 79 of the NPPF states that to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance and maintain the vitality of rural communities. It further states that planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services.

In the Fenland Draft Local Plan Policy LP1 identifies Eastrea as a Small Village A in the settlement hierarchy. Our client's site is immediately adjacent to the western settlement boundary of Eastrea and provides a natural extension to the village and therefore relates well to the built form. In addition, the site is east of the Whittlesey/Eastrea Buffer which is proposed in Map 8 of the recently submitted draft Whittlesey Neighbourhood Plan Submission June 2022.

To the east of the site is an inward facing residential development. Development on this proposed site would be outward facing with a landscaped edge achieving a boundary to the site which will reduce the visual impact on the landscape. A well-designed boundary will also provide a visual transition from the built-up settlement boundary of Eastrea into the Whittlesey/Eastrea Buffer area and prevent coalescence between the village of Eastrea and Whittlesey. We highlight how well-related the proposed site is to the settlement boundary and argue that development of the site would provide social and economic gains. Policy LP2 states Small Villages A will provide 1% of the total housing requirement (156 dwellings) and sites in the Open Countryside (Outside Settlement Boundary) providing 1% of the total housing requirement. Although paragraph 7.4 recognises that Fenland faces significant challenges to the delivery of new homes Policy LP60: Residential site allocations in Eastrea only allocates an existing site which has permission for 6 dwellings. This proposed site is an opportunity for development, would contribute to the delivery of housing targets and support the rural area. This site also offers the opportunity to deliver selfbuild/custom housebuilding providing the Council with certainty that self-build plots will be delivered.

The proposed settlement boundary for Eastrea predominately allows for development to the south of Eastrea, and west of Wype Road. Our site would be a natural continuation of development to the west of Eastrea with any future design layout complimenting the adjoining in depth residential development. Our client is actively engaging with adjoining landowners to connect the site to Eastrea Road and Half Acre Drove, and/or to Thornham Way, to provide a suitable and safe access for vehicles and pedestrians to the site. Any open space that is lost connecting to Thornham Way can be re-provided within the southern area of the proposed site. The site can also be accessed by pedestrians via Jones Lane. Our client is happy to engage as to the site area and the layout of the site.

We enclose the following plans to assist with your review of the site:

Location Plan - Drawing No AL0101 A
Existing Site Plan – Drawing No K0001 A
Proposed Site Layout Option – Drawing No K0005 A

--

LP61: Residential site allocations in Guyhirn

Title:		Position:	Associate Director
First Name:	Aaron	Organisation:	Strutt & Parker
Surname:	Coe		

Comment **Support**

Land at Selwyn Lodge Farm, Guyhir. SHEELA Ref: 40303.

Strutt and Parker have prepared this representation for Strategic Assets on Behalf of Cambridgeshire County Council in its role of landowner.

This representation is a summary of the full Site Representation Report which has also been submitted as part of this consultation response.

Guyhirn is identified as a Small Village in the settlement hierarchy (Policy LP1) and as such a suitable location to accommodate additional housing allocations. It is acknowledged in the Local Plan that it is important for villages to be allowed to grow in a sustainable manner. As such appropriate allocations are not only required in the higher tier settlements but also in the rural areas as set out in the above representations in respect of draft Policy LP2. Accordingly the County Council supports the allocation of this site in Guyhirn. The Site has been allocated as under Policy LP61.02:

An extract of the Policy 54.02 is set out below. It identifies that the site extends to 0.92ha and could potentially deliver 15 dwellings. This is considered to be a reasonable assessment of the Site's potential capacity. It is also reflective of the fact that the north east corner of the site falls within Flood Zone 3 and as such will not be suitable for development. This area will however be able to make a positive contribution to biodiversity enhancement and respond to the need for development to respect the playing fields to the north.

This particular site represents a sustainable location in the heart of the village, being within walking distance of the day to day services and facilities available. It is available for development and accordingly the County Council supports its inclusion within the new draft Local Plan.

Conclusions:

For the reasons set out above in respect of draft Local Plan Policy LP2 while it is considered that further site allocations need to be made to secure sufficient housing development to support the objectives of the new Local Plan strategy and for the Plan to be considered 'sound' at examination, it is equally important that all those draft allocations are carried forward into the submission Local Plan unless they are conclusively demonstrated to be undeliverable.

Guyhirn is identified as a Small Village in the settlement hierarchy (Policy LP1) and as such a suitable location to accommodate additional housing allocations. It is acknowledged in the Local Plan that it is important for villages to be allowed to grow in a sustainable manner. As such appropriate allocations are not only required in the higher tier settlements but also in the rural areas as set out in the above representations in respect of draft Policy LP2. Accordingly the County Council supports the allocation of this site in.

The Site is centrally located with excellent access to existing services and facilities within the village. It could be delivered in the early years of the new local plan and is considered to be both deliverable and developable. Accordingly, the County Council support its inclusion as an allocation in Policy LP61 of the draft Local Plan.

LP61: Residential site allocations in Guyhirn

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

Comment **Neutral**
land submission 40230

The site adjoins the existing development in this part of Guyhirn and forms a natural rounding off of the established settlement footprint. It is located on flood zone 1 land and is therefore in a sequentially preferable location in terms of flood risk. The reasoning on the Sites Evidence Report gives the incorrect size of the land, it should be 1.43ha and therefore the actual % of Flood Zone 3 land is less than identified by the LPA. This means that more of the site is within Flood Zone 1 than originally perceived, thereby further demonstrating the acceptability of the site.

There are no technical constraints which would restrict the use of the land for residential purposes and the site is immediately available for development. For the reasons given above the land should be allocated.

land submission 40486

The site is located within the established settlement of Guyhirn, on a gap within an otherwise built up residential location. The site lies within flood zone 3 however there is no other land available at lower risk of flooding which could be developed in a manner which reflected the linear pattern of development which characterises the village. The site is capable of accommodating up to 23 dwellings.

Development of the site for residential purposes would be in keeping with the established settlement footprint and would be a use which is compliant with the surrounding area.

Planning permission has previously been refused on the land given the constraints of the current Local Plan which placed Guyhirn as a ‘Small Village’ and that the site lies within flood zone 3. The Call for Sites under the new Local Plan presents an opportunity to support this logical village infill.

There are no technical issues which would restrict the development of this land and it is immediately available. It is therefore submitted that this site is appropriate for allocation as residential development. For the reasons given above the site should be allocated.

Title: Mrs **Position:** Parish Clerk & RFO
First Name: Sarah **Organisation:** Wisbech St Mary Parish Council
Surname: Bligh

Comment **Object**
40486 Land east of Gull Road – NOT ALLOCATED
The Parish Council note that the land in this site submission is in prime location for development in Guyhirn. There is development on either side and recommend flood alleviation measures to make this site a viable development option.

LP61: Residential site allocations in Guyhirn

Title:	Mr	Position:	Chair
First Name:	Peter	Organisation:	Poors Allotments Charities
Surname:	Davies		
Comment	Object		
This site is the only land left for development on Gull Rd and should be added to the new local plan			

Title:	Mrs	Position:	
First Name:	Linda	Organisation:	
Surname:	Brownlow		
Comment	Object		
I see from the new local plan public consultation re the above land that this land has had planning permission turned down. I would like to support the application plan and would like to see this land added to the plan for planning permission.			

LP61.01

Title:	Ms	Position:	Historic Environment Planning Adviser
First Name:	Debbie	Organisation:	Historic England
Surname:	Mack		
Comment	Neutral		
No comments			

Title:		Position:	
First Name:	Lucy	Organisation:	
Surname:	Cannon		
Comment	Object		
<p>This piece of land has been farmed for over 100 years by 3 generations of my family whilst being a council Tennant. Building on this land wouldnt just be morally wrong but it would also have an impact on the community. Cattle have grazed this land in the summer for over 35 years. These fields are part of the culture of the community. There is wildlife nesting and living in the trees. Building on this land will destroy their habitat. One piece of land in particular isn't suitable for building, it consists of dykes and drains of where the proposed planning is taking place. Access would be onto a main road where the speed limit is 60 miles an hour with sharp bends on either side. This would not be a safe access for 10 house to to exit upon.</p> <p>Neither Wisbech St Mary or Guyhirn can cope with more houses. This would put even more strain on the local schools and amenities which already cannot cope with the the continued building work and influx of people coming into this area.</p>			

Title:	Mrs	Position:	Parish Clerk & RFO
First Name:	Sarah	Organisation:	Wisbech St Mary Parish Council
Surname:	Bligh		
Comment	Object		
40147 Land at Gull Drove LP61.01			
The Parish Council has previously been opposed to development on this site due to the removal of a village green space and contamination issues as it was historically an old pit.			

