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1.0 Introduction

1.1. The purpose of this report is to provide maps and basic information about suggested ‘Changes to Development Envelopes’, received during the Preliminary Draft and Further Draft Local Plan consultations. In addition this report sets out the rationale which has been used to assess such proposals and Development Envelopes through the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan.

What are Development Envelopes?

1.2. The current adopted Local Plan 2015 draws Development Envelopes around the main built-up areas of settlements in East Cambridgeshire. Existing Development Envelopes are shown on the Policies Map.

1.3. Development Envelopes have many purposes; they define the areas within which development will normally be acceptable. Development Envelopes also protect the open countryside and agricultural land resources, as development is not normally acceptable outside of Development Envelopes. Development Envelopes therefore provide certainty to local people and developers about where new development may be located.

1.4. In addition Development Envelopes perform an important role in conserving the character and landscape setting of existing towns and villages and promotes sustainability, as a more compact form of development makes it easier to access jobs and services.

1.5. The Local Plan allows some specific forms of development to take place outside Development Envelopes, such as agricultural workers dwellings, rural exception sites for affordable housing and Community Land Trust developments.

1.6. It is our intention to continue to apply Development Envelopes in the emerging Local Plan.

Preliminary Draft Local Plan Consultation

1.7. In February and March 2016 the council consulted on the Preliminary Draft Local Plan which sets out the council’s emerging vision, objectives and planning policies for the growth and regeneration of East Cambridgeshire to 2036.

1.8. The Preliminary Draft Local Plan did not propose any specific changes to Development Envelopes at this early stage, but provided an opportunity to review these boundaries.

1.9. During the consultation, residents, parish councils and other stakeholders were invited to suggest changes to Development Envelopes they wish to be considered for inclusion in the Local Plan. Form C – Suggested Change to Development Envelopment was published on the Council’s website to ensure the process of submitting a suggested change was straightforward. A blank copy of Form C is provided on the final page of this report.

1.10. Following the Preliminary Draft Local Plan consultation, a report setting out all of the suggested changes was published. Section 4 lists all Suggested Development Envelope Changes received during the consultation. A total of 53 Suggested
Development Envelope Changes were received, suggesting amendment to settlements in 17 different parishes.

1.11. The Council assessed all of the suggested development envelope changes (using the criteria in section 2). Those suggested changes that met the assessment criteria were incorporated into the Further Draft Local Plan.

Further Draft Local Plan Consultation

1.12. In January and February 2017 the Council consulted on the Further Draft version of the Local Plan. A further three suggested development envelope changes were received.

2.0 Criteria for Appraising Development Envelopment Changes

Assessment Criteria

2.1 The purpose of the assessment is to review Development Envelopes, where a change has been suggested, to ensure the boundary creates a suitable and appropriate delineation between town and country. Whilst changes to development envelopes could create additional opportunities for development, the purpose of this assessment is not to appraise the suitability of specific development sites.

2.2 Section 4 of this report presents all Suggested Development Envelope Changes received. The profiles in section 4 have been compiled based on completed Form Cs received, with each suggested change assigned a unique reference number. This list of suggested changes will form the basis of the assessment.

2.3 In assessing the proposed change, we considered carefully the promoter’s explanation as to why a change is required. To inform our assessment we collected additional information, using desk-based research and/or by carrying out site visits. In assessing each Suggested Development Envelope Change we had regard to the following factors:-

- Whether the suggested change is logical (in defining the limits of the built-up area of the village) such as following a physical or natural landscape feature;
- Any loss of agricultural land or other resources which could result from the change;
- Impacts on the landscape or townscape which could arise as a result of the change;
- Extent to which the suggested change is in line with the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy;
- Whether the suggested change creates a significant size of developable site within the town/village that ought more appropriately be considered through the site selection process (i.e. site area of 0.3 ha and over).

