

# Isleham Neighbourhood Plan Examination

on behalf of East Cambridgeshire DC



## Examiner's clarifying questions to Isleham Parish Council (IPC)

### Question 1

I have two queries about the settlement boundary:

- The proposed revision would create a new “hole” around the recreation ground (to be extended): it is somewhat misleading to suggest that an area of land entirely surrounded by housing should be considered to lie outside the village envelope, and the examiner is not clear what practical value it would have, given the other policies in the Plan. Please could IPC explain?
- The boundary maintains the inclusion of three very small, completely detached and tightly defined short terraces north and south of the village (on the eastern and western side of Station Road and on the western side of Waterside). Should the opportunity provided by the preparation of the NP to consider the settlement boundary afresh not include the removal of these anomalous and unusual elements? Again, what purpose is served by their separation in this way?

I would add that neither of these questions about the settlement boundary is likely to impact on the issue of compliance with the basic conditions.

### Question 2

I would like clarification as to the meaning of the green and red colour-coding of the sites shown in Map 7. In Appendix 2, green seems to mean that the land is being put forward as a local green space in the Plan, with red meaning “considered but ultimately rejected”. However, it is difficult to correlate these two parts of the Plan document.

### Question 3

I recognise the relevance of the broad objective of Policy 4 (Maintaining Separation). However, as written, it means that virtually any development between Isleham and Fordham would be “caught” by it (ie anything “*that would either visually or physically reduce the separation, or sense of separation*”). This could encompass small-scale proposals which would otherwise be acceptable in policy terms. In addition:

(a) Why is the reference in the policy to “any neighbouring settlement”, whereas Map 8 only illustrates part of the gap between Isleham and Fordham?

(b) The map is described as showing only “general locations”, and yet it shows three clearly defined areas of land. Why are they different from any other components of the gap?

I would be likely to recommend an appropriate rephrasing of Policy 4 and the removal of Map 8, but would first like to know if the Council wishes to comment.

A response to these questions by Friday 25 February would be much appreciated.

David Kaiserman  
Independent Examiner  
11 February 2022