LP61.02

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

Comment Object

Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, the grade II* Chapel of Ease lies within the Cemetery immediately to the west of the site.

Any development of the site has the potential to impact the heritage asset and its setting. Therefore, we recommend you prepare an HIA. The recommendations of the HIA should then be used to inform the policy wording.

Suggested Change - Prepare an HIA and use findings to inform policy wording.

LP61.02

Title:		Position:	Associate Director
First Name:	Aaron	Organisation:	Strutt & Parker
Surname:	Coe		

Comment **Support**

Land at Selwyn Lodge Farm, Guyhir. SHEELA Ref: 40303.

Strutt and Parker have prepared this representation for Strategic Assets on Behalf of Cambridgeshire County Council in its role of landowner.

This representation is a summary of the full Site Representation Report which has also been submitted as part of this consultation response.

Guyhirn is identified as a Small Village in the settlement hierarchy (Policy LP1) and as such a suitable location to accommodate additional housing allocations. It is acknowledged in the Local Plan that it is important for villages to be allowed to grow in a sustainable manner. As such appropriate allocations are not only required in the higher tier settlements but also in the rural areas as set out in the above representations in respect of draft Policy LP2. Accordingly the County Council supports the allocation of this site in Guyhirn.

The Site has been allocated as under Policy LP61.02:

An extract of the Policy 54.02 is set out below. It identifies that the site extends to 0.92ha and could potentially deliver 15 dwellings. This is considered to be a reasonable assessment of the Site's potential capacity. It is also reflective of the fact that the north east corner of the site falls within Flood Zone 3 and as such will not be suitable for development. This area will however be able to make a positive contribution to biodiversity enhancement and respond to the need for development to respect the playing fields to the north.

This particular site represents a sustainable location in the heart of the village, being within walking distance of the day to day services and facilities available. It is available for development and accordingly the County Council supports its inclusion within the new draft Local Plan.

Conclusions:

For the reasons set out above in respect of draft Local Plan Policy LP2 while it is considered that further site allocations need to be made to secure sufficient housing development to support the objectives of the new Local Plan strategy and for the Plan to be considered 'sound' at examination, it is equally important that all those draft allocations are carried forward into the submission Local Plan unless they are conclusively demonstrated to be undeliverable.

Guyhirn is identified as a Small Village in the settlement hierarchy (Policy LP1) and as such a suitable location to accommodate additional housing allocations. It is acknowledged in the Local Plan that it is important for villages to be allowed to grow in a sustainable manner. As such appropriate allocations are not only required in the higher tier settlements but also in the rural areas as set out in the above representations in respect of draft Policy LP2. Accordingly the County Council supports the allocation of this site in.

The Site is centrally located with excellent access to existing services and facilities within the village. It could be delivered in the early years of the new local plan and is considered to be both deliverable and developable. Accordingly, the County Council support its inclusion as an allocation in Policy LP61 of the draft Local Plan.

LP61.02

Title:	Mr	Position:	
First Name:	Gareth	Organisation:	Guyhirn Playing Field Committee
Surname:	Edwards		

Comment

Object

The proposed allocation will need to utilise the existing vehicular access to the village playing field and community hall, the track is a single car width which is used by vehicles and pedestrians so increasing it with dwellings will lead to the potential problems. The playing field has utilised a section of the land proposed for car parking at busy times (football matches, community events, etc), which this proposal will lose this option further adding to issues with access and parking, this use of the land has happened in excess of 10 years. Dwellings being proposed adjacent to our field and community centre could create potential conflict for the home owners with noise and disturbance along with light pollution from the flood lights on the field and its use both day and night. We feel there are better locations for dwellings in the village, but support new dwellings in the village.

Title:	Mr	Position:	
First Name:	Gareth	Organisation:	Guyhirn Playing Field Committee
Surname:	Edwards		

Comment

Object

Our community hall and playing field utilises the shared access which will be required to access the development, we currently utilise a section of the allocation for parking which we have done for excess of 10 years and to lose this would create issues with vehicle parking and access to both the field and dwellings. The dwellings would also be located close to the field and community hall which may lead to noise concerns of the occupiers of the dwellings.

Title:	Mrs	Position:	Parish Clerk & RFO
First Name:	Sarah	Organisation:	Wisbech St Mary Parish Council
Surname:	Bligh		

Comment

Object

40303 Land at Selwyn Lodge Farm LP61.02

The Parish Council are very concerned that FDC has determined this site as suitable towards the growth of Guyhirn. Its location would allow backland development central to the Guyhirn amenity fields. This area has just had over £200,000 spent on its development for the betterment of the village and to allow residential development here would be against the wishes of both the Parish Council and the Guyhirn Playing Field Association.

LP61.03

Title:	Ms	Position:	Historic Environment Planning Adviser
First Name:	Debbie	Organisation:	Historic England
Surname:	Mack		
Comment	Neutral		
No comments			

Title:	Mrs	Position:	Parish Clerk & RFO
First Name:	Sarah	Organisation:	Wisbech St Mary Parish Council
Surname:	Bligh		
Comment	Neutral		
40207 Land to the rear of Neneside LP61.03			
The Parish Council raised no objections for this site of 5 proposed dwellings.			

LP62: Residential site allocations in Murrow

Title:	Ms	Position:	Chartered Town Planner
First Name:	Shanna	Organisation:	Swann Edwards Architecture Limited
Surname:	Jackson		
Comment	Neutral		
land submission 40231			

This site is proposed for residential (C3) use. The site is within a central location within the village with good links to amenities and is immediately available for development. It is located within flood zone 3 however there is no land available at lower risk of flooding within the village. There is sufficient scope within the site to create a high quality development which reflects character the neighbouring built form. No other undeveloped land has been allocated for housing in Murrow (the only site already benefits from permission and works have already commenced) and this site represents a prime opportunity to enhance the village to the benefit of existing local facilities including the village hall and primary school. For the reasons given above the land should be allocated.

land submission 40219

This site is proposed for residential (C3) and educational (D1) uses. The D1 use relates to the use of part of the land as an extension to the existing school car park. The uses are compatible with the existing neighbouring development. The site is within a central location within the village with good links to amenities and is immediately available for development. It is located within flood zone 3 however there is no land available at lower risk of flooding within the village. There will be no loss of valuable agricultural land as identified by the existing tenant and there is sufficient scope within the site to create a high quality development which reflects character the neighbouring built form. No other undeveloped land has been allocated for housing in Murrow (the only site already benefits from permission and works have already commenced) and this site represents a prime opportunity to enhance the village to the benefit of existing local facilities including the village hall and primary school. For the reasons given above the land should be allocated.

Title:	Mr	Position:	
First Name:	Peter	Organisation:	Peter Humphrey Associates Ltd
Surname:	Humphrey		
Comment	Object		
The Development Area Boundary should include allocation of land to the rear of 1-3 Back Road, Murrow. This would be a logical 'rounding off' of the D.A.B. And, to allow build opportunity within village.			

Title:	Mr	Position:	
First Name:	Peter	Organisation:	Peter Humphrey Associates Ltd
Surname:	Humphrey		
Comment	Object		
There should be more and/or larger allocations to sustain the existing village amenities.			

LP62.01

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

Comment Object

Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, Hollycroft Farmhouse and the converted Church of Corpus Christ, both listed at grade II, lie to the west of the site.

Any development of the site has the potential to impact the heritage assets and their settings. Therefore, we recommend you prepare an HIA. The recommendations of the HIA should then be used to inform the policy wording.

Suggested Change - Prepare an HIA and use findings to inform policy wording.