Relationship to Site Suggestions

2.4 In addition to amending Development Envelopes, the new Local Plan also identifies sites for future development known as ‘site allocations’. Where a site is formally
allocated in the Local Plan, the Development Envelope will, in most instances, also be redrawn to accommodate these sites.

2.5 Typically, Suggested Development Envelope Changes are modest amendments.

2.6 Some Suggested Development Envelope Changes received were identical to (or overlap part of) a site suggestion being considered for inclusion in the Local Plan. Section 3 includes ‘profiles’ providing basic information about each Suggested Development Envelope Change.

2.7 Where a Suggested Development Envelope Change overlaps or is identical to a suggested site, both are assessed through their respective assessment process. As previously mentioned, where a suggested site will be included in the Local Plan the Development Envelope will, in most instances, be automatically amended. Where a suggested site is rejected it will continue to be appraised as a change to the Development Envelope; however such a change is unlikely to be suitable. In appraising Suggested Development Envelope Changes, we may draw on the findings of the Site Assessment process. It should be noted that in a number of instances, a suggested development envelope change is rejected in this report, but the overlapping site allocation is approved, and the development envelope then changed. As such, where this report says ‘no’ to a suggestion, that decision is, in some instances, overturned if the land is allocated as a development site.

3.0 Identification of Development Envelope Changes

3.1 Following the receipt of additional suggested development envelope changes during the Further Draft consultation, and comments received on the rejected development envelope changes, the appraisal of the suggested changes and the reasoning for their proposed inclusion, or not, was revisited. This review and consideration of additional sites has resulted in an additional suggested change being implemented.

3.2 As set out in Section 2, each suggested development envelope change has been subject of a site visit to consider the suggestion in context of the built form of the settlement and the assessment criteria as set out. Site visits were undertaken during July and August 2016, with the additional suggested changes submitted during the Further Draft consultation visited during June and July 2017.

