



East Cambridgeshire
District Council

**Summary of Main
Issues Raised in
Representations in
respect of the
Proposed Submission
Local Plan**

*A regulation 22(1)(c)(v)
statement*

February 2018

East Cambridgeshire Local Plan

Introduction

Regulation 22(1)(c) of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 requires a local authority, on submitting a Local Plan for its examination, to provide a Statement covering various matters. Submitted Core Document CD09 forms the umbrella document for meeting this regulation requirement, but that document in effect signposts to other documents and statements, including this one.

Summary of main issues raised in representations

This Statement is in respect of Regulation 22(1)(c)(v) which requires a local authority to provide “a *summary of the main issues raised*” during the Proposed Submission (regulation 19) consultation period.

This report fulfils that legal requirement and, to assist the Inspector which is to be appointed to hold the examination, a focused and preliminary response has been provided by East Cambridgeshire District Council (ECDC) to each of the identified main issues.

In preparing this report, ECDC is aware that the regulation seeks a summary of ‘main issues’ only, but is conscious that this is undefined, and that representors will, on the whole, consider their representations to be ‘main’. Nevertheless, Table 1 of this document aims to draw out the more ‘headline’ main issues raised during the proposed submission consultation for the Local Plan.

The summaries have been prepared by officers and represent their best efforts to accurately and clearly identify these ‘headline’ main issues raised. However, ***this summary is intended to act as a guide only and should not be used as a substitute for the full and comprehensive set of all duly made representations.*** A full set of all representations made is publicly available from the Programme Officer’s library and all are available to view on the web site:

Name: Hannah Charlish
Email: programme.officer@eastcambs.gov.uk
Address: East Cambridgeshire Local Plan Programme Officer
c/o East Cambridgeshire District Council
The Grange
Nutholt Street
Ely
Cambs
CB7 4EE
Telephone: 07920 160203

Website: <https://www.eastcambs.gov.uk/local-development-framework/local-plan-review>

The representations received expressing support for the Local Plan policies have, on the whole, not been listed in Table 1.

It can be confirmed (as required by Regulation 22(1)(C)(v)) that **we received a total of 777 separate representations, from 259 separate representors.**

Table 1 - Summary of main issues

The summaries below aim to draw out the main issues raised during the proposed submission consultation for the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan.

The representations received expressing support for the Local Plan policies have, on the whole, not been listed in this 'main issues' summary.

Policy/ Section	'Headline' Main Issues	ECDC Initial Response
Sustainability Appraisal report & Habitats Regulation Assessment Report	<p>A number of comments made on the SA including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England consider SA & HRA to be legally compliant (some more minor issues were raised by NE in response to the HRA). • Historic England not had the capacity to review the SA in detail but commented on scoring of few policies. • SA has not considered education impacts arising from the LP draft policies and site allocations. 	<p>The Council will review Natural England's comments, but notes that fundamentally NE considers the SA and HRA to be appropriate. Specific additional education facilities required to meet the needs of Local Plan growth are identified by the Infrastructure Investment Plan (IIP).</p>
General (to Local Plan as a whole i.e. the representor did not specify a precise location within the plan to which it objected to)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request for full update of SHMA (across whole housing market area) and update of Memorandum of Co-operation. • Objection to Liverpool method of calculating 5 Year Land Supply. 	<p>The evidence base sets out clearly and robustly the approach to these matters. No changes proposed.</p>
Suggested Additional Policies	<p>Additional policies were requested for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LP needs to include a review policy which outlines trigger point for LP review, time scale for the review and consequences for not meeting the review deadline • A specific policy relating to the Countryside, separate from the Settlement Hierarchy. 	<p>The 'countryside' is adequately addressed by policies (namely LP3 and LP31). A specific policy committing to a review of the Local Plan is not considered necessary. Such a decision should be taken by democratically-elected members of the Council, based on monitoring of the plan.</p>