Title:	Mrs	Position:	Parish Clerk & RFO
First Name:	Sarah	Organisation:	Wisbech St Mary Parish Council
Surname:	Bligh		

Comment Neutral

40150 – Land at Front Road LP62.01

The Parish Council raised no objections to this site but recommend sympathetic development in keeping with the other recent builds along Front Road. As the site is opposite mainly bungalows then any development should be of the same.

LP63: Residential site allocations in Tydd St Giles

Title:	Mr	Position:	
First Name:	Dave	Organisation:	Tydd St Giles Parish Council
Surname:	Gibbs		

Comment Object

The Parish Council’s Planning Committee considered the Draft Local Plan at their meeting on 13 October and have a number of concerns regarding the potential impact of the plan on life in Tydd St Giles.

The restrictive nature of the new proposed settlement boundary (Inset 25) and the complete absence of available sites for future development will stifle the natural growth that is necessary for the long-term sustainability of the village. This is unacceptable. More than thirty dwellings have been built in the village during the last decade and the Parish Council considers this level of development to be wholly appropriate for the future. The only site identified in the Draft Plan is for seven dwellings currently nearing completion. Paragraph 6.7 of the Draft Plan addresses this issue succinctly, thus: “However, it is also recognised that smaller communities should benefit from an appropriate level of growth to ensure their long-term sustainability.” A more flexible approach to the settlement boundary is required and the Parish Council is keen to work with officers to consider all options to facilitate this.

Policy LP63 states that “The village includes a primary school but otherwise has limited services.” A more accurate description would be that this popular village includes a thriving primary school operating at near capacity, a well-supported church with its own choir and bell-ringing team, a large modern community centre, a popular pub/restaurant, a hairdresser, a major leisure business providing an 18-hole golf course, a swimming pool, a gym, a dance studio, a restaurant, a café, a bar, a sauna and steam room. These facilities offer a variety of employment opportunities for local people, as well as contract and supply chain opportunities for small businesses. The village currently lacks a village shop, however there are two possible solutions for this, one of which is the subject of a current planning application. A designation of medium village would be more appropriate for Tydd St Giles.

The members of the Parish Council were unclear about the precise meaning of Policy LP1 Part C, relating to the new hinterland development provisions. The definition of the settlement hinterland boundary refers to “an individual, isolated dwelling unconnected to any settlement.” How would this be applied in the case of two or three dwellings together, for example a group of farm cottages? The frontage development criteria states that proposals “should not result in the physical and visual coalescence of settlements nor loss of or significant reduction in important gaps within or between settlements.” How do we distinguish an important gap from an unimportant one?

In order to address the Council’s concerns, members request that a senior planning officer visits Tydd St Giles to discuss the draft proposals in more detail and to consider site-specific issues within the general policies and the new hinterland provisions to provide the Parish Council with the clarity to advise residents and to fulfil its statutory obligation as a consultee on future applications.

LP63: Residential site allocations in Tydd St Giles

Title: Ms **Position:** Chartered Town Planner

First Name: Shanna **Organisation:** Swann Edwards Architecture Limited

Surname: Jackson

Comment **Neutral**
land submission 40489

The site is located within the established settlement of Tydd St Giles and includes a gap within an otherwise built up residential location. The site lies within flood zones 1 and 3 however there is no other land available at lower risk of flooding which could accommodate a development of this scale. The site is capable of accommodating up to 50 dwellings.

Development of the site for residential purposes would be in keeping with the established settlement footprint and would be a use which is compliant with the surrounding area.

No other undeveloped land has been allocated for housing in Tydd St Giles (the only site already benefits from permission and works have already commenced) and this site represents a prime opportunity to enhance the village to the benefit of existing local facilities including the village hall and primary school. For the reasons given above the land should be allocated.

Title: Mrs **Position:**

First Name: Suzanne **Organisation:**

Surname: Hodder

Comment **Object**

Why is there only one site allocation for Tydd St Giles that being for 7 dwellings in Hockland Road?
I question the accuracy of this figure and believe the number of site allocations should be higher.

LP63: Residential site allocations in Tydd St Giles

Title:

Position:

First Name:

Geoff

Organisation:

Surname:

Newham

Comment

Object

In summary, the Draft Development Plan:

- Is contradictory and lacks certainty, definitive instruction and direction
- Opens the doors to rampant exploitation
- Will destroy the Fenland landscape and small village settlement patterns
- Does not conform to the NPPF
- Refers to and uses out-of-date information
- Perpetuates poor planning controls leading to over development
- Promotes an adversarial approach to applications
- Creates discord and divisiveness which promotes poor community health
- Does not address the poorly maintained infrastructure
- Increases the amount of commuter traffic

1. Fenland District Council's Draft Local Plan for Consultation provides confusion and misunderstanding and will lead to severe exploitation and rampant development in the countryside.

2. In the Draft Plan, LP1 Part B stipulates that building in the countryside, outside the established development footprint, will be tightly controlled and restricted to allow refusal of permission to build residential developments outside the village settlement boundary because it's contrary to the vision, objectives and policies of this Draft Plan.

3. But then, Part C of LP1 sweeps away all these controls and restrictions with its newly coined phrase, 'Frontage Infill Development'. This is repeated at paras 17.1 and 17.5. And, there's another newly coined term, the 'Settlement Hinterland'. This is described as being anywhere within what might be creatively interpreted to mean the village boundary. This will open the floodgates for a barrage of planning applications with no defence. What greenery, openness and countryside there is left in Tydd St Giles will be consigned to the scrapheap. Part B and Part C directly contradict one another and makes them unworkable.

4. Tydd St Giles will become a magnet for every would-be and has-been developer to bring in linear developments and destroy the unique settlement that is Tydd St Giles. This nullifies all the declared visions, objectives and ambitions which pepper the Draft Plan from start to finish, such as 'Retain the distinctive character of Fenland's landscape... preserve settlement patterns... Minimise the irreversible loss of undeveloped land... unique and protected landscape...'

5. There is nothing within the National Planning and Policy Framework (NPPF) that gives rise to Frontage Infill Development or a Settlement Hinterland?

6. Sections 5 and 6 of the Draft Plan, The Spatial Strategy, provides a plan to meet the housing need across the region administered by Fenland District Council. It would appear that FDC will face the impossible task of reconciling the re-introduction of settlement boundaries with the simultaneous dismissal of those same boundaries. Applications will be flouting one policy while at the same time conforming to another. This will give the decision maker a bit of a headache so s/he may well end up abandoning the Plan-Led approach to decision making advocated in the new Draft Plan.

7. In paragraph 26.14, the Draft Plan states, 'As a small village, Tydd St Giles provides opportunities for new housing development.' One can only presume this is where the frontage infill development and the new settlement hinterland come into play – to encourage and allow even more applications to come forward, gobbling up yet more green spaces and openness. But there is no room left within the settlement boundary; Tydd St Giles has already reached saturation point. Over-development is now a sadly obvious regret. The village has already grossly exceeded its expectations for growth in recent years; one could argue this growth has become indecent.

8. In LP63, Tydd St Giles is shown as being allocated 7 houses which are, indeed, being built as I write. Far from being 'allocated for development', they are well on the way to being completed following a variation to the original

LP63: Residential site allocations in Tydd St Giles

permission granted more than a decade ago. But there's no mention of all the other recently successful applications; 12 on Sapphire Close, another 12 more being built and crammed in along Kirkgate, 4 more on the Old Stable Gardens and a host of other ad hoc projects dotted in and around the village. And, worryingly, para 26.14 has not been expanded sufficiently to give any meaning to the words. But, again, one is drawn back to LP1, Part C. Herein lies the future. And it's bleak.

9. Rather conveniently, this plan seems to by-pass the over-development that's already taken place in Tydd St Giles. Only quoting one of the development projects presents an inaccurate summary of the excessive growth that's taken place in the village. Without an accurate overview, that uses up-to-date and correct data, the whole Development Plan fails to provide the necessary certainty for applicants, decision makers and villagers.

10. A full audit of the homes built in the village over the last 12 years should be conducted for a year-on-year growth comparison using the position that existed in 2010 as the base. The results of the audit should be made publicly available.

11. A lack of accuracy only leads to a lack of trust. Without transparency, and an accurate starting point, FDC cannot plan and manage growth, or be seen to, with any assurance or certainty.