3.3 The table below sets out each of the submitted development envelope changes with reasoning for its inclusion, or not, based on the assessment criteria set out above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Is change logical?</th>
<th>Is change likely to result in the loss of resources?</th>
<th>Will change result in likely adverse visual impacts?</th>
<th>Does change create a significant size of site?</th>
<th>Suggested change accepted?</th>
<th>Reasoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DE/01/01</td>
<td>Land off Silverley Way, Ashley</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change, suggested change would not be logical and would create awkward shaped development envelope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/03/01</td>
<td>Rear of Uplands, Carlton Road, Brinkley</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change, suggested amendment would be illogical and extend development envelope into open countryside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/05/01</td>
<td>Land at 131 &amp; 131B North Street, Burwell</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change to boundary required as the proposed boundary change will result in random boundary and loss of agricultural land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/05/02</td>
<td>Land at Melton Farm/Newmarket Road, Burwell</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Very large site but most of it is allocated for housing development. Few minor boundary changes are suggested and the boundary will be altered in line with any changes made to housing allocation in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/05/03</td>
<td>Rear of 131B North Street, Burwell</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change, suggested change would result in random boundary and loss of agricultural land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/05/04</td>
<td>North of Toyse Lane, Burwell</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change, suggested change does not follow any logical feature or demarcation. Dividing an agricultural field in two.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/05/05</td>
<td>East of Ness Road, Burwell</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change, suggested site does not follow any logical feature or demarcation, dividing an agricultural field in two.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/05/06</td>
<td>South-east of High Street, Burwell</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change, suggested change would create a long strip of land and illogical development envelope. Could result in backland development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Is change logical?</td>
<td>Is change likely to result in the loss of resources?</td>
<td>Will change result in likely adverse visual impacts?</td>
<td>Does change create a significant size of site?</td>
<td>Suggested change accepted?</td>
<td>Reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/05/07</td>
<td>West of Low Road</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change, suggested change would create a long strip of land and illogical development envelope. Could result in backland development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/06/01</td>
<td>Land at Centre Drive, Newmarket Fringe</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change, area is wooded with some mature trees, suggested change would create illogical development envelope. Difficult to discern the boundary on site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/06/02</td>
<td>Land east of High Street, Cheveley</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Although there are some natural features on site that could make it logical boundary change, these features do not cover all of the boundary. A large site would be created with considerable potential for growth and thus should, if desired, be progressed through the allocation process where it can be thoroughly assessed. No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/06/03</td>
<td>Rear garden land to Burrell Lodge, 171 High Street, Cheveley</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The proposed boundary change would create awkward boundary in the area. Neighbours garden area would need to be included to make it logical boundary change and this will result in creating considerable developable area within the boundary. No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/08/01</td>
<td>Land at Gravel End, Coveney</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change. Has some merit as site is surrounded by other dwellings in a low density, organic fashion. However high hedgerow along Gravel End and overgrown site conceals houses and other buildings to north. Access likely to be from track to neighbouring dwelling (which is also PROW), as Gravel End has sharp bend. May not cause significant harm if developed where existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Is change logical?</td>
<td>Is change likely to result in the loss of resources?</td>
<td>Will change result in likely adverse visual impacts?</td>
<td>Does change create a significant size of site?</td>
<td>Suggested change accepted?</td>
<td>Reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/08/02</td>
<td>Land west of Mansion Farm Yard, Coveney</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Trees and hedges are retained to lessen impact on neighbours. Beyond natural 'end' of village. Retain boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/08/03</td>
<td>Land rear of Meadowcroft Lodge, Coveney</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unable to determine what impacts may be from W, S or N. If whole of farm yard put forward for development, may be appropriate to also consider this land. Appears from map to follow a logical boundary on western side, but could not confirm this from site visit. Potentially has merit, but this proposed change to development envelope (if made) would likely result in a large development site for the whole of the farmyard area. Would be more suitably appraised, if desired, through site allocation process. In conclusion, no change to development envelope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/10/01</td>
<td>Cathedral Marina, Ely</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change. High hedgerow along Gravel End and overgrown site conceals houses and other buildings within vicinity. Proposed site is beyond natural 'end' of village and currently in use as a paddock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/10/02</td>
<td>Westmills Foods</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change. Important location for tourism at quayside. Needs to be managed carefully. Highly constrained site. Development options limited. Narrow vehicular access over bridge. Access by river. See Site/10/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Is change logical?</td>
<td>Is change likely to result in the loss of resources?</td>
<td>Will change result in likely adverse visual impacts?</td>
<td>Does change create a significant size of site?</td>
<td>Suggested change accepted?</td>
<td>Reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site, Ely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the site allocation process. See Site/10/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/11/01</td>
<td>Land at 5 Station Road, Fordham</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change. Large site better considered through the site allocation process. See Site/11/02.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/11/02</td>
<td>Land at Soham Road, Fordham</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change. Large site better considered through the site allocation process. See Site/11/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/11/03</td>
<td>Land off Grove Park, Fordham</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change. Large site better considered through the site allocation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/11/04</td>
<td>Scotsdale Garden Centre, Fordham</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change. Large site better considered through the site allocation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/11/05</td>
<td>Land at Collin’s Hill, Fordham</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change, Large site better considered through the site allocation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/12/01</td>
<td>Land at Hod Hall Lane, Haddenham</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change recommended - if implemented, change would likely result in backland development, with poor access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/12/02</td>
<td>22 The Borough, Aldreth</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change, current development envelope reflects current extend of built development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/12/03</td>
<td>Land at School Lane, Aldreth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change, suggested change would create illogical development envelope that would incorporate a large area of developable land and subsequently impact upon the setting of the village.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| DE/16/01| Land adjacent to Recreation Ground, north of | No                 | Yes                                                  | Yes                                                   | Yes                                           | No                 | No change, suggested change would create illogical development envelope that would incorporate a large area of developable land and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Is change logical?</th>
<th>Is change likely to result in the loss of resources?</th>
<th>Will change result in likely adverse visual impacts?</th>
<th>Does change create a significant size of site?</th>
<th>Suggested change accepted?</th>
<th>Reasoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DE/16/02</td>
<td>Feoffess School, Little Downham</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>subsequently impact upon the setting of the village. More suitably appraised through the site allocation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/16/03</td>
