



East Cambridgeshire
District Council

East Cambridgeshire Local Plan

Matter 15 – Proposed Site Allocations – Large Villages

East Cambridgeshire District Council

Hearing Statement

September 2018

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?*

The Council has prepared a supporting document titled *Table of Local Plan Site Allocations* (hereafter referred to as 'the Table') which sets out details of each draft Site Allocation. Please refer to the Table alongside the Council's response to questions 60, 61 and 62 (Matters 14-16).

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?

Please refer to the council's hearing statement for Matter 14, question 60, part a.

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

Please refer to the council's hearing statement for Matter 14, question 60, part b.

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

Please refer to the council's hearing statement for Matter 14, question 60, part c.

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

Please refer to the council's hearing statement for Matter 14, question 60, part d.

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

Please refer to the council's hearing statement for Matter 14, question 60, part e.

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

Please refer to the council's hearing statement for Matter 14, question 60, part f.

g) How does the site relate to nearby uses?

Please refer to the council's hearing statement for Matter 14, question 60, part g.

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

Please refer to the council's hearing statement for Matter 14, question 60, part h.

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?

Please refer to the council's hearing statement for Matter 14, question 60, part i.

- 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?**

Please refer to the council's hearing statement for Matter 14, question 60, part j.

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

Please refer to the council's hearing statement for Matter 14, question 60, part k.

- l) **Is the site realistically viable and deliverable?**

Please refer to the council's hearing statement for Matter 14, question 60, part l.

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

Please refer to the council's hearing statement for Matter 14, question 60, part m.

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

Please refer to the council's hearing statement for Matter 14, question 60, part n.

- 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...'**

Please refer to the council's hearing statement for Matter 14, question 60, part o.

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

Please refer to the council's hearing statement for Matter 14, question 60, part p.

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

The Table (columns r and s) set out key issues raised through written representations and the Council's proposed response.

The Council has agreed through a Statement of Common Ground with Anglian Water that, in response to their representations and to ensure the policy is effective, the site specific requirements for site ISL.H1 set out in policy Isleham 3 should be amended.

The Council requests that the Inspector consider the suggested modifications to Isleham 3 as set out in in the Statement of Common Ground with Anglian Water.