

EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Inspector: Miss Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI
Programme Officer: Hannah Charlish
Email: Programme.Officer@eastcambs.gov.uk
Tel: 07920 160203

EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

INSPECTOR'S MATTERS, ISSUES, AND QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION AT THE EXAMINATION HEARINGS

VERSION 1

The Hearings Programme may be updated. Please ensure that you check the latest position if you wish to attend a particular hearing by contacting the Programme Officer or viewing it on the website at www.eastcambs.gov.uk.

Please remind yourself of the guidance concerning the format of the hearing at this Examination, contained in the Inspector's Guidance Note.

I have split the examination of the Local Plan into stages. These questions relate to STAGE 2 of the hearings.

Please note that references to relevant planning policies are not exhaustive. There may be other policies which are related or linked.

Please be aware since the last hearing sessions took place in June 2018 I wrote to the Council on the 30th of July (ED031). The Council responded to my letter on Friday 3rd August 2018 (ED032).

Please familiarise yourselves with the contents of both letters.

EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Inspector: Miss Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI
Programme Officer: Hannah Charlish
Email: Programme.Officer@eastcambs.gov.uk
Tel: 07920 160203

Matter 5: Highway, transport, infrastructure and community facilities provision and developer contributions

Issue 1: Whether the approach to identifying and delivering the requisite infrastructure to support the development objectives of the plan is fully justified, based on up-to-date and reliable evidence, deliverable, positively prepared and consistent with national policy?

Relevant policies- LP16, LP17, LP18, LP19, LP20, LP21, LP30 and settlement specific policies

1. Is the Infrastructure Investment Plan (PE12) sufficiently up-to-date and complete to provide an effective understanding of the infrastructure which is required to support the Local Plan? What are the implications of the delivery of the plan for all forms of infrastructure, including outside the district? How will improvements and any new infrastructure required be funded and delivered and by whom and when? What impact will this have on the timing and viability of the delivery of proposed developments (reference should be made to individual sites under Matters 14 and 15)?
2. Is there appropriate certainty, and evidence that adequate levels of school, health, transport, flood, water related, green, social and other infrastructure provision will be provided in a timely fashion and at appropriate suitably accessible locations, so as to support the delivery of the growth proposed within the Local Plan?
3. Should planned essential specific infrastructure be identified on the Policies Map?
4. Overall, what mechanisms will be in place to ensure essential/critical infrastructure will be provided and delivered in a timely fashion? How will other organisations be involved in delivering infrastructure and what commitments to delivery/ funding, and on-going maintenance are in place?
5. Specifically, are the various Infrastructure and Community Facilities policies which relate to each settlement, together with Policy LP19, justified by evidence, effective and viable? Is it clear on what basis the provision of such infrastructure would be required and how any such infrastructure would be delivered?
6. Are policies LP17 and LP18 worded in such a way as to be, effective, accurate, consistent with national policy and realistic? What is the significance, if any, of the rural nature of the district to the delivery of both policies?

EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Inspector: Miss Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI
Programme Officer: Hannah Charlish
Email: Programme.Officer@eastcamb.gov.uk
Tel: 07920 160203

7. Are the policies of the Local Plan which require developer contributions effective and consistent with the CIL regulations in relation to the provision of financial or contributions in kind?
8. Is it appropriate to refer within a policy to documents which are not statutory planning documents, such as Supplementary Planning Documents?

Matter 6: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Relevant Policies- LP8, LP11, LP12, LP14, LP15, LP22, LP27, LP28 and other site specific policies

Issue 1: Whether the Plan provides a positive framework relating to the historic environment consistent with Paragraph 126 of the Framework and whether the policies of the Plan are effective, justified, and consistent with its objectives?