12. As a small village, Tydd St Giles cannot cope. The NPPF advocates respect for the countryside; it should be conserved, preserved, protected, revered and enjoyed. Fat chance of that happening with all the cash-hungry people with any parcel of land queuing up to grab a piece of the action. Most, if not all, of the projects listed above were in breach of the policies in the Local Plan. So how and why were they ever granted permission in the first place?

13. The 4 houses being built to the west of Magnolia Cottage, on Kirkgate, opposite the golf course entrance, are sitting cheek by jowl with their neighbours, with what can only be described as no more than an intimate space between them. The plots are too small for the houses being built; or are the houses too large? The designs aren't special or high quality, either. They're basic off-the-peg stock offered by any 'flog 'em high' architectural drawing shop.

14. And another two houses are being built to the east of Tindall Mill on Kirkgate which are also indecently close together. The quality of housing is safeguarded and enhanced when the land on which they sit is in proportion to the built size and form. Squeezing them in is detrimental and cheapening.

15. The sylvan appeal of Kirkgate has vanished. And this will be replicated across the village if this draft Development Plan is allowed to proceed in its current form. There's been little control either of numbers being granted permission, or of the design quality. Two of the houses being built on Kirkgate appear to have stalled mid-build, with weeds and rubble surrounding a collection of mostly unused vehicles and a lop-sided caravan. There appears to have been inadequate financial due diligences and oversight.

16. This is a small village with 660 residents, and a village school that is, now, full to bursting. It has a pub that opens some evenings only, and a barber-cum-hairdresser. No shop. No Post Office. No Doctor Surgery. In fact, no other services and none expected, either.

17. If this latest draft version of Fenland District Council's development plan is allowed to proceed, it will decimate Tydd St Giles. The village has managed to stave off a number of undesirable applications over the past 10 or 11 years, and it became quiet for a while.

18. But, over the last year or so, it seems everyone with any land or too much garden is having a go.

19. There's so much at stake that people are either being press-ganged into supporting the applications, agreeing to quid pro quo support, or physically and emotionally harassed and intimidated if they object. This plan will further increase the divisiveness, and create animosity beyond repair.

20. This plan breaches FDC's health and welfare objectives. Living in fear, coping with abuse, the stress of fending off intrusive belligerent behaviour... These are not the tangible outcomes FDC wants with this Plan. This is not a speculative look into the future, either. It's already happening, right now, and will only become worse.

LP63: Residential site allocations in Tydd St Giles

21. If the planning committee had held true to the stated visions and objectives outlined in the 2014 version of the Local Plan, then there was a chance for this peaceful village to avoid becoming another Parson Drove. Most of the applications that are in at the moment were in breach of the 2014 Local Plan, its objectives, principles and policies. The Draft New Plan in its current format will not be capable of holding back the tide or maintaining control over the destiny of small villages.

22. The much-vaunted vision and objectives have been lost and forgotten. The unique Fenland landscape and the distinct settlement patterns of its villages will become a thing of the past, a piece of history, a part of Fenland folk lore.

23. The Plan's words and phrases have shrugged off their meaning. Fenland District Council appears to be more concerned with increasing its tax revenue than with safe-guarding the countryside, preserving the fenland landscape and the settlement patterns of small villages.

24. Residents move to villages like Tydd St Giles; for its peace, the quiet, the openness, unaware of the undercurrent that's seeking to change the core reason for why people move to small villages in unspoilt Fenland.

25. The newly coined approach seems to be geared to providing sufficient windfall sites to top up the numbers required to meet the quota of new homes. All at the expense of the open countryside and the unique Fenland landscape.

26. Planning Law requires applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the published development plan, which, in turn, must hold true to the values and principles laid down in the NPPF, unless material and significant considerations indicate otherwise. The Newly Draft Development Plan must, then, follow the principles and policies laid down. In turn, this will then lead to informed planning decisions, making the planning system genuinely Plan-led. Fenland District Council's newly drafted Development Plan lacks the certainty to ensure this will be achieved.

27. The content of the NPPF is clear: 'Succinct and up-to-date local plans should contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals.' This is crucial and sits at the heart of what needs tidying up in Fenland District Council's Draft Plan. There is no point having a detailed Plan in place if all its policies and tenets are dismissed and some other procedure is brought in to decide matters.

28. Where policies are tight enough and clear enough, any proposal that comes forward has either been presented with the benefit of a pre-application discussion and the submitted proposal then complies with the outcome of those discussions or, the policies in the Local Plan have been read and understood and the proposal being submitted meets the vision, objectives and policies of the Plan. Anything that doesn't comply is refused. In either case, there's no doubt about how the decision maker should react. Where the policies are clearly defined, a decision maker simply follows the template. Proposals that don't measure up to the Plan's policies are summarily refused. The Draft Plan lacks the certainty and assurance required.

29. Within the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), there is a requirement to allow for public consultation. This should allow members of the public to comment, but only on valid and material planning concerns. 'Local opposition or support for a proposal is not in itself a ground for refusing or granting planning permission, unless it is founded upon valid material planning reasons...'

30. This explicitly favours public comments, whether supporting or objecting, that clearly explain the justifications for the comments being made. Empty rhetoric and blandly negative statements or those responders who do nothing more than tick a box, should not be validated or included.

31. Only where there are special considerations or a super innovative idea has been proposed, should some element of consensus be sought. However, that is the whole point of pre-application discussions. Any one-off or special proposals can be discussed and the policies in the Development Plan challenged to find an acceptable conclusion, a workable compromise before the project is submitted for final consideration.

LP63: Residential site allocations in Tydd St Giles

32. Within the current draft plan, too much has not been clearly defined. For years, now, important decisions have been thought to be greatly influenced by the number of Objection Vs Support Comments. This has caused endless aggravation, distress, and mistrust. It immediately divides the village, foments arguments and causes stress. The Draft Plan could be vastly improved by making it abundantly clear that only valid and material planning concerns will be considered. This should never be a 'show of hands'.

33. There is perception in this village, that planning decisions are made based on the number supporting the application Vs the number objecting. And the highest number wins.

34. This adversarial approach gathers some traction when the committee meets to consider planning applications and speakers for each side are invited to speak for five minutes. At the end of the speeches, the committee votes for one side or the other. Seemingly, there is too little weight applied to valid planning reasons. Again, if the Plan's policies don't allow it, refuse permission. Unless something special, highly innovative or socially beneficial is apparent.

35. The social consequences of this belief, counting those in favour against those who object, are proving very grave indeed and openly evident in Tydd St Giles. Villagers are press-ganged into support; family and friends (often from outside the village) are given instructions on what to say and told to support the application either with copied wording or just to put a tick in the support box with no comment at all. The sole objective is to have a greater number of supporters than 'the other side' has for objections. This apparent winner-takes-all approach erodes any trust in the Local Plan and the way it's administered.

36. Objectors are being harassed, intimidated and threatened. Some lives even made a misery. That is the very real consequence of what has become an adversarial approach to decide if a project should be granted permission or not. It's a social disaster. It is ruining individual health as well as the cohesive health of our village community. Apart from the village becoming over-developed, with ever more houses shoe-horned into ever decreasing spaces, there is, now, a noticeable Us-and-Them storm-cloud menacing the village.

37. A clear and decisive Local Development Plan that is laid out in line with the NPPF and conducted in line with Planning Law as well as common decency and respect for social consequences, will prevent this community division, preserve social health and protect our village and the unique and distinct Fenland landscape. A clear and decisive plan is essential together with an amended Comments Form that reforms perceptions and rebuilds community trust.

38. The Comments Form within the application process could be amended to remove the support or objection options and their running totals and to invite only valid planning-related comments that materially affect the application, one way or the other. This removes the perception that only votes count, and removes the adversarial nature of the process. It also invites valid, considered and pertinent comments that may well adversely affect near neighbours and local residents, or be of concern to the village as a whole or, indeed, agree with the application for its beneficial contribution to residents, village life or local amenities.

39. There may be a specific reason that has not been covered by the Plan or the Planning Officer may not be fully aware of something local that's pertinent. It would then be up to the Planning Officer to consider the impact of the reason(s) and decide. There is no place for objecting or supporting per se. But there is a place for well-considered and valid comments and reasons, suggestions and ideas.