<td>Land west of Ely Road, Little Downham</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change, suggested change would create an illogical development envelope, extending into the open countryside. More suitably appraised though the site allocation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/16/04</td>
<td>Land south west of Main Street, Pymoor</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change, suggested change would create an illogical development envelope, extending into the open countryside. More suitably appraised though the site allocation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/16/05</td>
<td>Land north west of School Lane, Pymoor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change, suggested change would create an illogical development envelope, extending into the open countryside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/16/06</td>
<td>Land south of Pymoor Lane to opposite the Old Mill, Pymoor</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change, site visit identified that suggested change would not be logical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/16/07</td>
<td>Land east of Main Street, Pymoor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change, current development envelope reflects current built development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No change, suggested change would create an illogical development envelope, extending into the open countryside.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Is change logical?</th>
<th>Is change likely to result in the loss of resources?</th>
<th>Will change result in likely adverse visual impacts?</th>
<th>Does change create a significant size of site?</th>
<th>Suggested change accepted?</th>
<th>Reasoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DE/16/08</td>
<td>Land rear of Tower Mill, Little Downham</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (in part)</td>
<td>As the site has been developed, it appears logical to amend the Development Envelope. Very much at the fringe of the village. Suggested change made in part, in order to reflect development, but not unnecessarily open up land for development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/17/01</td>
<td>Former scaffolding site, Little Thetford</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change, would create an illogical development envelope, creating an isolated parcel of land physically separate from village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/21/01</td>
<td>Land at Water Hall Cottage, Reach</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change. Suggested change would extend into open countryside, beyond the natural limit of the built form of the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/23/01</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Manor House, Barway</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change, a relatively small area adjacent to a listed building, with the potential to impact upon the open feel of the village and the listed building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/23/02</td>
<td>Rear of Pond House, 103 Mere Side, Soham</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change, suggested change would extend into open countryside and would incorporate large area of developable land more suitably appraised through the site allocation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/23/03</td>
<td>Land adjacent Cherry Tree pub, Soham</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change. Large site better considered through the site allocation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/23/04</td>
<td>Land west of Orchard Row, Soham</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change, suggested change would extend into open countryside and would incorporate large area of developable land more suitably appraised through the site allocation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Is change logical?</td>
<td>Is change likely to result in the loss of resources?</td>
<td>Will change result in likely adverse visual impacts?</td>
<td>Does change create a significant size of site?</td>
<td>Suggested change accepted?</td>
<td>Reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/24/01</td>
<td>Land at Stetchworth park Stud, Church Lane, Stetchworth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Very large site would be created not connected to the village. Part of stud farm currently used for grazing. Boundary change would not be logical. No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/25/01</td>
<td>Land at 17 Short Road, Stretham</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change, current development envelope reflects current built development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/26/01</td>
<td>Land at Rectory Farm, south of Station Road, Sutton</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change, suggested change would incorporate garden land, opening up opportunity for inappropriate development and reducing openness of area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/26/02</td>
<td>Land north of Bellairs, Sutton</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change, suggested change would be illogical and extend into open countryside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/27/01</td>
<td>Land between Green Bank Road, Heath Road, Quarry Lane and Pound Way, Swaffham Bulbeck</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change. Large site better considered through the site allocation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/28/01</td>
<td>Land north of Mill Hill accessed from High Street, Swaffham Prior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change, suggested change would create large developable area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/28/02</td>
<td>Land at Lower End, Swaffham Prior</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change, suggested change would result in the incorporation of an area of open countryside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Is change logical?</td>
<td>Is change likely to result in the loss of resources?</td>
<td>Will change result in likely adverse visual impacts?</td>
<td>Does change create a significant size of site?</td>
<td>Suggested change accepted?</td>
<td>Reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/28/03</td>
<td>Dencora Field, west of B1102, adjacent to Rogers Road, Swaffham Prior</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change, suggested change would create large developable area, no logical boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/28/04</td>
<td>Land north of 49 Lower End, Swaffham Prior</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change, suggested change would form illogical development envelope that would extend into open countryside and would incorporate large area of developable land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/28/05</td>
<td>Land adjacent to 75 High Street, Swaffham Prior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change, suggested change would create large developable area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/29/01</td>
<td>Land adjacent Garwood Lodge, Main Street, Wentworth</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Current line of development envelope is illogical, area to be included has planning permission, unlikely to create additional development. Change development envelope to incorporate existing garden land/ site boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/29/02</td>
<td>Land north of Main Street, Wentworth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change, the suggested change could result in the loss of the open feel of the village, and in particular the playing field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/29/03</td>
<td>Land rear of 3 Main Street, Wentworth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change, suggested change would create illogical boundary that extends into the open countryside and would open up land for backland development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/31/01</td>
<td>Land at 10 Streatham Road,</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change, suggested change would extend into the open countryside and would incorporate a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Is change logical?</td>
<td>Is change likely to result in the loss of resources?</td>
<td>Will change result in likely adverse visual impacts?</td>
<td>Does change create a significant size of site?</td>
<td>Suggested change accepted?</td>
<td>Reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/31/02</td>
<td>Land south of Lower Road, Wicken</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Current development envelope reflects the built-up form of the village, suggested change is not logical, proposing to incorporate a mix of garden land and agricultural land. This site overlaps with DE/31/05.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/31/03</td>
<td>Land south of Chapel Lane, Wicken</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change, to development envelope would incorporate an area of low level agriculture with no obvious southern boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/31/04</td>
<td>Land north of Church Rd, Wicken</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change, suggested change would extend along the road frontage into the open countryside, incorporating a large area of developable land more suitably appraised through the site allocation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/31/05</td>
<td>Land at Lower Road, Wicken</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change, current development envelope reflects the built up form of the village, suggested change would extend into open countryside. Overlaps with DE/31/02.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/31/06</td>
<td>Land at Upware Road, Upware</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change, the suggested change would incorporate a large area, which is unsuitable for development, within the development envelope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE/35/01</td>
<td>Land at Ditton Green, Woodditton</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change, current development envelope reflects the built up form of the village. Suggested change would create illogical boundary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.0  Parish and Site Profiles – Suggested Changes to Development Envelopes