9. I will consider site specific matters in relation to individual sites later. However, as a broader issue, has the Council appropriately considered the historic environment in its allocation of sites and its policies? In particular, is Policy LP28 justified, effective and consistent with national policy with reference to the impact of development on views of Ely Cathedral and the '*general visual distinctiveness of Ely.*'
10. Is the correct nomenclature relating to various elements of the historic environment used throughout the Plan, and does its wording accurately reflect the statutory duties vis a vis the historic environment?
11. Is the Plan, and are the generic and site specific policies within the Plan justified by up-to-date evidence relating to the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats? Should there be a specific policy relating to heritage assets most at risk? If so, how should it be phrased?
12. Do the policies of the plan, with reference to the historic environment give a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal?
13. Should all criteria based policies make reference to '*heritage assets*'?
14. Is the level of detail set out within the individual site allocations relating to designated and non-designated heritage assets justified and based on evidence, and has this evidence adequately informed the allocation of sites, and any site specific policies?

EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Inspector: Miss Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI
Programme Officer: Hannah Charlish
Email: Programme.Officer@eastcambs.gov.uk
Tel: 07920 160203

Matter 7: Promoting healthy communities, design, natural environment and green infrastructure

Relevant Policies-, LP20, LP21 and LP22 (Appendix B), LP26, LP28, LP29, LP30, Soham13, Witchford6 and others

Issue 1: Whether the Local Plan is justified, effective and consistent with national policy in relation to its approach towards promoting healthy communities, requiring good design and enhancing and conserving the natural environment?

15. What are the implications of the revised Habitats Regulation Assessment (CD13A) on the detailed wording of Policy LP20, LP30 and other consequential potential amendments to the Plan.
16. Are Policies LP20 and LP30 flexible, justified, and worded in such a manner as to be effective? What impact will it have on the viability of developments, and is it consistent with national policy?
17. Is Policy LP21 positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy? In particular, are the standards referred to within Appendix A justified by up-to-date evidence and is it clear how the policy will be implemented?
18. Are the locally derived parking standards contained within Appendix B of the Local Plan effective, justified and suitably flexible?
19. Is the wording of Policy LP22 effective and consistent with national policy? How does it relate to the individual settlement specific 'Local Character/ and Facilities' policies? Is the wording of these policies effective, justified and consistent with national policy? Is there duplication between these and Policy LP22 and will this lead to a lack of clarity in determining applications?
20. Is a voluntary approach to the provision of Health Impact Assessments consistent with creating healthy, inclusive communities?
21. Would the requirement to seek developer contributions towards improved or new health facilities, or other facilities or resources, such as green infrastructure result in 'double dipping'? Is the approach consistent with CIL Regulations in relation to the provision of financial or other contributions in kind?

EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Inspector: Miss Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI
 Programme Officer: Hannah Charlish
 Email: Programme.Officer@eastcamb.gov.uk
 Tel: 07920 160203

22. Is the wording of Policy LP26 effective, and is the policy justified by technical evidence and consistent with national policy with particular reference to the use of mechanical ventilation?
23. Is it appropriate to refer within a policy to documents which are not statutory planning documents, such as Supplementary Planning Documents?
24. Is the designation of Local Green Spaces, as set out below, justified by evidence, effective and consistent with national policy? The designation of an area of land as Local Green Space confers significant protection. Is the Council satisfied in each case below that the proposed allocation can be justified? Please set out in detail, why this is considered to be the case and draw on any relevant representations.

ASH.LGS1	Wavier Pond, Church Street
BOT.LGS1	Ancient Meadows
BR1.LGS1	Beechcroft Field
BUR.LGS1	Pauline Swamp
KIR.LGS1	Kirtling Playing Field
KIR.LGS2	Cricket Pitch
NFR.LGS1	Peterhouse Drive
REA.LGS1	The Hythe
STU.LSG1	Stutney Play Area
SUT.LGS1	Recreation Ground, off the Brook
SUT.LGS2	Old Recreation Ground, Lawn Lane
SWP.LGS1	Playing Field, High Street
SWP.LGS2	Coopers Green, Green Head Road
WFD.LGS1	Victoria Green
WFD.LGS2	Millennium Wood
WFD.LGS3	Manor Road
WFD.LGS4	Between Field End and Wheats Close
WFD.LGS5	Broadway
WFD.LGS6	Common Road
WFD.LGS7	Horse Meadow, Main Street

EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Inspector: Miss Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI
Programme Officer: Hannah Charlish
Email: Programme.Officer@eastcambs.gov.uk
Tel: 07920 160203

25. Is the designation of land as a Green Wedge, and the related policy
Withford6: Green Wedges, justified, and consistent with national policy?
What is the difference between a Green Wedge and Local Green Space?

EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Inspector: Miss Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI
Programme Officer: Hannah Charlish
Email: Programme.Officer@eastcambs.gov.uk
Tel: 07920 160203

Matter 8: Flood risk and water management

Relevant Policies- LP23, and LP25

Issue 1: Whether the policies relating to flood risk and wider water management issues are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

26. Is the application of the Optional Technical Housing Standard for water efficiency justified and consistent with national policy?
27. To what extent is Policy LP25 effective and realistic in mitigating, and militating against flood risk, including the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage systems?
28. Is Policy LP25 based on up-to-date evidence and worded in such a way as to be effective and both internally, and regionally consistent? How has the Water Cycle Study influenced the policies and strategy of the Plan and what is the implication of the recently produced Addendum to the Water Cycle Study (PE17A) on the wording of the policies?

Matter 9: Building a strong, competitive economy.

Issue 1: Whether the plan has been positively prepared and whether it is justified, effective and consistent with national policy in relation to its approach towards building a strong and competitive economy?

Relevant policies- ELY.M5, LP8, LP14, LP15

Employment Land Provision

29. Is the provision and distribution of employment sites consistent with the Council's development strategy? Individual site allocations are considered within the relevant settlement policy.
30. How has the Lancaster Way Enterprise Zone been taken into account in overall employment land provision?
31. Is the approach set out in Policy LP8 effective, particularly in terms of flexibility and is it justified and consistent with national policy? Does the policy satisfy Paragraph 154 of the Framework? In particular, is the terminology clear?

Other land in Employment (B1, B2 or B8) Uses

32. Is the policy overly restrictive and how will it be implemented?

EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Inspector: Miss Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI
Programme Officer: Hannah Charlish
Email: Programme.Officer@eastcamb.gov.uk
Tel: 07920 160203

New employment development in the countryside

33. With reference to new employment development in the countryside what is meant by the phrase, '*built framework of a settlement*'? What is the basis and justification for the definition of small scale development at less than 500 square metres? How does the policy relate to conversions and is the policy consistent with national policy?

Town centre vitality and viability

34. How do the two policies support the future viability and viability of Ely town centre, and other centres, in a positive manner consistent with the policies of the Framework?
35. Is it clear what is meant by a 'main town centre use'? Is the strategy relating to 'main town centres uses' in the Main Settlements, the Large Villages, Medium and Small Villages justified by an up-to-date evidence base and does it provide sufficient clarity? What is the justification to differentiate the approach between Ely and Octagon Park and the rest of the district?
36. In particular, how has the proposed development at Octagon Park and its potential impact on patterns of retailing elsewhere within the district been considered? Is it envisaged that its role is to provide capacity for large format bulky goods which could not be located within the main town centre? If so, is this reflected within policy?
37. Does the wording of Policy LP14 provide a clear, spatially distinctive approach to where main town centre uses would be appropriate and where the sequential test would be triggered for developments over 280 square metres? What is the justification for the figure of 280 square metres? How can a '*clear localised need*' be demonstrated?
38. On what basis have the boundaries of the defined town centres, and the extent and location of the Primary and Secondary Frontages, been drawn?
39. To what extent is the wording of the criteria set out in Policy LP15 consistent with the Framework which requires that policies make clear which uses will be permitted in areas defined as primary and secondary frontages? Is the policy suitably flexible to enable the long term vitality and viability of the district's centres? What is the justification for the figure of 200 square metres within Policy LP15?
40. Does the Local Plan provide adequate flexibility for small scale supporting uses within employment areas?

EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Inspector: Miss Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI
Programme Officer: Hannah Charlish
Email: Programme.Officer@eastcambs.gov.uk
Tel: 07920 160203

Matter 10: Equine related activity

Relevant Policies- LP9, LP10, LP11 and LP12

Issue 1: Whether the Local Plan has been positively prepared and whether it is justified, effective and consistent with national policy in relation to the approach towards the horse racing industry, equine sports and recreation?

41. Are the policies of the Plan consistent with national policy, effective and justified in the context of the horse racing industry? How could the policies of the plan be more flexible and make greater provision for the equine industry and other horse related developments without undermining the wider objective of the Local Plan and remaining consistent with national policy?

Matter 11: Strengthening communities

Relevant Policies- LP6

Issue 1: Whether the Local Plan has been positively prepared and whether it is justified, effective and consistent with national policy in relation to the approach towards the provision of housing and affordable housing.

42. Given the Council has used a standard housing method to set its housing requirement, and my initial findings set out in my letter of the 30th of July (ED031), should reference continue to be made to the housing needs of the Cambridge Sub- Region? How is the Council to ensure a justified and appropriate mix of housing is identified, and the delivery of a wide range of tenures and specialist housing, throughout the lifetime of the Plan?

Affordable housing

43. What are the trends in the delivery of affordable housing and has it been delivered?
44. What is the evidence in relation to the viability of delivering affordable housing as part of market housing? Is the differentiation between the 30% affordable housing for all of the district, other than Soham and Littleport at 20%, justified by viability assessments? Is the wording of this element of the policy effective?
45. Is the approach to the mix of tenures justified, should reference be made to building for rent?
46. Is the approach sufficiently flexible, particularly in terms of the effect on viability and the potential for off-site contributions?

EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Inspector: Miss Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI
Programme Officer: Hannah Charlish
Email: Programme.Officer@eastcambs.gov.uk
Tel: 07920 160203

47. Is the affordable housing element justified and consistent with national policy?

Dwellings with Higher Access standards

48. What is the justification to require all housing within the district to be built to Building Regulations Part M (Vol 1) Category 2? Is there a quantified need and how does this requirement impact on the viability of housing and its deliverability? Is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?

Self- Build Homes

49. What is the justification for the 100 dwelling plus threshold set for self-build housing? Is such an approach justified, effective and consistent with national policy? What are the practical implications? Is the wording of the policy effective?

Homes for older people

50. Is the wording of this element of Policy LP6 effective, clear and consistent with national policy? How does the occupancy of a development influence the visual impact of a proposal? How can a more positive approach be set out?

Residential care accommodation

51. Is the wording of this element of Policy LP6 effective, clear and consistent with national policy? How will the contribution of such communal accommodation to the housing supply be calculated?

Hybrid schemes for older people

52. How would such schemes be determined under the policies of the Local Plan?

Homes for Permanent Caravan Dwellers/ Park homes

53. Is the wording of the policy effective? Does it mean that the caravan dweller must not travel, or that the caravan never moves? Would it be appropriate for this policy to be expanded to provide sites which would be suitable for the needs of former gypsies and travellers who no longer meet the definition of gypsy and traveller set out in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites?

EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Inspector: Miss Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI
Programme Officer: Hannah Charlish
Email: Programme.Officer@eastcambs.gov.uk
Tel: 07920 160203

Provision of sites on which caravans can be stationed

54. Following my initial findings, how is the Council going to ensure that it adequately makes provision for the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district, with respect to the provision of sites for caravans? What is the scale of need for people not meeting the definition in the PPTS, yet who would require the provision of sites? How will this need be addressed to enable a five year supply of deliverable sites, and to identify broad locations which may be appropriate?