Forward, Preface & rest of Chapter 1	Reasonable alternative sites have not been evaluated fairly based on proportionate evidence as required within paragraph 182 of the NPPF 2012.	The site assessment process is considered to be robust in its methodology and findings, and was published for consultation alongside the Local Plan.
Vision / Objectives and rest of Chapter 2	<p>A variety of issues raised, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to significantly increase housing delivery to provide much needed affordable housing locally. • Some undeveloped land will be required to be released to meet future growth and objective 1 should be modified accordingly. • Basis for 5 year housing land supply is flawed due to undue weight given to the emerging LP policies. • Maximise affordable housing supply by significantly boosting housing delivery. • Flooding policies need to be robust to reduce the risk of flooding. 	<p>The vision and objectives support the delivery of the district's development needs.</p> <p>No changes proposed</p>
LP1: A Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	<p>A variety of issues raised, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Wildlife Trust not convinced that LP will deliver sustainable development. • HRA will need to address combined and cumulative effect of increased population and recreation on sites such as Wicken Fen Devil's Dyke and Breckland, etc. • LP failing to deliver sufficient quantity and quality of Green Infrastructure. • The policy should expand on 'material consideration' to include such as extant planning permissions, positive pre-application advice, unallocated sites, etc. 	<p>The policy reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out by the NPPF.</p> <p>No changes proposed</p>
LP2: Level and Distribution of Growth	<p>A number of issues raised, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various figures for number of new dwellings have been suggested including: 11,960, 12,335, 12,900, 14,100, 18,200. 	<p>The evidence base sets out clearly and robustly the approach to these matters.</p> <p>No changes proposed</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robust economic assessment required to determine jobs and employment land required taking account of recent economic changes. . • Several objections to this policy in particular town-led approach • Sedgefield method should be used rather than Liverpool method for calculating the five year housing land supply. • LP should meet the full objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing and not rely too much on Memorandum of Co-operation, CLT or windfall sites. • New dwelling figure used in LP2 based on consultation document yet to be formally adopted and should only be afforded limited weight in plan making. Need to increase housing to deliver shortfall in previous years and boost housing supply. • Policy should provide scale of growth in various tiers of settlements in the settlement hierarchy. • LP need to boost housing supply in early years. The plan should include numerous small sites (<50 dwellings) to improve deliverability and diversify supply chain. 	
<p>LP3: The Settlement Hierarchy and the Countryside</p>	<p>Site promoters seeking reclassification of a number of settlements, most notably Kennett and Burwell.</p> <p>Comments that the settlement hierarchy is inconsistent.</p> <p>Concern that policy wording relating to Community Land Trusts will encourage large scale development in the countryside.</p> <p>Site promoters object to distribution of development for various reasons, including that each level of the hierarchy should have a percentage of growth apportioned to it; Economic factors are not taken into account; Too much growth proposed in Soham and Littleport that may not happen.</p> <p>Site promoters objecting to development envelopes not having been re-assessed.</p>	<p>The evidence base sets out clearly and robustly the approach to these matters.</p> <p>No changes proposed</p>

	Countryside should be addressed in a separate and more flexible policy.	
LP4: Green Belt	No main issues raised.	N/A
LP5: Community-led development	No main issues raised.	N/A
LP6: Meeting Local Housing Needs	<p>General: The policy is too narrowly defined and restrictive Further clarification needed in relation to homes for older people and residential care accommodation.</p> <p>Affordable housing: No main issues raised</p> <p>Dwellings with Higher Access Standards: No evidence to show all dwellings should need to meet higher access standards.</p> <p>Self-build Homes Requirement for serviced plots on large sites onerous and not justified by evidence.</p> <p>Homes for Older People This section of the policy is too vague and not based on clear evidence of need.</p> <p>Residential care accommodation Should be permitted in all settlements</p> <p>Homes for Permanent Caravan dwellers/Park Homes No comments received</p> <p>Houseboats No comments received.</p>	<p>The SHMA (and other demographic data) clearly indicates an ageing population. The policy seeks to address this through ensuring homes meet people's needs as the age, and through supporting the delivery of residential care accommodation in sustainable locations.</p> <p>Requirements for self-build plots reflects recent changes to national policy and legislation which places a duty on Council's to make available land for self and custom build. The Council maintains a register of households wishing to acquire a self-build plot.</p> <p>The evidence base sets out clearly and robustly the approach to these matters. No changes proposed.</p>
LP7: Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites	No comments received.	N/A