40. The rhetoric which insists a village needs growth to thrive is misleading. Not everyone wants a town-centre café culture with a shopping mall in a small Fenland Village. People move here, to Tydd St Giles, for its peace, its calm and its open views. That's how it was. That's how it still is, but less so than it was. People don't move here because they foresee it growing into some mini conurbation thinking, 'Yeah! That's just what I need'.

41. Of course not. The attractiveness of Tydd St Giles is judged on the way it looks now. Its attractiveness is exactly that – what it is now. A quiet Fenland village with its openness, wide horizons and huge skies. There are a few with 'property developer' aspirations. But that's where a well-drafted Development Plan comes in. It quells any thoughts of disfiguring an historic, farming-based village with plans to render this a soul-less dormitory town.

LP63: Residential site allocations in Tydd St Giles

42. Granting permission for ever more homes does not a thriving community make!

43. There is an implied connection between economic growth, development and thriving local communities. For Tydd St Giles, it's difficult to fathom the extent of housing development required to ensure our local community of 660 souls remains thriving. (Although that census count was for 2018 and is way out of date since the Tydd St Giles building revolution gathered momentum, nicking acres of green space in the process).

44. All policies should be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence. Quoting information that's 4 years or more out of date undermines the credibility, functionality and integrity of the Plan as well as the decisions made by Planning Officers, and a Committee that's left having to work with it.

45. Exactly what comprises and determines a 'thriving community'? How is it defined? People are shaping this phrase to suit their individual purpose, so it changes shape and meaning until it becomes meaningless.

46. How and when did we lose our thrive? Or, is our thrive factor only declining? Do we need more building on our sparse green bits to obtain a bigger more acceptable kind of thrive? I've not read anything in the NPPF that qualifies or justifies this approach, one that will culminate in the destruction of small Fenland villages and communities.

47. And what kind of economic growth is envisaged in Tydd St Giles to meet this objective? What shape will this take? Are we to rob more countryside in pursuit of more thrive or a bigger thrive? Do we need to build retail outlets with more car parking attached to encourage their use and build yet more houses to feed them? Should the village jump on the ever rising spiral of more tarmac, more bricks and mortar, more shops that then require even more of everything to survive and become more thriving? Many might say of course not. But the press gangs do see it differently. This minority with land or vested interests will be hard at work to convince everyone they really do need something that won't actually be commercially viable beyond its honeymoon period. The village Post Office and shops have all been and gone. Lauded as highly welcome. Failed for lack of use.

48. A Local Development Plan should be sensitive to its surroundings, and not have an unacceptable impact on local roads. Where Small Villages are concerned, this objective is difficult to achieve by blanket-covering them all with words that might or could apply to any or all. This isn't suitable for a 'one size fits all' strategy. Being sensitive to surroundings requires an individual approach to each Small Village, taking stock of its ethos, noting how its Parish Council works and the extent to which it correctly reflects and respects villagers and the village's place in the wider landscape. Each Parish Council certainly should not have to become an arbiter in the social divide, having to hold the voluble minority in check at its Council meetings. Again, the New Plan should provide more certainty, sufficient to avoid divisions in local communities.

49. The roads in our village are appalling. They're falling apart, crumbling at the edges with dips and bumps that amplify the stress upon the substrata caused by the weight of more and more vehicles. Yet, this is unheeded. Patching little bits here and there doesn't address the underlying problem. Increasing the commuter traffic in and out of the village only makes matters worse.

50. The Draft Plan could include an 'In Principle' stage within its process whereby development proposals are run past a Planning Officer for an 'In Principle' decision. If the proposal is clearly at odds with the policies applicable to the location concerned, and there is no mention of a special circumstance or social benefit or other valid redeeming feature, then the Plan-led approach to the proposal will result in rejection. This would avoid costly consultation procedures and wasted time for FDC, and minimise the community's emotionally draining involvement.

51. If there is something 'special', this could be discussed in more detail at a pre-app consultation and, because it strays from the policies, be set before the Committee to approve after public comments are received. This would require the proposer to include and justify the special reason(s) in the Design and Access Statement so that the project is fully understood and only relevant planning-valid comments would be accepted and considered.

52. The long-term consequences of allowing this current Draft Plan to become live are dire. Yes, most of the housing need will be directed to the four major towns. Some of the largest villages may well be able to cope and expand under the proposed policies. But the smallest villages in Fenland District Council's region will suffer greatly. The countryside

LP63: Residential site allocations in Tydd St Giles

will be vanquished in pursuit of profit; the collective health will decline rapidly; social division will be the norm; and, a dystopian society will have been born.

53. None are desirable. All are preventable. And prevention is better than cure.

LP63.01

Title:	Ms	Position:	Historic Environment Planning Adviser
First Name:	Debbie	Organisation:	Historic England
Surname:	Mack		
Comment	Neutral		
No comments			

LP64.01

Title:	Ms	Position:	Historic Environment Planning Adviser
First Name:	Debbie	Organisation:	Historic England
Surname:	Mack		
Comment	Neutral		
No comments			

Title:		Position:	
First Name:	Liam	Organisation:	Peter Humphrey Associates Ltd
Surname:	Lunn-Towler		
Comment	Support		
LP64.01 site is still available and deliverable. The Draft allocation is located in a sensible and deliverable part of Coldham.			
The land to the north is also available, therefore, the north development boundary can be moved north to be in line with the north boundary of 6 Bramley Court.			
<hr/>			

LP65: Residential site allocations in Collett's Bridge

Title:

Position:

First Name: Patricia and Gerry

Organisation:

Surname: Cuthbertson and Betts

Comment **Object**

The egress from this site is very dangerous with all traffic from Colletts Bridge Lane and Towpath Lane exiting onto Gosmoor Lane. The visibility at the junction is extremely poor, traffic from the A1101 often enters Gosmoor lane at speed and in the middle of the road. An additional potential of 20 cars would be disastrous. Collett's Bridge Lane is single track with no turning spaces. Access into the lane can be difficult if there are lorries on the road. Farm vehicles also use the Lane for access. Another obstacle.

Gosmoor Lane is used as rat run, short cut and race track, any traffic exiting onto it would be at risk. To exit onto Collett's Bridge would also be a risk and require the removal of the existing ancient field hedge which is a haven for wildlife.

Collett's Bridge Lane is used by walkers, dog walkers and runners. A building site would put them at risk and spoil a recreational facility.

The large lorries accessing the Fenmarc site on Gosmoor Lane take up both sides of the carriage way, leaving no space for the existing users of Collett's Bridge Lane, where would these additional vehicles exit safely?

Has any member of the consultation team visited Collett's Bridge, observed the traffic and viewed the proposed plot?

There are no services within easy access of Collett's Bridge Lane. My heart leapt with joy when I read that there was a bus service within a 5 minute walk, only to find that it had been discontinued over 20 years ago. The nearest buses are available at Emneth, 20 minutes walk away down a single track dangerous road without a footpath and Elm, similar road with the additional hazard of large lorries. No white lines down either road! 60 mph speed limit, often exceeded!

Your assumption is based on inaccurate information which calls into question the accuracy of the report in general!

Transport by car is the only way to reach shops and Wisbech town centre, at times this can take up to 40 minutes depending on the time it takes you to negotiate Elme Hall Roundabout.

Also frequent accident black spot, very dangerous junction at crossroads onto A1101.

Access to welfare and medical facilities are only achievable by car, particularly if children are concerned. There are no dedicated footpaths or cycleways. There is a pedestrian route to Elm via the towpath but this is not suitable for a day to day commute. Mainly recreational use.

Elm school is a good 20 minute walk away along a busy road with out a footpath frequented by large lorries and fast cars. It would not be safe to walk along there on your own never mind with a child or children. Once more transport by car would be required adding to the problems on the junction of Gosmoor Lane, A 1101 and Collett's Bridge Lane. According to my knowledge the school is full and any space would be taken up by children from the large development in Elm village currently being planned.

Although the plan states that there is no flood risk, the bottom of my garden which is adjacent to the proposed site is always wet and boggy throughout the winter months. During the heavy rain which we seem to be experiencing more frequently the road floods, a fact which I have reported to your Highways Department on more than one occasion. The land in question is waterlogged and marshy. Where will the excess water from 10 more houses go. The land cannot cope with the drain off it has normally. The land is currently at sea level.