Matter 12: Community-led development

Relevant Policies-, LP3, LP5, LP31, HAD.H1, STR.H1 and KEN.M1.

Issue 1: Whether the policies relating to community-led development are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

55. What is the justification to treat community-led development differently to other development that comes forward and to preclude other development models? On what planning basis is there a 'presumption in favour' of community led development? Is this approach consistent with national planning policy?
56. Is it appropriate to refer within a policy to documents which are not statutory planning documents, such as Supplementary Planning Documents? Is the approach of Policy LP5 consistent with Paragraph 204 of the Framework and Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010?
57. Is it justified and consistent with national policy that development sites be excluded from within a settlement boundary so that they can be brought forward as community-led development?

Matter 13: Development in the countryside.

Issue 1: Whether the plan has been positively prepared and whether it is justified, effective and consistent with national policy in relation to its approach towards development in the countryside?

Relevant policies- LP3, LP31, LP32

Development in the countryside

58. Is Policy LP31, and the approach to rural development, as set out in Parts A- H inclusive, justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Inspector: Miss Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI
Programme Officer: Hannah Charlish
Email: Programme.Officer@eastcambs.gov.uk
Tel: 07920 160203

59. What is the justification for the parameters set out in Policy LP32? Are they consistent with national policy? How does the policy reflect local circumstances and is it sufficiently flexible so as to be effective?

EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Inspector: Miss Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI
Programme Officer: Hannah Charlish
Email: Programme.Officer@eastcamb.gov.uk
Tel: 07920 160203

Matter 14: Proposed site allocations- Main Settlements

Relevant Policies- LP3, site allocations and relevant development management policies

Issue 1: Whether the proposed site allocations for the Main Settlements of the City of Ely, Littleport and Soham are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

60. Taking each of the following proposed site allocations individually:

Ely

ELY.H1	Land off Lynn Road
ELY.H2	Land at Barton Road Car Park
Ely.H3	Former depot, Lisle Lane
ELY.M1	North Ely
ELY.M2	The Grange, Nutholt Lane
ELY.M3	Paradise Area, off Nutholt Lane
ELY.M4	Station Gateway
ELY.M5	Octagon Business Park, Angel Drove
ELY.M6	Princess of Wales Hospital
ELY.E1	Ely Road and Rail Distribution Centre, Queen Adelaide Way
ELY.E2 (a-c)	Lancaster Way Business Park
ELY.L1	Downham Road sports and leisure hub

Littleport

LIT.H1	Old Station Goods Yard, Station Road
LIT.H2	Highfield Farm, Ely Road
LIT.H3	Land north east of 5 Back Lane
LIT.H4	Field west of 1B Upton Lane
LIT.H5	Land west of Highfields
LIT.M1	West of Woodfen Road
LIT.M2	Land south of Grange Lane
LIT.E1	Land north of Wisbech Road Business Park
LIT.E2	Land west of 150 Wisbech Road

EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Inspector: Miss Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI
Programme Officer: Hannah Charlish
Email: Programme.Officer@eastcambs.gov.uk
Tel: 07920 160203

EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Inspector: Miss Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI
 Programme Officer: Hannah Charlish
 Email: Programme.Officer@eastcamb.gov.uk
 Tel: 07920 160203

Soham

SOH.H1	Land off Brook Street
SOH.H2	Land at 117 Mereside
SOH.H3	Land rear of 23-49 Fordham Road
SOH.H4	Land off Fordham Road
SOH.H5	Land south of Blackberry Lane
SOH.H6	Land north of Blackberry Lane
SOH.H7	Land west of The Cherry Tree PH, Cherrytree Lane
SOH.H8	Land parcel east of 2 The Shade
SOH.H9	Land south of Cherrytree Lane, West of Orchard Row
SOH.H10	Land off Kingfisher Drive
SOH.H11	Land at Northfield Road
SOH.H12	Land to rear of 7 and 7A Townsend
SOH.H13	Soham Health Centre, Pratt Street
SOH.H14	90 Paddock Street
SOH.H15	Grassed Area Opposite 2 The Shade
SOH.M1	Eastern Gateway
SOH.M2	Land north west of The Shade School
SOH.M3	Land off Station Road
SOH.E1	Land east of A142 bypass