4.1 This section is organised in parish order. Each suggested development envelope change has an individual change profile providing basic information about each suggested change. The profiles identify each proposal by reference number and address and include information including the promoters’ explanation as to why a change is needed, and whether the change overlaps with any other site.

4.2 It is important to note that this section does not provide any assessment, but rather sets out each of the suggested changes in a consistent format. The suggested development envelope changes listed in this section have been assessed (as set out in section 3 above) to determine their suitability in accordance with the assessment criteria in section 2.

4.3 The maps in this document are provided for reference and have not been published to scale. Maps are reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty’s Stationary Office Crown copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.
Development Envelope Ref: DE/01/01  Parish: Ashley CP

DE Name: Land off Silverley Way

Address: Land off Silverley Way

Settlement: Ashley  Gross area (ha): 0.16

Overlaps suggested site / allocation:

Location Plan

Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:
To amend the building envelope so as to permit limited infill development on brownfield and other land within the built area of the village.
Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:
The current development envelope runs along the back building line of my house, Uplands. My house is in the development envelope, my garden is outside it. The addition of a porch or a conservatory to the back of my house would invoke separate planning regimes.

I would like to propose that the development envelope is extended to include both my garden and my house. This would bring the back of my garden in line with the ‘Brinkley’ sign and gates on the road.