There is a wide range of wildlife and bird life in Collett's Bridge Lane. From Kestrels, Buzzards, Sparrowhawks, down to all the smaller garden birds. We have frogs, toads, newts and grass snakes, a huge variety of butterflies and moths. In addition all the small and larger wild mammals like hedgehogs and deer. These are due to the diverse conditions in

LP65: Residential site allocations in Collett’s Bridge

and around the Lane. These would all be affected by any building program and disruption or removal of hedging/vegetation.

For a number of years planning permission has been sought for a small plot at the far end of the lane. This has been refused in the past, present and future. A member of the planning committee stated that any future requests would be thrown out. How could this plot be deemed suitable for the building of ten houses, when the previous plot was considered unsuitable? Surely all the reasons that applied to that one apply to this plot, multiplied by ten!

Title:		Position:	
First Name:	AJ	Organisation:	
Surname:	Bryant		
Comment	Support		
Sites 40361 was rejected during the assessment phase. I agree with the reasons given for rejection. I would further add that the unanimous decision of the FDC planning committee in April 22 to reject F/YR21/1536/O includes many further reasons to reject this site from the new local plan.			
Sites 40474 was rejected during the assessment phase. I agree with the reasons given for rejection. I would further add that the unanimous decision of the FDC planning committee in April 22 to reject F/YR21/1536/O includes many further reasons to reject this site from the new local plan.			

Title:		Position:	
First Name:	PJ	Organisation:	
Surname:	Bryant		
Comment	Support		
Sites 40474 was rejected during the assessment phase. I agree with the reasons given for rejection. I would further add that the unanimous decision of the FDC planning committee in April 22 to reject F/YR21/1536/O includes many further reasons to reject this site from the new local plan.			
Sites 40361 was rejected during the assessment phase. I agree with the reasons given for rejection. I would further add that the unanimous decision of the FDC planning committee in April 22 to reject F/YR21/1536/O includes many further reasons to reject this site from the new local plan.			

LP65: Residential site allocations in Collett’s Bridge

Title:		Position:
First Name:	AJ	Organisation:
Surname:	Bryant	

CommentSupport

Sites 40361 was rejected during the assessment phase. I agree with the reasons given for rejection. I would further add that the unanimous decision of the FDC planning committee in April 22 to reject F/YR21/1536/O includes many further reasons to reject this site from the new local plan.

Sites 40474 was rejected during the assessment phase. I agree with the reasons given for rejection. I would further add that the unanimous decision of the FDC planning committee in April 22 to reject F/YR21/1536/O includes many further reasons to reject this site from the new local plan.

LP65.01

Title:

Position:

First Name: Albert

Organisation:

Surname: Peacock

Comment **Object**

Not a suitable site for development. Blind corner. No pavements. HGV usage of Gosmoor Lane makes very dangerous exit. No buses. No school vacancy.

Title: Mr

Position:

First Name: PJ

Organisation:

Surname: Bryant

Comment **Object**

SHELAA 40137

Title:

Position:

First Name: AJ

Organisation:

Surname: Bryant

Comment **Object**

Please see attached document detailing my objection to the inclusion of SHELAA 40137 in LP65.01

Title:

Position:

First Name: Liam

Organisation: Peter Humphrey Associates Ltd

Surname: Lunn-Towler

Comment **Support**

LP65.01 site is still available and deliverable. The Draft allocation is located in a sensible and deliverable part of Collett's Bridge.

LP65.01

Title:	Mrs	Position:	
First Name:	C D	Organisation:	
Surname:	Brown		

Comment	Object
----------------	---------------

- | | |
|----------------------------|--|
| 1. Buses | |
| 2. Road / Access - traffic | |
| 3. Flooding | |
| 4. Schools | |
| 5. 10 houses = 20 cars | |
| 6. Pavements, cycle track? | |

Please see below:

1. Bus-stops apparently are a 5-minute walk away. Not sure where this bus stop would be, as the nearest stop is currently a 25 min walk to Elm, but if you are going to Emneth you need to cross the A1101 and it is still a 25 min walk to the bus-stop in Emneth. In addition to this, due to these being vehicular routes used by heavy lorries, farm machinery and speeding cars these roads have no pathways and nowhere to place a footpath.

2. Traffic is currently consistently heavy with HGV's frequently heading to the vegetable plant in Gosmoor Lane. Unsure of how the new housing would be given access as either lanes are just that LANES, which are not wide enough for two vehicles or a centre line. Gosmoor Lane is a heavily used road without including any HGV traffic, with the additional 10 new properties there will be at least a minimum of 20 cars adding to the congestion.

3. This parcel of land is constantly flooding due to drainage form other lanes and land. How is this to be dealt with, without a detrimental effect on these lanes and this land?

4. The point raise regarding the school is totally incorrect. At this moment in time the school is full and parents have to elect to have their children on a waiting list from birth. As the leading member of the church, I have dealings with the school and confirm this is true as both Emneth and Elm schools are full.

5. The section showing that pavements/footpaths and cycle ways will be constructed does not clearly show how the additional land is going to be obtained. Either side of Gosmoor Lane there are dykes which cannot be filled in as surely this would be in contravention of the Drainage Board.

6. Finally, if the building of a single property on the western side of Collett's Bridge Lane would I quote "...enclose this side of Collett's Bridge Lane from the open countryside beyond to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area and would arguably create a precedent for further development on the western side of Collett's Bridge Lane that would erode the existing open rural character this side." What has changed to allow 10 buildings?

LP65.01

Title: Mrs **Position:**

First Name: Shirley **Organisation:**

Surname: Kelvie

Comment **Object**

I fully support the submission made by Peter and Angie Bryant, with a few points of my own.

The junction of Colletts Bridge Lane and Gosmoor Lane is already quite precarious.

From Colletts Bridge Lane it's a blind bend. A danger for both vehicles and walkers & horse riders.

Title: **Position:**

First Name: Angela **Organisation:**

Surname: Bailey

Comment **Object**

I object to the plan for a development on the corner of Gosmoor Lane and Colletts Bridge Lane. Lp1 I object to the development in terms of access which is unsuitable for additional vehicles as Gosmoor lane is a narrow lane where HGVs straddle the white lines to gain access.

LP1.2 there are no pavements or services within 10-15 mins walk of local shops, public transport or schools.

There are 2 dikes parallel to the Gosmoor lane and near site, which prevent the lane being widened. These dikes are assumed to house water voles and as such should be protected.

The employment possibility in this area is hindered by the lack of cycling lanes and lack of pavements. It is at least 20 mins from any employers.

There are limited places at local schools and over subscribed Dentists and doctors in this area. More houses will overload these.

The site is can only bring more vehicles to this area and on already overloaded access roads there is a safety aspect hear that could potentially be hazardous where gaining and exiting Collecting Bridge Lane and the A1101.

Colletts Bridge Lane is a quite and well designed hamlet and this development could serve to ruin the quality of life of the people living here.

This area of the fenland has many hedges and fields which support wildlife, where birds life thrive, owls can be heard at night and flocks of sparrows can be seen in the hedgerows. A development here should seriously impact the character of the place.

The flood risk here is flood zone 1 and climate change is a factor to be considered here and would additional problem arise from more development?

This is grade 1 silt lane, prime growing land, which should be not be built on. A big loss to greenfield land.

LP65.01

Title:		Position:
First Name:	Michael	Organisation:
Surname:	Rolph	
Comment	Object	
This site is in a dangerous position, heavy goods traffic operates 24-7, also many other vehicles use this route as a rat run to avoid the constant traffic jams on the main road, mornings and night, it's increasing every day.		
I believe this is the lowest point in this area. All surplus water ends up here, with nowhere to go.		
A wildlife haven.		

Title:		Position:
First Name:	AJ	Organisation:
Surname:	Bryant	
Comment	Object	
SHELAA Site 40137		

LP65.01

Title:

Position:

First Name: Marie

Organisation:

Surname: Marker

Comment **Object**

I would like to object regarding the above plan in the area where myself and my family reside. We have chosen to live a nice quiet area away from the hustle of living in a built up area, this is why we live here and love it. To then learn that a proposed development of 10 properties so close to our lovely rural community has been applied for has filled us with dread. There really is no need for more properties around Colletts bridge lane.