LP8: Delivering Prosperity and jobs	The policy is too inflexible in its definition of employment uses.	The evidence base sets out clearly and robustly the approach to these matters. No changes proposed.
LP9: Equine Development	No main issues raised.	N/A
LP10: Development affecting the horse racing industry	No main issues raised.	N/A
LP11: Tourist facilities and visitor attractions	No main issues raised.	N/A
LP12: Tourist accommodation (excluding holiday cottages)	The policy is too restrictive and should allow greater flexibility, in terms of its definition of tourist accommodation, requirements for marketing, and proximity to Development Envelopes.	The evidence base sets out clearly and robustly the approach to these matters. No changes proposed.
LP13: Holiday Cottage Accommodation	No main issues raised.	N/A
LP14: Retail and other main town centre uses	No main issues raised.	N/A
LP15: Retail uses in town centres	No comments received.	N/A
LP16: Infrastructure to support growth	Concerns were raised in relation to cumulative impacts of development on infrastructure, in particular for transport and education. Further clarity is needed to explain how/when CIL and S106 will be used to address infrastructure needs, and to ensure 'double-dipping' does not occur.	The policy indicates that 'planning permission will only be granted' where there is 'infrastructure capacity to support and meet all the necessary requirements arising from the proposed development'. Where additional infrastructure is required, this is identified within the IIP and in policies in Section 7 to ensure that developments contribute appropriately. The CIL and S106 processes are well-established. The Local Plan is not proposing any modifications to these processes.

		<p>However, the R123 Infrastructure List and Planning Obligations SPD will be reviewed in due course.</p> <p>The evidence base sets out clearly and robustly the approach to these matters.</p> <p>No changes proposed.</p>
LP17: Creating a sustainable, efficient and resilient transport network	No main issues raised.	N/A
LP18: Improving Cycle provision	No main issues raised.	N/A
LP19: Maintaining and improving community facilities	The need for a robust business plan and governance arrangements for new community facilities as part of a wider development, is too onerous.	<p>The policy seeks to meet the NPPF requirement to promote healthy communities (section 8) and the requirement for a business plan and governance arrangements aims to ensure that proposals are deliverable and viable.</p> <p>The evidence base sets out clearly and robustly the approach to these matters.</p> <p>No changes proposed.</p>
LP20: Delivering Green Infrastructure, trees and woodlands	Concern that in combination with other Plan requirements policy is too onerous.	<p>The Viability Assessment demonstrates that the plan's policies will not threaten development viability. Infrastructure will be secured in accordance with the R123 list and Planning Obligations SPD.</p> <p>The evidence base sets out clearly and robustly the approach to these matters.</p> <p>No changes proposed.</p>
LP21: Open space, sport and recreational facilities	Developments under 400 homes should make contributions towards securing new, or enhancing existing off site sports provision.	Where existing pressures and shortfalls are known, these are identified within policies in Section 7 to ensure that developments

		<p>contribute appropriately to open spaces and sports facilities.</p> <p>The evidence base sets out clearly and robustly the approach to these matters.</p> <p>No changes proposed.</p>
LP22: Achieving design excellence	Concern that contributions for health facilities are being sought twice – through this policy and the Community Infrastructure Levy process.	<p>The R123 List and Planning Obligations SPD will be reviewed in due course.</p> <p>No changes proposed.</p>
LP23: Water efficiency	Both objection and support expressed for the inclusion of higher water efficiency standards.	<p>East Cambridgeshire is identified, in the Water Cycle Study as being an area of water resources that are under severe stress, therefore it is appropriate and justified to ensure new development uses water as efficiently as possible.</p> <p>The evidence base sets out clearly and robustly the approach to these matters.</p> <p>No changes proposed.</p>
LP24: Renewable and low carbon energy development	No main issues raised.	N/A
LP25: Managing water resources and flood risk	The Environment Agency has raised concerns about the level of detail within, and clarity of, the policy, and in relation to the evidence base.	The Council will liaise with the EA to address their concerns in relation to the policy and evidence base. A statement of common ground might be forthcoming, potentially with suggested modifications, if necessary.
LP26: Pollution and land contamination	Objection to the statement regarding mechanical ventilation as it is considered too restrictive.	The Council consider that mechanical ventilation (in lieu of opening windows, particularly at night) as a solution to excessive noise does not provide a suitable standard of living accommodation, a matter endorsed by a recent inspector (Witchford).