This would add weight to my campaign to get the 30 m.p.h. Sign moved to where the ‘Brinkley’ sign is located. It is currently located at the front (NW corner) of my property.

The current development envelope as it affects ‘Uplands’ is an anomaly.

My proposal is outlined in the accompanying drawing. The proposed extension is coloured red.
Development Envelope Ref: DE/05/01  Parish: Burwell CP
DE Name: Land at 131 & 131B North Street, Burwell

Address: Land at 131 & 131B North Street, Burwell
Settlement: Burwell  Gross area (ha): 0.2
Overlaps suggested site / allocation:

Location Plan

Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:
We would like the following to be considered in this current consultation period.

At our family’s farm/small holding (3rd generation) at 131 North Street, Burwell, we have strived to work with E.C.D.C Planning over many years to house our family in a manner that has least impact to the local environment, but with some style and liveability as related to the Rural community.

After many delayed starts, we entered into the original LDP/LDF process to sort what some planning staff then called the “anomaly” of the change to the Building Line 1987 to 1988, behind our bungalow, 131B now demolished to make way for our daughter and our self build homes.

The “various North Street Anomalies” we understood were to be addressed at the site specific stage, the process never appears to have reached site specifics.

The enclosed maps and documents show the line prior to the 1987/1988 Lorimar review, which is straight across our land.

The proposed new line appears to run linear and possibly touching, the west wall of our new self build home and then at a very strange angle that appears to be the west wall or close to the other family bungalow, under construction, ignoring and sectioning through our small barn. The
Development Envelope Ref: DE/05/01 Parish: Burwell CP

DE Name: Land at 131 & 131B North Street, Burwell

Planning consent passed for our new home, is subject to the removal of permitted rights for a garden shed or conservatory without prior permission. As all of our recognised formal garden* will be outside the envelope, we find this most odd and against any custom and practice of achieving the envelope that we can find. The envelope on the surrounding properties observes the rear garden boundaries.

We note 117a North Street, which is in close proximity, was outside the 2009 envelope and similar in setting to us and has been included in the development envelope re map 8.8

Restoration of the area show on the map attached would rectify the anomaly giving a clear and concise edge to the development envelope by drawing upon recent and current features as we believe is custom and practice.
Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:
Proposed development envelope change includes site of existing LP allocation BUR1. Necessary to review Development Envelope to ensure it reflects the boundary of this development site.
Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:
Owing to incorrect mapping of features, buildings and planning permissions in progress on family land holdings at North Street, Burwell; the development envelope is not justified, effective nor consistent with national planning policy.

Our family land holding consists of the remainder of the family farm, Black Barn Farm. This includes our house 131B North Street, 131 North Street, my in-laws replacement home for the a property formerly numbered 131B North Street (an administrative error had this number transferred to our property rather than retained by them – they are currently awaiting a number), and the remainder of the farmyard which runs behind 131B, 131, 131A, 133B and 133A North Street.

As far as we can establish, the development envelope line in map 8.8 running south to north behind 131B coincides with their rear elevation of their new home (a replacement for their marital home built in the 1970s). The effect of this means that the erection of a garden shed or a small conservatory would require planning permission – which seems burdensome on both a homeowner and the council. The rear elevation of a house is not a defensible line for development.

On the site to the rear of 131 North Street, the location of what was to be my wife’s late uncle’s retirement home (approved and underway but not finished owing to his unexpected death), the
Development Envelope Ref: DE/05/03  Parish: Burwell CP

DE Name: Rear of 131B North Street, Burwell

proposed development envelope, starting at the point between 131B and 131, now heads diagonally north-west before running briefly west to east. In particular, the boundary around the plot again appears to coincide with a rear elevation, which is not defensible.

The envelope then completes its route across our land south to north, east to west, and then finally south to north – completely inconsistent with the straight boundaries along North Street.