1. We, as a community do not need further development so close to our homes, in general the area does not, and will never need anymore homes. It will spoil the whole area and could possibly devalue our homes.

2. There is no way the road or dangerous junctions could accommodate anymore traffic, the road from the lane is dangerous as it is now, when trying to pull out, I have myself had a few near misses. People travel in the middle of the road without knowing or caring that there will be other road users turning left or right, Another 10 homes with perhaps 2 cars per household is an extra 20 vehicles that this road cannot take. The lorries we have travelling to Fenmac 24 hours a day, 7 days a week as well as tractors and other farm vehicles everyday. Gosmoor Lane isn't wide enough for 2 vehicles and is dangerous for cars aswell as pedestrains, dog walkers etc; Bearing in mind there is no footpath on this road at all, it's far too dangerous to even contemplate adding more homes or traffic. There is no street lightning either, which again would cause more problems and perhaps crime too, we simply do not have the facilities to cope with more people, traffic and upheaval that this or any development would bring. All this should be taken into account when plans go in for any development.

3. There is no bus stop for over a mile and no school places as was previously stated in the local village

4. We are a small village and we are happy and settled with the way it is. We do not need anymore homes, people or cars to spoil the tranquility and way of life we have here. The site is used by beautiful wildlife presently and as they have no voice we find ourselves trying to protect them and their habitat too. Due to all of these as detailed above this development shouldn't be considered, it's a dangerous road as it is and needs no more residents. The current speed limit is 60mph, we would find ourselves in a very built up area and spoil the whole area should this go ahead.

Title: Ms

Position: Historic Environment Planning Adviser

First Name: Debbie

Organisation: Historic England

Surname: Mack

Comment **Neutral**

No comments. Comment - Is this address right?

LP65.01

Title:

Position:

First Name: Antony

Organisation:

Surname: West

Comment **Object**

Gosmoor Lane is a very narrow county lane- it is in constant use of HGV's to and from the Fenmarc site. This road is in poor condition has no pavement and no street lighting.

The land proposed constantly floods.

Building on this site will enclose Collett's Bridge Lane from the openness of the countryside and spoil the character and appearance of the area.

There is absolutely not a bus stop a five minute walk away, currently it is a 25 minute walk in Elm. The other bus stop is located in Emneth which is still a 25 minute walk and includes crossing the very busy A1101. This road is used by HGV lorries, farm vehicles and speeding cars. There are no footpaths and nowhere to place one.

The school is currently full and over a 20 minute walk away with most of the journey down Gosmoor lane with no footpath or street lighting.

Title:

Position:

First Name: Fay

Organisation:

Surname: Sutton

Comment **Object**

Highway Safety - Gosmoor lane is an already very dangerous road, i have walked down this road many times to get into the village and sometimes risk my life as there is no footpath along this road into the village and the road isn't wide enough for 2 cars to pass. You state there has to be "suitable vehicular access with footway/cycleway connectivity" which there is not, walking down this road is very danergous for example Lorries trying to pass to get to fenmarc and the road isn't wide enough.

Road Access: Collett's bridge lane joins onto Gosmoor lane at a corner and there has been numerous near misses as you are unable to see the oncoming traffic having more traffic using this road would result in more near misses and potetially a very dangerous accident.

As stated "this site is located in the catchment of a primary school which has spare capacity in every year" which is incorrect the primary school is currently full and with other plans in the village that have already been accepted the school will be unable to take any more children.

LP65.01

Title:

Position:

First Name: Sam

Organisation:

Surname: Sutton

Comment **Object**

Gormoor lane road is already in a very bad way there are numerous potholes and the side of the road is falling away due to the heavy use of lorries along this road - having vehicles will only add to this road becoming even more unsafe.

This road is heavily used for lorries going to FenMarc and traffic use it as a cut through at busy times and adding another potential 20 plus vehicles onto this road will again add to the road becoming even more unsafe.

We enter gosmoor lane at colletts Bridge Lane junction and this is already very dangerous as the road is narrow and the turning for the main road is not visible.

As stated "this site is located in the catchment of a primary school which has spare capacity in every year" this statement is incorrect as the school is already full. Also there is no safe way for children to get to and from school without parents having to use their car to drive them to and from the bus stop/school this only adds to the air pollution, children should be able to walk to school safely but this is just not viable where you are considering to build these homes. As there are no footpaths or street lights.

This proposed site is regularly flooded with surface water in periods of wet weather. Where will this water be diverted.

No public transport is available to this site. This would therefore require all homes to have more vehicles to access amenities such as shops and the school. As there is no safe way to get into the village on foot.

Title:

Position:

First Name: Will

Organisation:

Surname: Sutton

Comment **Object**

I really don't see how this site has progressed to this stage, given that three applications and three appeals have noted that this road is in an unsustainable area, there isn't any supporting infrastructure, no shops, no church, no community building, so basically, nothing!

LP65.01

Title:

Position:

First Name: Gloria

Organisation:

Surname: Peacock

Comment **Object**

Not within 5 minutes' walk of bus stop. No pavements, narrow Lane. To my knowledge school is full.

Where the access is from Colletts Bridge Lane, blind corner to left. I have been in an accident on this junction so speak from experience. Gosmoor Lane is used at peak times to avoid long tailbacks on A1101, there are HGV vehicles at all times of day and night (Fenmarc). During sugar beet season used as cut through to farms in Elm and Friday Bridge taking no notice of 'Not Suitable for HGVs' sign at top end of Gosmoor Lane. No footpaths result in vehicle and bicycle and pedestrian problems.

This site is unable to meet the goal of sustainable development, as a rejection was made a few months ago with a unanimous rejection of F/YR21 536/O. The plot in question is subject to regular surface water flooding – when we have heavy rain it is a natural run-off area for our lovely hamlet of Colletts Bridge Lane. Please let our hamlet remain as it is, a small lane leading on to Gosmoor Lane. Please no more development.

Title: Ms

Position: Parish Clerk

First Name: Suzanne

Organisation: Elm Parish Council

Surname: England

Comment **Object**

Collett's Bridge is a small hamlet with limited development, highways are unsafe for cyclists and pedestrians. Access to employment is not supported by transport services. Development on a site this size is therefore inappropriate.

LP65.01

Title: Mrs **Position:**

First Name: T M and Roy **Organisation:**

Surname: Colbourne and Payne

Comment **Object**

1. **Traffic** :- Gosmoor Lane and Colletts Bridge Lane, as their names suggest, are narrow roads (only wide enough for one vehicle) with no central marking, no foot paths, no street lighting and no passing bays. Gosmoor particularly takes the bulk of the traffic in the form of large HGVs using Fenmarc. The road is in bad state of repair, with steep camber, and is a danger to drive on. Not suitable for foot traffic. It is used as a cut through for people to get to the A1101 causing extra traffic. It is already hazardous to exit Colletts Bridge Lane, turning left or right, with poor visibility from overgrown hedges, of which there are many, and traffic approaching in the centre of the road. Without changes to the road extra traffic from the proposed development its an accident waiting to happen. Where is the exit and entrance to this site.?

2. **The site** that has been set for this development is prone to flooding what safety measures are in place to stop this happening?

3. **Facilities**:- What facilities would be provided? The school in Elm is already full to capacity, likewise Friday Bridge and Emneth. All the doctors surgeries in the surrounding areas are full. There is no bus service in Gosmoor Lane. The nearest is Elm village. Emneth or along the A1101, all of these are 20 mins walk away.

4. **Colletts Bridge** is deemed a Hamlet and has sufficient properties for its size. We are one of the smallest villages to be considered for development and if it should be passed the size would increase by a third, bringing with it extra cars causing problems for an already well used area.

Title: **Position:**

First Name: Gordon **Organisation:**

Surname: Cox

Comment **Object**

The road is dangerous. HGVs all night and day taking up most of the road. Traffic increasing from main road daily. A run-off for all water. Very bad lighting.

