

PART B: REPRESENTATION

Please repeat your Name or Organisation:

MRS ROSEMARY WILKINSON

3. Did you submit representations on the Proposed Submission Version of the Core Strategy during the public consultation (28 th February – 10 th April 2013)?	Yes:	
	No:	(please go to Q6)
	Don't know	(please go to Q6)

4. Did you submit a representation relating to the North-East March Allocation (in Policy CS9 – March)?	Yes:	
	No:	N/A

5. If you submitted representations on the North-East March Allocation, do you want the comments you make below to replace those previously made (in so far as they relate to the North-East March amendments)?	Yes:	
	No:	N/A

6. Do you support the amendments to the Proposed Submission Version as set out in the Addendum relating to North-East March?	Yes:	
	No:	✓

7. With the addition of the amendments in the Addendum do you consider that the Fenland Core Strategy is legally compliant?	Yes:	
	No:	✓

8. With the addition of the amendments in the Addendum do you consider that the Fenland Core Strategy is sound?	Yes:	
	No:	✓

9. If you consider the Fenland Core Strategy with the addition of the amendments in the Addendum is not sound, please identify your reason(s) for this by ticking the appropriate box(es). Please see the Guidance Notes to help you decide.

In my opinion, the Core Strategy is not:

Positively prepared: Justified: Effective: Consistent with national policy:

10. Please use the box below to set out your reasoning behind your response to Q7, Q8 and/or Q9.

I DO NOT FEEL THAT THE AMENDMENTS IN THE ADDENDUM ARE LEGALLY COMPLIANT AS THEY WERE DECIDED ALMOST AT THE LAST MINUTE BEFORE THE APPROPRIATE MEETING. THE COUNCIL HAD ORIGINALLY INCLUDED THE NORTH EAST ALLOCATION INTO THE CORE STRATEGY, THEN REMOVED IT AFTER IT HAD BEEN INITIALLY AGREED UPON. THE MAIN OBJECTORS WHO INITIATED PUBLIC PETITION AGAINST THE NORTH EAST ALLOCATION APPEARED TO WANT THE DELETION OF THE ESTOVER PLAYING FIELD. WHILST I FEEL THAT IT WOULD BE WRONG TO BUILD ON THE PLAYING FIELD, I BELIEVE THAT IT WAS UNNECESSARY

Continue on extra sheets/expand box if necessary

CONTINUED ON EXTRA SHEET

CONTINUED . . .

10.

TO REMOVE THE ENTIRE ALLOCATION, A SMALLER DEVELOPMENT ~~TO~~ AS AN EXTENSION OF THE EXISTING HOUSING DEVELOPMENT (BERRYFIELDS) WOULD SURELY BE OF A MORE DESIRABLE COMPROMISE. THIS WOULD THEREFORE REQUIRE THIS AREA TO BE RE-INSTATED INTO THE ALLOCATION, LEAVING ESTOVER PLAYING FIELD AS GREEN AREA. SURELY THIS WOULD HAVE BEEN A SOUNDER ADMENDMENT THAN REMOVING THE WHOLE AREA.

HAVING BUSINESS INTERESTS IN MARCH I HAVE FOLLOWED THE DEBATES VIA OPEN FORUMS SUCH AS "FREE VOICE MARCH" ETC. I AM APPALLED AT THE WAY TWO MAIN INDIVIDUALS CAN "RAILROAD" PUBLIC OPINION AND ULTIMATELY FORCE COUNCILLORS TO CHANGE SOMETHING THAT IS ALREADY AGREED UPON. IN MY OPINION A SMALLER DEVELOPMENT SIMILAR TO BERRYFIELDS WOULD BE THE WAY FORWARD, IT WOULD APPEASE PUBLIC OPPOSITION TO LARGE SCALE DEVELOPMENTS. IT WOULD ENCOURAGE FAMILIES INTO THE TOWN WHICH IN TURN WOULD GENERATE MUCH NEEDED REVENUE FOR EXISTING TOWN BUSINESSES. THIS AREA TO THE NORTH OF THE TOWN HAS GOOD ACCESS TO THE STATION AND PRIMARY SCHOOLS. IT WOULD ALSO RELIEVE CONGESTION IN THE TOWN CENTRE AS TRAFFIC COULD LEAVE MARCH VIA ELM ROAD AND LINK UP TO A141/A47 ETC.

11. If you think that the Fenland Core Strategy (with Addendum) needs further changes, please set out what you consider the change(s) should be to make it legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

THE AREA WHICH INCLUDES THE ESTOVER ROAD PLAYING FIELD SHOULD BE DELETED FROM THE ALLOCATION.

THE REMAINING LAND TO THE NORTH OF THIS AREA SHOULD BE RE-INSTATED / RE-ALLOCATED THEREBY ALLOWING DEVELOPMENTS OF SMALLER AREAS, WHICH WOULD BE CONTINUATIONS OF EXISTING HOUSING AREAS (BERRYFIELDS).

Continue on extra sheets/expand box if necessary

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation. After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

12. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the forthcoming public examination (or can it be considered by written representations)?

NO, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination:

✓

YES, I wish to participate at the oral examination:

13. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

Continue on extra sheets/expand box if necessary

Please note that the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Please make sure you have signed and dated the front page of the form