

**EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE
LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION**

**MATTER 15
SITE ALLOCATIONS –
LARGER VILLAGES**

**BLOOR HOMES EASTERN
ID: 983134**

WRITTEN STATEMENT

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Matter 2: Vision And Objectives And Development Strategy	2
Site Allocation: ISL.H4: Land off Fordham Road	2

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This Hearing Statement has been prepared by Carter Jonas LLP on behalf of Bloor Homes Eastern. Bloor Homes Eastern controls land off Fordham Road in Isleham including most of the site allocation Ref. ISL.H4. This Hearing Statement responds to the Inspector's Questions for this site only.
- 1.2 As set out in our representations to the Proposed Submission East Cambridgeshire Local Plan (ECLP), we support the proposed allocation of the site. A planning application (Ref. 18/00363/OUM) has been submitted for 125 dwellings on the majority of the allocated site; approximately 1.3Ha of land on the western edge of the site allocation ISL.H4 was not included within the application site. At the Planning Committee on 1st August 2018, the Council resolved to grant outline planning permission for the proposed development, subject to the completion of a S106 Agreement.

2. MATTER 2: VISION AND OBJECTIVES AND DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

Issue 1: Whether the proposed site allocations for the Large Villages of Bottisham, Burwell, Fordham, Haddenham, Isleham, Little Downham, Stretham, Sutton and Witchford are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

Site Allocation: ISL.H4: Land off Fordham Road, Isleham

Question 61. Taking each of the following proposed site allocations individually:

a) What is the background to the site allocation? How was it identified and which options were considered?

- 2.1 The site was assessed in the Site Assessment Evidence Report [Doc Ref. PE13] – see Site Ref. 13/03. The main findings and recommendations of the assessment state that *“the site is accessible and has few constraints to development. It is therefore considered suitable for housing development”*. As set out in Bloor Homes Eastern’s representations to Site Allocation ISL.H4, we agreed with the findings for most of the topics in the site assessment, and it is noted that for most of the assessment criteria the site scores A to C. We commented on the findings where it was considered amendments should be made. The accessibility by cycling should have been included in the assessment of the proximity to medical services. The availability of school bus services should have been included in the assessment of proximity to secondary schools. The capacity of the primary school has been discussed, and an option exists to relocate the existing early year’s facility to create more capacity; land for an early year’s facility is included within the proposed development at ISL.H4. The Ground Conditions/Contaminated Land Assessment demonstrates that contamination is not a constraint to development at the site. The site is adjacent to the Conservation Area, and the Built Heritage Statement demonstrates the designated and non-designated heritage assets adjacent to and in the vicinity of the site would not be harmed by the proposed development. The Desk Based Archaeological Assessment demonstrates that the site has a low potential for archaeological assets; further archaeological work is subject to a planning condition for the proposed development so that any archaeological remains at the site are recorded. The Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment demonstrates that the site can accommodate development, and the proposed development includes landscape buffers and additional planting.
- 2.2 Therefore, the site was subject to a detailed assessment of the constraints in order to determine whether it should be allocated. A number of sites were assessed in Isleham, and those sites where no significant constraints to development exist are allocated. Isleham is one of the largest villages in East Cambridgeshire and it contains a good range of services and facilities, and as such it is entirely appropriate to allocate development sites in Isleham.

b) How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?

- 2.3 A Transport Assessment has been prepared for the proposed development, and was submitted with the planning application for 125 dwellings (Ref. 18/00363/OUM). The Transport Assessment assessed the capacity of the highway network and junctions in the vicinity of the site, and demonstrated that the proposed development would have no impact. As part of the planning application process, the County Council’s Transport Team acknowledged that the proposed development would have no detrimental impact on highway capacity or road safety, and raised no objection.

c) What is the scale type/mix of uses proposed?

- 2.4 A planning application (Ref. 18/00363/OUM) has been submitted for 125 dwellings on the majority of the allocated site. The remainder of the allocation - approximately 1.3Ha of land on the western edge of the site adjacent to Halls Barn Road Industrial Estate - was not included within the application site, but is suitable for additional residential development; this site was retained by the landowner. The proposed development includes dwellings, land reserved for nursery use (Use Class D1), open space, and play areas.

- 2.5 The proposed development would deliver 30% affordable housing. The affordable housing mix will be set out in the S106 Agreement that is currently being drafted. The proposed development would provide a mix of house sizes, and the indicative housing mix suggested through the planning application process was as follows: 22% one/two bedroom; 32% three bedroom; 36% four bedroom; and, 10% five plus bedroom dwellings. The proposed development also includes a proportion of self-build plots and bungalows.

d) What is the basis for this and is it justified?