- a) What is the background to the site allocation? How was it identified and which options were considered?
- b) How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?
- c) What is the scale type/mix of uses proposed?
- d) What is the basis for this and is it justified?
- e) What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and completions/construction?
- f) What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?
- g) How does the site relate to nearby uses?
- h) What are the potential adverse impacts of developing the sites, including to heritage assets? How could they be mitigated?

EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Inspector: Miss Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI
Programme Officer: Hannah Charlish
Email: Programme.Officer@eastcambs.gov.uk
Tel: 07920 160203

- 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?
- 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?
- k) In particular is there an issue with waste water treatment capacity and how would any issues be resolved?
- l) Is the site realistically viable and deliverable?
- m) What is the expected timescale and rate of development and is this realistic?
- n) Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary?
- 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...*'?
- p) Is the terminology used within the relevant site specific policy consistent and clear, for example, 'concept plan'?

NB. In responding to the questions on the site allocations the Council should identify and address specific key concerns raised in representations eg in terms of adverse impacts, delivery etc.

EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Inspector: Miss Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI
Programme Officer: Hannah Charlish
Email: Programme.Officer@eastcamb.gov.uk
Tel: 07920 160203

Matter 15: Proposed site allocations- Large Villages

Relevant Policies- LP3, site allocations and relevant development management policies

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?

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

Bottisham

BOT.H1	Land east of Bell Road
BOT.E1	Extension to Tunbridge Lane Business Park

Burwell

BUR.H1	Land off Newmarket Road
BUR.PH1	Land at Stanford Park, Weirs Drove
BUR.M1	Former DS Site Reach Road
BUR.E1	Land at Reach Road

Fordham

FRD.H1	Land south of Mildenhall Road, East of Collin's Hill
FRD.H2	Land north-east of Rules Garden
FRD.H3	Land off Station Road
FRD.H4	Land off Steward's Field
FRD.M1	Scotsdale Garden Centre, Market Street
FRD.M2	Land north of Mildenhall Road
FRD.E1 (a) –(g)	Employment Cluster South of Fordham

Haddenham

HAD.H1	Land off West End
HAD.H2	Land at New Road
HAD.H3	Land east of Chewells Lane
HAD.E1	Land at Haddenham Business Park, Station Road

EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Inspector: Miss Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI
Programme Officer: Hannah Charlish
Email: Programme.Officer@eastcamb.gov.uk
Tel: 07920 160203

Isleham

ISL.H1	Land south of and west of Lady Frances Court
ISL.H2	Land at 5a Fordham Road
ISL.H3	Land west of Hall Barn Road
ISL.H4	Land off Fordham Road
ISL.E1	Land adjacent to Hall Barn Road Industrial Estate

Little Downham

LTD.H1	Land west of Ely Road
--------	-----------------------

Stretham

STR.H1	Land at Manor Farm Stretham
--------	-----------------------------

Sutton

SUT.H1	Land north of the Brook and west of Mepal Road
SUT.H2	Land east of Garden Close
SUT.E1	Elean Business Park

Witchford

WFD.H1	Land north of Field End
WFD.H2	Land at Common Road
WFD.H3	Land south of Main Road
WFD.H4	Land to the rear of 1-7 Sutton Road
WFD.E1	Sedgeway Business Park

- a) What is the background to the site allocation? How was it identified and which options were considered?
- b) How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?
- c) What is the scale type/mix of uses proposed?
- d) What is the basis for this and is it justified?
- e) What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and completions/construction?
- f) What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?
- g) How does the site relate to nearby uses?

EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Inspector: Miss Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI
Programme Officer: Hannah Charlish
Email: Programme.Officer@eastcambs.gov.uk
Tel: 07920 160203

- h) What are the potential adverse impacts of developing the sites, including to heritage assets? How could they be mitigated?
- 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?
- 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?
- k) In particular is there an issue with waste water treatment capacity and how would any issues be resolved?
- l) Is the site realistically viable and deliverable?
- m) What is the expected timescale and rate of development and is this realistic?
- n) Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary?
- 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...*'?
- p) Is the terminology used within the relevant site specific policy consistent and clear, for example, 'concept plan'?

NB. In responding to the questions on the site allocations the Council should identify and address specific key concerns raised in representations eg in terms of adverse impacts, delivery etc.

EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Inspector: Miss Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI
Programme Officer: Hannah Charlish
Email: Programme.Officer@eastcambs.gov.uk
Tel: 07920 160203

Matter 16: Proposed site allocations- Medium Villages

Relevant Policies- LP3, site allocations and relevant development management policies

Issue 1: Whether the proposed site allocations, excluding Local Green Spaces, for the defined Medium Villages of Ashley, Burrough Green/Burrough End, Cheveley, Dullingham, Kennett, Little Thetford, Lode with Long Meadow, Mepal, Newmarket Fringe, Stetchworth, Swaffham Bulbeck, Swaffham Prior, Wilburton are justified, based on up-to-date evidence, effective, viable, deliverable and consistent with national policy?

62. Taking each of the following proposed site allocations individually:

Burrough Green/ Burrough End

BRG.H1	Land off Brinkley Road, Burrough End
--------	--------------------------------------

Cheveley

CHV.H1	Land between 199 and 209 High Street
CHV.H2	Brook Stud, High Street

Dullingham

DUL.H1	Land at Kettlefields
--------	----------------------

Kennett

KEN.M1	Land to the West of Station Road
--------	----------------------------------

Little Thetford

LTT.H1	Land north of the Wyches
LTT.H2	Land south of Caravan Park, Two Acres, Ely Road

Lode with Long Meadow

LOD.H1	Sunny Ridge Farmyard, Station Road
--------	------------------------------------

Mepal

MEP.H1	Land at Brick Lane
--------	--------------------

EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Inspector: Miss Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI
Programme Officer: Hannah Charlish
Email: Programme.Officer@eastcamb.gov.uk
Tel: 07920 160203

Newmarket Fringe

NFR.H1	Site adjacent to 37 St Johns Avenue, Newmarket
--------	------------------------------------------------

Stetchworth- No allocations

Swaffham Bulbeck

SWB.H1	Land off Heath Road and Quarry Lane
SWB.H2	Land fronting Heath Road
SWB.H3	Hillside Mill, Quarry Lane

Swaffham Prior

SWP.H1	Rear of 73 High Street
SWP.E1	Land at East of Goodwin Farm, Heath Road

Wilburton

WIL.H1	Land off Station Lane
WIL.H2	Land west of Clarke's Lane and South of Hinton Way

- a) What is the background to the site allocation? How was it identified and which options were considered?
- b) How have the wider transport implications of the proposed development been considered?
- c) What is the scale type/mix of uses proposed?
- d) What is the basis for this and is it justified?
- e) What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and completions/construction?
- f) What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?
- g) How does the site relate to nearby uses?
- h) What are the potential adverse impacts of developing the sites, including to heritage assets? How could they be mitigated?
- 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?
- 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?

EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Inspector: Miss Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI
Programme Officer: Hannah Charlish
Email: Programme.Officer@eastcambs.gov.uk
Tel: 07920 160203

- k) In particular is there an issue with waste water treatment capacity and how would any issues be resolved?
- l) Is the site realistically viable and deliverable?
- m) What is the expected timescale and rate of development and is this realistic?
- n) Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary?
- 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...*'?
- p) Is the terminology used within the relevant site specific policy consistent and clear, for example, 'concept plan'?