		No changes proposed.
LP27: Conserving and enhancing heritage assets	The section and policy titles need to be amended to better describe the historic environment.	Minor matters which are likely to be addressed through minor or main modifications.
LP28: Landscape, Treescape and built environment character, including cathedral views	Concern that the policy is too restrictive, especially in relation to building heights and the re-use of brownfield land. Concern that the policy is too vague in relation to the general visual distinctiveness of Ely.	The evidence base sets out clearly and robustly the approach to these matters. No changes proposed.
LP29: Conserving Local Green Spaces	Queries as to whether the Council have followed the tests set out in the NPPF and have thoroughly examined the evidence on each site. A request to amend the boundary to remove a Water Recycling Centre from one specific Local Green Space. (<i>The Hythe, Reach</i>)	The evidence base sets out clearly and robustly the approach to these matters. The LGS (The Hythe, Reach) boundary will be reviewed, and a suggested modification may be forthcoming.
LP30: Conserving and enhancing biodiversity and geodiversity	Request for factual correction relating to definitions of habitats and species.	Points of factual inaccuracies will be reviewed and a suggested modification may be forthcoming.
LP31: Development in the Countryside	The policy is too restrictive, in effect allowing only limited exceptions where development can take place. The requirement to offer dwellings (Part B) to three Registered Social Landlords, before being offered on the open market, is not justified.	The evidence base sets out clearly and robustly the approach to these matters. No changes proposed.
LP32: Infill development in locations outside of development envelopes	The stated maximum distance, 200m, from the development envelope is too restrictive. Policy does not allow for site specific circumstances. The policy should also apply to small villages. The policy fails to include sites located adjacent to the development envelope.	The evidence base sets out clearly and robustly the approach to these matters. No changes proposed.
LP33: Residential Annexes	The justification and need for this policy are questioned.	A high number of planning applications for annexe development have been received over

		<p>recent years, highlighting the need for a specific policy.</p> <p>The evidence base sets out clearly and robustly the approach to these matters.</p> <p>No changes proposed.</p>
Policies for Places Chapter 7	Objections from promoters of omission sites	The site assessment process is considered to be robust in its methodology and findings. The methodology and site assessment were published for consultation alongside the Local Plan.
Aldreth	No <i>major</i> issues raised	N/a
Ashley	Promoters object to omission of their sites, dispute distribution of development and findings of the site assessment process.	The site assessment process is considered to be robust in its methodology and findings.
Barway	No <i>major</i> issues raised	N/a
Black Horse Drove	No <i>major</i> issues raised	N/a
Bottisham	Promoters object to omission of their sites, dispute distribution of development and findings of the site assessment process.	The site assessment process is considered to be robust in its methodology and findings.
Brinkley	Promoter objects to omission of their site and requests reassessment.	The site assessment process is considered to be robust in its methodology and findings.
Burrough Green and Burrough End	No <i>major</i> issues raised	N/a
Burwell	Promoters object to omission of their sites, dispute distribution of development and findings of the site assessment process.	The site assessment process is considered to be robust in its methodology and findings.
Chettisham	No <i>major</i> issues raised	N/a
Cheveley	Promoter objects to omission of their site	The site assessment process is considered to be robust in its methodology and findings.
Chippenham	Promoter objects to omission of their site	The site assessment process is considered to be robust in its methodology and findings.
Coveney	No <i>major</i> issues raised	N/a