- 2.6 The quantum of development was informed by the character of the surrounding area and the neighbouring uses, and the need to include landscape buffers between the proposed development and neighbouring residential properties. The proposed development includes areas of open space and an extension to the recreation ground. The land available for built development is 4.2Ha. The proposed development of 125 dwellings would result in a net density of 30 dwellings per hectare, which is appropriate for a larger village and reflects the character of Isleham.

e) What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and completions/construction?

- 2.7 A planning application (Ref. 18/00363/OUM) has been submitted for 125 dwellings on the majority of the allocated site. At the Planning Committee on 1st August 2018, the Council resolved to grant outline planning permission for the proposed development, subject to the completion of a S106 Agreement. The S106 Agreement is currently being drafted. The description of the proposed development is as follows:

“Outline planning permission with all matters reserved except for access for the erection of up to 125 dwellings including affordable housing, land to be reserved for nursery use (Use Class D1), open space including an extension to the recreation ground, play areas, sustainability drainage features and associated infrastructure including foul sewage pumping station.”

f) What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

- 2.8 The proposed development would provide housing and affordable housing, a mix of house types and sizes, and includes both self-build plots and bungalows, all of which represent benefits. The proposed development includes an extension to the existing recreation area to provide space for additional sports pitches, which represents a benefit for the village. The proposed development includes land for an early year's facility, which is provided to enable the existing early year's facility at Isleham Primary School to relocate. The relocation of the existing early year's facility would enable the capacity of the primary school to be increased. The provision of land for an early year's facility and the opportunity to increase capacity at the primary school represent benefits of the proposed development.

g) How does the site relate to nearby uses?

- 2.9 The neighbouring uses to the site comprise residential, employment and recreation areas. The proposed development includes landscape buffers to maintain separation with the existing dwellings and industrial buildings. There is no record of noise issues associated with current industrial units at Hall Barn Road Industrial Estate. The planning permission for additional industrial units at site includes a planning condition to limit noise levels and agree noise mitigation measures.

h) What are the potential adverse impacts of developing the sites, including to heritage assets? How could they be mitigated?

- 2.10 The site was assessed in the Site Assessment Evidence Report [Doc Ref. PE13] and no adverse impacts were identified. A planning application has been submitted for 125 dwellings on the majority of the allocated site. The planning application was subject to consultation with statutory consultees, and no significant adverse impacts were identified for the proposed development. The Planning Committee resolved to grant planning permission for the proposed development. A S106 Agreement is currently being drafted, which in due course will include planning obligations to mitigate the impact of the proposed development.
- 2.11 The site is not within the Isleham Conservation Area, but the eastern boundary of the site lies adjacent to it. The Isleham Conservation Area covers the majority of the village's historic core to the north-east. There are no

designated or non-designated built heritage assets within the site. There are a number of Grade I and Grade II listed buildings and several non-designated built heritage assets within Isleham. A Built Heritage Statement has been prepared for the site, which demonstrates the designated and non-designated heritage assets adjacent to and in the vicinity of the site would not be harmed by the proposed development.

i) How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

- 2.12 A Flood Risk Assessment has been prepared for the proposed development. The site is located within Flood Zone 1, which means it has a low probability of flooding. The proposed development will include an appropriate surface water management system, comprising swales and attenuation basins.

j) What are the infrastructure requirements/ costs and are there physical or other constraints to development? How would these be addressed and are they directly related to, necessary and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development?

- 2.13 A S106 Agreement is currently being drafted to mitigate the impact of the proposed development.

k) In particular is there an issue with waste water treatment capacity and how would any issues be resolved?

- 2.14 Not applicable.

l) Is the site realistically viable and deliverable?

- 2.15 Yes. The site is controlled by a housebuilder. The proposed development would provide 30% affordable housing which complies with policy requirements.

m) What is the expected timescale and rate of development and is this realistic?

- 2.16 It is anticipated that outline planning permission for the proposed development will be issued shortly. Once the decision notice has been issued the next stages will be to discharge the relevant conditions and submit reserved matters. The proposed development would be completed within the 5 year period.

n) Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary?

- 2.17 The site boundary for the allocation is appropriate.

o) Are the detailed policy requirements clear and unambiguous, effective, justified and consistent with national policy? Is it appropriate to defer within the policy to the 'principles established by consented schemes...'?

- 2.18 Yes.

p) Is the terminology used within the relevant site specific policy consistent and clear, for example, 'concept plan'?

- 2.19 Yes.