NB. In responding to the questions on the site allocations the Council should identify and address specific key concerns raised in representations eg in terms of adverse impacts, delivery etc.

EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Inspector: Miss Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI
Programme Officer: Hannah Charlish
Email: Programme.Officer@eastcambs.gov.uk
Tel: 07920 160203

Matter 17: Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes

Relevant Policies- LP2, LP3, LP5, LP6, LP7, LP32 including individual site allocations and the housing trajectory

Issue 1: Whether the approach towards the supply and delivery of housing land is justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

63. What is the estimated total supply of new housing in the plan period 2016-2036? How does this compare with an annual requirement of 598 dwellings (11,960)? Would it be appropriate for the timescale of the Plan to be reduced from 2016- 2034 (as per Council's letter of 3 August 2018) and would such an approach be justified, effective and consistent with national policy?
64. What is the estimated total supply in the plan period from a) completions since 2016; b) existing planning permissions; c) other commitments; for example, sites subject to S106; d) windfalls (including CLT developments); and e) proposed site allocations?
65. What allowance has been made for, and on what basis will communal forms of accommodation contribute to the five year housing supply?
66. What are the assumptions about the scale and timing of supply and annual rates of delivery from these various sources? Are these realistic? For example, has there been any discounting of sites with planning permission?
67. Specifically, are the timescales and rates of delivery on large sites over 500 dwellings realistic? Are there any barriers to development?
68. How have windfalls been defined and what evidence is there to support future estimates?
69. How has flexibility been provided in terms of the supply of housing? Are there other potential sources of supply not specifically identified? Can this be quantified?
70. Has there been a persistent undersupply of housing? If so, is it appropriate that a buffer of 20% be applied?
71. How should the shortfall in delivery since 2016 be dealt with?
72. What would the requirement be for a five year supply of housing, including a buffer, and accommodating any shortfall since 2016?

EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Inspector: Miss Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI
Programme Officer: Hannah Charlish
Email: Programme.Officer@eastcambs.gov.uk
Tel: 07920 160203

73. Would the Local Plan realistically provide for a five year supply on adoption? Will a five year supply be maintained?
74. Is there a case for a staggered or phased housing requirement with a lower figure in the early years of the plan period to take account of the larger strategic allocations and the findings of my letter of the 30th of July? If so, what would be the appropriate phasing in respect of annual housing requirements and timing?
75. In overall terms would the Local Plan deliver the wide choice of high quality homes required over the plan period?

Matter 18: Protecting Green Belt

Relevant Policies- LP4, and other settlement specific policies

Issue 1: Whether the policy is justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

76. What is the justification for the policy? In particular, is it consistent with national policy and effective? How does it relate to other policies within the Local Plan? What added value does it add to national policy?

Matter 19: Other Policies

Relevant Policies- LP1, LP11, LP12, LP13, LP24, LP33 and Witcham 3

Issue 1: Whether other policies are justified, positively prepared, effective and consistent with national policy?

77. For all policies above:
- a) What is the basis of the policy? What is it seeking to achieve?
 - b) How does the policy relate to the evidence base?
 - c) How will the policy be implemented? Is this clear?
 - d) Is the policy sufficiently flexible? Would it allow for specific circumstances and the effect on viability to be taken into account?
 - e) How does the policy relate to national policy? How is it consistent? Are there any inconsistencies?
 - f) In overall terms is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national policy?
 - g) Does it duplicate national or other policies within the Plan?

EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Inspector: Miss Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI
Programme Officer: Hannah Charlish
Email: Programme.Officer@eastcambs.gov.uk
Tel: 07920 160203

Matter 20: Implementation, delivery, and monitoring

78. Does the Local Plan have clear and effective mechanisms for implementation, delivery and monitoring?
79. Are all the policies of the plan which have a geographical application clearly and consistently shown on the Policies Map?