Dullingham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objections to proposed allocation due to concerns surrounding: traffic, accessibility, drainage, ecology, built character and amenity. • Promoter objects to omission of their site and disputes findings of the site assessment process. 	The site assessment process is considered to be robust in its methodology and findings.
Ely	Promoters object to omission of their sites and dispute findings of the site assessment process.	The site assessment process is considered to be robust in its methodology and findings.
Fordham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promoters object to omission of their sites and disputes findings of the site assessment process. • Promoter of site FRD.M1 objects to 'maximum' dwelling limit. • Promoter of site FRD.E1(d) objects to exclusion of B8 use class. 	The site assessment process is considered to be robust in its methodology and findings.
Haddenham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promoters object to omission of their sites and disputes findings of the site assessment process. • Promoter of site HAD.E1 requests greater flexibility for (non-'B' class) employment generating uses. 	The site assessment process is considered to be robust in its methodology and findings.
Isleham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objections to scale of development identified for the village, due to infrastructure constraints. • Promoter of ISL.H4 objects to max 140 dwelling limit, and 25-dwelling phasing of development. However, support from community for these requirements. • Promoters object to omission of their sites and dispute findings of the site assessment process. • Requests for infrastructure investment, including road network, parking facilities and primary school. 	<p>The site assessment process is considered to be robust in its methodology and findings.</p> <p>Infrastructure requirements will be agreed in accordance with Policy LP16 and Policy Isleham2.</p>
Kennett	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial number of objections (including paper and e-petitions) from local residents, and from promoters of omission sites, to site KEN.M1 due to concerns regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ scale of development not proportionate to size of village; 	<p>The site assessment process is considered to be robust in its methodology and findings.</p> <p>The policy requires the developer to provide a number of specific infrastructure requirements, in order to mitigate the impacts growth.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ classification as Medium Village;○ impact on character of village;○ transport/traffic, congestion and air quality in village and further afield;○ lack of services and infrastructure in village;○ not on gas or mains sewer network, and constrained potable water supply;○ lack of public transport;○ proposal will require significant investment in local infrastructure and should include an A11/A14 link road;○ constrained site – tumulus at north of site, mineral safeguarding zone, and noise from rail line;○ concerns over heritage impacts on assets including SAM & Listed Buildings;○ impacts on SSSI;○ landscape impacts due to elevated site and lack of defensible boundaries;○ loss of agricultural land;○ impact on amenity of Dane Hill Farm;○ impact on operation of local stud farms and equestrian industries, resulting in economic consequences;○ cross boundary impacts in neighbouring authority areas;○ Devolution deal should not justify inclusion of site;○ claims that CLT not representative of community's view;○ Perceived conflict of interest as promoter (Palace Green Homes) part of EDCD trading company;○ not sustainable strategy for meeting housing need; <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Promoter of omission site 14/10 argues their site would be more suitable than KEN.M1, on grounds of scale; community benefit; impact on village character.● Some support for 14/10 as an alternative to KEN.M1.	No changes proposed.
--	--	----------------------

Kirtling	No <i>major</i> issues raised	N/a
Little Downham	Promoter objects to omission of their site and disputes findings of the site assessment process.	The site assessment process is considered to be robust in its methodology and findings.
Little Thetford	Promoter objects to omission of their site and disputes findings of the site assessment process.	The site assessment process is considered to be robust in its methodology and findings.
Littleport	Promoter of LIT.M1 indicates site could deliver more dwellings (approx. 450 dwellings).	The plan takes a conservative estimate of the site's capacity following advice from the Highways Authority.
Lode with Long Meadow	Promoter objects to omission of their site and disputes findings of the site assessment process.	The site assessment process is considered to be robust in its methodology and findings.
Mepal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promoters object to omission of their sites and dispute findings of the site assessment process. • Concerns about position of vehicular access for site MEP.H1 	<p>The site assessment process is considered to be robust in its methodology and findings.</p> <p>The proposed location of the site access reflects comments received from Highways Authority.</p>
Newmarket Fringe	Promoters object to omission of their sites and distribution of development, suggesting more sites should be allocated in close proximity of Newmarket.	The site assessment process is considered to be robust in its methodology and findings.
Prickwillow	No <i>major</i> issues raised	N/a
Pymoor	No <i>major</i> issues raised	N/a
Queen Adelaide	No <i>major</i> issues raised	N/a
Reach	Objections to the location of the Development Envelope following recent permissions granted.	The Development Envelope assessment process is considered to be robust in its methodology and findings.
Saxon Street	No <i>major</i> issues raised	N/a
Snailwell	No <i>major</i> issues raised	N/a
Soham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soham Town Council object to multiple site allocations / scale of growth, with concerns around flooding; traffic; loss of open spaces; water infrastructure; parking. 	The site assessment process is considered to be robust in its methodology and findings.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objections to scale of growth due to lack of infrastructure (particularly health, education, public transport); lack of employment opportunities; flooding/drainage issues. • Objections to site SOH.H10 due to: flooding/drainage; odour from WRC; transport/traffic; vehicular access; impacts on neighbour's amenity. • Objection to SOH.M1 due to concerns regarding vehicular access. • Promoter of site SOH.M1 requests increase of indicative dwelling figure to 600 dwellings. • Promoter of site SOH.M2 requests site allocated for residential use only (rather than mixed use), and increase site area from 2.8ha to 6.1ha and indicative dwelling figure from 20 to 50 dwellings. • Promoter of site SOH.H5 objects to reduction of indicative dwelling figure. • Promoter of site SOH.H10 objects to reduction of site area and indicative dwelling figure – requests increase from 100 to 175 dwellings. • Promoter of site SOH.M3 seeks increase of site area and indicative no. of dwellings. • Promoter of site SOH.H1 objects to indicative dwelling figure - requests increase from 300 to 400 dwellings. • Promoters object to omission of their site and dispute findings of the site assessment process. • Promoter of site SOH.H5 objects to indicative dwelling figure – requests increase from 130 to 160 dwellings. • Promoter of SOH.H9 objects to indicative dwelling figure, requesting this is increased. Objects to education infrastructure requirements and requests clarity. • Environment Agency raised concerns regarding potential flood risk of SOH.H1. 	<p>Estimates of indicative dwelling numbers were revised down for a number of sites in Soham, due to concerns surrounding noise and amenity, due to proximity to the highway network.</p> <p>The government has awarded HIF funding for SOH.M1 (Soham Eastern Gateway) to enable land assembly, for provision of a roundabout and access road.</p>
Stetchworth	Promoter objects to omission of their site.	The site assessment process is considered to be robust in its methodology and findings.