The development envelope as a whole as it crosses our family land certainly does not create a coherent delineation between the built-up area of the village and the countryside on the opposite side of the Weirs. The line ignores the features of our own property and uses no identifiable feature or discernable change in the character of the landscape.

In particular, whilst the plot for my in-law's replacement home behind 131B North Street runs down to the Weirs, having viewed the site in the early 2000s Council officers plotted a line (as indicated on the map) demarcating their 'formal' garden from their 'informal' one. It is not a random line. It also incorporates the documented historic extent of the old inner farmyard. This inner farmyard, which included the extant barn (to the west of 131 North Street, unmarked on the map) and another former barn behind 133B off the field entrance, ran straight across.

There are two logical defensible lines across the rear of our properties – that of the Weirs and that of the historic farmyard. The envelope as it currently stands is not fit for purpose and has not recognised existing features (such as our unplotted barn which has been in situ for decades) or new development (such as my in-laws home), so therefore needs to be amended.
Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:

The logic behind the proposed envelope changes shown on the map is to maximise the use of existing Highway and utility infrastructure. In order to do this perhaps we should target areas where existing back development is also progressing such as along Toyes Lane, Newmarket Road, Ness Road, etc. This would spread the additional housing need more evenly around the village and make best use of existing infrastructure. The sites are also smaller and potentially more deliverable than larger sites.
**Development Envelope Ref:** DE/05/05  
**Parish:** Burwell CP

**DE Name:** East of Ness Road

**Address:** Land rear of existing dwellings along Ness Road

**Settlement:** Burwell  
**Gross area (ha):** 2.39

**Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:**

The logic behind the proposed envelope changes shown on the map is to maximise the use of existing Highway and utility infrastructure. In order to do this perhaps we should target areas where existing back development is also progressing such as along Toyes Lane, Newmarket Road, Ness Road, etc. This would spread the additional housing need more evenly around the village and make best use of existing infrastructure. The sites are also smaller and potentially more deliverable than larger sites.
Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:
The logic behind the proposed envelope changes shown on the map is to maximise the use of existing Highway and utility infrastructure. In order to do this perhaps we should target areas where existing back development is also progressing such as along Toyes Lane, Newmarket Road, Ness Road, etc. This would spread the additional housing need more evenly around the village and make best use of existing infrastructure. The sites are also smaller and potentially more deliverable than larger sites.
Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:
The logic behind the proposed envelope changes shown on the map is to maximise the use of existing Highway and utility infrastructure. In order to do this perhaps we should target areas where existing back development is also progressing such as along Toyes Lane, Newmarket Road, Ness Road, etc. This would spread the additional housing need more evenly around the village and make best use of existing infrastructure. The sites are also smaller and potentially more deliverable than larger sites.
Development Envelope Ref: DE/06/01 Parish: Cheveley CP

DE Name: Land at Centre Drive

Address: Land at Centre Drive

Settlement Cheveley Gross area (ha): 0.53

Overlaps suggested site / allocation:

Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:
The land shown appears unusable for garden or paddock and would be more suitable development.
Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:

We are proposing that the paddocks to the east of an existing housing development site, which has planning permission for 15 dwellings (LPA Ref: 13/01139/FUM), is included within the development envelope boundary for the village. The paddocks area extends to approx. 1.3ha in area and is well-screened by existing mature trees along its southern boundary, which create a natural boundary to the site.

The site could be accessed from the adjacent housing development, which is due to be constructed shortly. The access would involve the loss of one plot within the approved development, which would allow a new ‘private drive’ to be created to serve a low density development of around six detached houses.

The paddocks site proposed for inclusion within a revised development envelope boundary, would form a logical extension to the approved housing development, with minimal visual impact on the surrounding countryside, which is largely used as racehorse paddocks. The site is also located outside the boundary of the designated village Conservation Area, and the development of the site for housing purposes would not adversely affect the setting of the Conservation Area.