LP66: Residential site allocations in Newton

Title:	Councillor	Position:	
First Name:	Dave	Organisation:	Newton-in-the-Isle Parish Council
Surname:	Gibbs		

Comment Object

The Parish Council’s Planning Committee considered the Draft Local Plan at their meeting on 11 October and have a number of concerns regarding the potential impact of the plan on life in Newton-in-the-Isle.

Firstly, throughout the document, with a couple of exceptions, the name of our village has been abbreviated to Newton. Please ensure that the full name is used in every case.

Members were disappointed to see Newton-in-the-Isle categorised as a Small Village B alongside a selection of hamlets. In population terms, our village is out of kilter with this category.

The restrictive nature of the new proposed settlement boundary (Inset 18) and the shortage of available sites for future development will stifle the natural growth that is necessary for the long-term sustainability of the village. This is unacceptable. Paragraph 6.7 of the Draft Plan addresses this issue succinctly, thus: “However, it is also recognised that smaller communities should benefit from an appropriate level of growth to ensure their long-term sustainability.” The decision to define two separate settlement boundaries goes against everything the Parish Council is doing to unite the two ends of the village. A number of infill plots exist on the High Road in the central section of the village and these should be included within the settlement boundary. A more flexible approach to the settlement boundary is required and the Parish Council is keen to work with officers to consider all options to facilitate this.

The Environment Agency’s Flood Map for Planning at the eastern end of the village is not fit for purpose, based, as it appears, on two conflicting data sets. Environment Agency officers have confirmed that this is the case. For this reason, it should be disregarded in determining the suitability of individual sites. The development of site 40191 carries the highest priority for the Parish Council on road safety grounds, as it is the only means by which a footway may be created along this section of the B1165 at national speed limit. This route forms part of the circular walk around the village and also provides access to and from the village bus service for residents of the High Road.

In order to address the Council’s concerns, members request that a senior planning officer visits Newton-in-the-Isle to discuss the draft proposals in more detail and to consider site-specific issues within the general policies and the new hinterland provisions to provide the Parish Council with the clarity to advise residents and to fulfil its statutory obligation as a consultee on future applications.

LP66.01

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

Comment **Neutral**

Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, The Shrubberies listed at grade II lies to the south east of the site. However, given the intervening development, the impact on the heritage assets is likely to be minimal.

LP68.01

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

Comment Object

Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary the grade II listed Toll House lies immediately to the north of the site.

Any development of the site has the potential to impact the heritage asset and its setting. Therefore, we recommend you prepare an HIA. The recommendations of the HIA should then be used to inform the policy wording.

Suggested Change - Prepare an HIA and use findings to inform policy wording.

LP69: Residential site allocations in Tholomas Drove

Title:		Position:	Graduate Planner
First Name:	Isabel	Organisation:	Strutt & Parker
Surname:	Ede		

Comment **Neutral**

Land at Willock Farm, Tholomas Drove, Wisbech St Mary. SHEELA Ref: 40307

Strutt and Parker have prepared this representation for Strategic Assets on Behalf of Cambridgeshire County Council in its role of landowner.

This representation is a summary of the full Site Representation Report which has also been submitted as part of this consultation response, along with an updated Site Plan.

In Policy LP1, Tholomas Drove has been identified as a 'Small Village' (B) and as such sits as the lowest category in the settlement hierarchy. However, in line with the NPPF the development strategy recognises that growth is also required in rural communities to allow them to grow and thrive. The site has been partially allocated under Policy LP69: Residential site allocations in Tholomas Drove. The scale of the proposed original allocation was raised as a concern. In order to ensure that a more proportionate development which reflects the modest size of the existing settlement a small part of the Site was allocated. However, as set out in the above response to policy LP2 it is also important that the Plan should take every opportunity to allocate as many sites as possible. In this particular case there is the opportunity to allocate a slightly larger and more logical site as shown in the amended site plan below.

While it is acknowledged that the north east corner of this proposed allocation area would be in Flood Zone 2 it is not the intention that this part of the Site should be developed as it can be used as open space and to provide an area for biodiversity enhancement and additional tree planting. Including this land will form a more logical site boundary and allow an efficient use of the remainder of the Site to be achieved. While the total site area would be increased to 1.64ha, realistically the site would only be able to deliver a maximum of 30 dwellings. The area of land which it is proposed to exclude from the current allocation will represent a small narrow strip which will be difficult and less viable to farm in the future. As such it seems more logical that this land is included with the allocation.

By extending the boundary to the south east this will provide an opportunity for there to be a link to the existing public footpath creating a pedestrian route back to the village. This is considered to be an important benefit of providing an amended site area. Furthermore, this would also allow the village to development boundary to be drawn more logically and connect this part of the village with the main area to the south. It is therefore suggested that Policy LP69 should be amended to the following:

Development should provide:

- A suitable vehicle access;
- Connections to Public Footpaths 267/4
- An area of open space and biodiversity enhancement.
- An assessment of Flood Risk, which reflects the recommendations of the SFRA Level 2 assessment;

The Council will require the submission of sufficient information from the applicant to enable the completion of a project-level screening exercise under the Habitats Regulations Assessment process and, if that screening concludes that full Appropriate Assessment is needed, sufficient information to enable it to complete that Appropriate Assessment. This process will need to demonstrate that the development will not have a significant adverse effect on the integrity of the Nene Washes SAC, SPA and Ramsar.

Conclusions:

For the reasons set out above in respect of draft Local Plan Policy LP2 it is considered that further site allocations need to be made to secure sufficient housing development to support the objectives of the new Local Plan strategy and for

LP69: Residential site allocations in Tholomas Drove

the Plan to considered 'sound' at examination.

Tholomas Drove has been identified as a 'Small Village' (B) and as such sits as the lowest category in the settlement hierarchy. However the Local Plan acknowledges that it is important that rural communities have the opportunity to expand allowing them to grow and thrive.

The Site is located on the edge of the village. By expanding the allocation to the south will allow future development to link to the existing public footpath to deliver a safe and convenient access back into the village. It will also mean that the site can be developed more efficiently to deliver additional housing.

The Site could be delivered in the early years of the new Local Plan and is considered to be both deliverable and developable.

Accordingly, it is considered that Policy LP69 should be amended to include this slightly increased site allocation.

LP69.01

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

Comment Object

Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary the grade II listed eighteenth century Ripes House lies immediately to the north west of the site. The site, though screened by deciduous trees, would be very visible from the listed building in winter months.

Any development of the site has the potential to impact the heritage asset and its setting. Therefore, we recommend you prepare an HIA. The recommendations of the HIA should then be used to inform the policy wording.

We have concerns about development of the full extent of the site. Subject to the findings of the HIA, we suggest reducing the size of the site to the land opposite the other properties along the road frontage, leaving the land to the west and in front of the listed property open.

Suggested Changes

Prepare an HIA and use findings to inform policy wording.

We suggest reducing the size of the site to the land opposite the other properties along the road frontage, leaving the land to the west and in front of the listed property open.

Title:		Position:	
First Name:	Paul	Organisation:	
Surname:	Cannon		

Comment Object

I would like to object to the plans for building on land at Tholomas Drove the site in question has been pasture for many years at least 50, it is surrounded by trees and hedgerows that have been there for years that's full of wildlife I can think of three other locations on the Guyhirn side of Tholomas Drove which I'm sure would be more suitable. I will be speaking to Defra and Natural England about the site in question.

Title:		Position:	
First Name:	Stephen	Organisation:	
Surname:	Cobb		

Comment Object

This is farm land and therefore should be farmed whether it be agriculture or livestock. Like it has been for over 100 years.

BACK BRITISH FARMING

LP69.01

Title:		Position:	
First Name:	Clare	Organisation:	
Surname:	Lightfoot		
Comment	Object		
The roads are unable to cope with the amount of traffic as it is, my house shakes continuously because the road is so damaged, people speeding, more houses means more cars and more danger. Plus this is a village not a town, people move here for the countryside, if I wanted to live in a concrete city I would have stayed in Peterborough.			

Title:	Mrs	Position:	Parish Clerk & RFO
First Name:	Sarah	Organisation:	Wisbech St Mary Parish Council
Surname:	Bligh		
Comment	Neutral		
40307 Land at Willock Farm LP69.01			
The Parish Council raised no objections to this site but only based on the amount remaining at 10 dwellings as per the LP justification report.			