Stretham	Promoters object to omission of their sites and dispute findings of the site assessment process.	The site assessment process is considered to be robust in its methodology and findings.
Stuntney	No <i>major</i> issues raised	N/a
Sutton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objections to site allocations on the basis of infrastructure constraints, and impact on character of the village and countryside. • Promoters object to omission of their sites, dispute distribution of development and findings of the site assessment process. • Promoter of site SUT.H1 seeks to increase indicative dwelling nos. (to 427 dwellings). • Promoter of SUT.H2 seeks to increase site area and indicative dwelling nos. (to 53 dwellings). 	<p>The site assessment process is considered to be robust in its methodology and findings.</p> <p>The indicative dwelling figures reflect characteristics of each site, and infrastructure constraints in Sutton, namely capacity at the primary school.</p>
Swaffham Bulbeck	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promoter of site SWB.H1 seeks to increase indicative dwelling nos. (to 45 dwellings). • Promoters object to omission of their sites. 	<p>The site assessment process is considered to be robust in its methodology and findings.</p> <p>The dwelling figure is intended to be 'indicative' and is neither a minimum nor maximum limit.</p>
Swaffham Prior	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England object to site SWP.H1 due to potential impact on the setting of a number of heritage assets. • Promoters object to omission of their sites. 	<p>The site assessment process is considered to be robust in its methodology and findings.</p> <p>The council will review policy wording to ensure impacts on heritage assets from site SWP.H1 are minimised/mitigated, as per HEs comments. If necessary, a suggested modification may be forthcoming.</p>
Upend	No <i>major</i> issues raised	N/a
Upware	No <i>major</i> issues raised	N/a
Wardy Hill	No <i>major</i> issues raised	N/a
Wentworth	Promoters object to omission of their sites.	The site assessment process is considered to be robust in its methodology and findings

Westley Waterless	No <i>major</i> issues raised	N/a
Wicken	Promoters object to omission of their sites.	The site assessment process is considered to be robust in its methodology and findings.
Wilburton	No <i>major</i> issues raised	N/a
Witcham	Promoter objects to omission of their site	The site assessment process is considered to be robust in its methodology and findings.
Witchford	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promoter of site WFD.H1 objects to max 128 dwelling limit and combining of two sites. Requests site split into two separate sites for 128 & 55 dwellings. • Site promoters request removal of countryside & Green Wedge designations. • Requests for clarity for education infrastructure requirements. • Promoters object to omission of their sites, and seek allocation of strategic scale growth supported by infrastructure provision. • Promoter of omission site objects to proposed Local Green Space WFD.LGS7. 	<p>The site assessment and Local Green Space assessment process is considered to be robust in its methodology and findings.</p> <p>The Green Wedge is supported by the Green Wedge Evidence Report.</p>
Woodditton	No <i>major</i> issues raised	N/a
Appendix A Open Space Provision Standards	No comments received	N/A
Appendix B Parking Provision	Concerns expressed in relation to the 'Additional Guidance for Developers'. In particular that suggested parking spaces sizes are excessive, and garages should be counted as parking spaces. Concern standards as set out will lead to increase in parking courts	No changes proposed
Appendix C Neighbourhood Planning	No comments received	N/A
Appendix D Glossary	No main issues raised.	N/A