Cheveley is designated as a ‘medium village’ in the proposed settlement hierarchy set out in the draft Local Plan, where some new housing development would be located. Cheveley is a popular village with a good level of local services and facilities, including: the church; post office and village store; public house (The Red Lion); primary school; community room; and recreation ground (including sports pavilion and children’s play area). The village is also served by a regular bus service to Newmarket. Previous work undertaken by the Council in respect of potential
housing sites in the village (undertaken as part of the ‘Village Vision’ for the adopted Local Plan 2015), demonstrated that there were a lack of suitable housing sites on the edge of the village, within easy walking distance of local services and amenities. The site for the housing development approved under 13/01139/FUM, was carefully selected and enjoyed the support of the Parish Council. It was seen as the only potential housing site that had High Street frontage and was within close proximity of the village shop and post office, the community room and the pub. It therefore makes sense to add a modest extension to the site, which could be served by the approved access road, to provide several attractive, large family houses.

The existing use of the site is as horse and foaling paddocks, and its loss for housing development would not affect the operation of Brook Stud, which has numerous paddocks around the east side of the village. The approval of planning application 13/01139/FUM demonstrates that the Council consider this part of the village to be a sustainable location for new housing development, and the development of the additional site proposed by this suggested change to the development envelope boundary would only result in a net gain of five houses, over and above those already approved but not yet built – a potential total of 20 houses. This scale of development would not ‘overwhelm’ the village, either visually or in terms of potential impact on existing services and facilities, and the development would be low density to reflect the character of the surrounding area.

For all of the above reasons, we would submit that this proposed change to the development envelope boundary of the village makes complete sense in planning terms, and would not adversely affect the character of this part of the village or the surrounding countryside.
Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:

We are proposing that the rear garden land to Burrell Lodge, 171 High Street, Cheveley (as shown on the attached plans) is included within the development envelope boundary for the village. The garden area extends to approx. 0.24ha in area and is well-screened by existing mature trees along its northern boundary, which create a natural boundary to the site, and is also enclosed by existing large equestrian buildings to the south and east. Burrell Lodge itself currently forms the western boundary of the site.

Elsewhere in the village, the Development Envelope Boundary has been largely drawn to include all the gardens of existing houses, and given the character of the area immediately to the east and south of the site, we feel that it would logical and consistent to include the rear garden area within the Boundary. The owners of the Burrell Lodge would like to replace their property with a larger, new, sensitively designed house, as the existing house does not make a particularly positive contribution to the character and appearance of this part of the village Conservation Area, and is in need of significant improvements, updating and extending to provide for the needs of their growing family. If the garden land were to be included within the Development Envelope Boundary, then it would be possible to redevelop the site for three, large detached houses that would be in-keeping with the character of this part of the village. Access would be gained by utilising the existing access to Burrell Lodge (suitably improved and enhanced as necessary) and forming a short ‘private drive’ to serve a replacement dwelling at the front of the site, and two further detached houses in the area currently used as rear garden to Burrell Lodge (see attached indicative layout plan).
Cheveley is designated as a ‘medium village’ in the proposed settlement hierarchy set out in the draft Local Plan, where some new housing development would be located. Cheveley is a popular village with a good level of local services and facilities, including: the church; post office and village store; public house (The Red Lion); primary school; community room; and recreation ground (including sports pavilion and children's play area). The village is also served by a regular bus service to Newmarket.

The approval of planning application 13/01139/FUM (Land at 199 – 209 High Street, just to the south), demonstrates that the Council consider this part of the village to be a sustainable location for modest new housing development, and the scale of development that would be proposed would be entirely in-keeping with the character of this part of the village. This scale of development would not ‘overwhelm’ the village, either visually or in terms of potential impact on existing services and facilities.

For all of the above reasons, we would submit that this proposed change to the development envelope boundary of the village makes complete sense in planning terms, and the development of the site for low density housing would not adversely affect the character of this part of the village or the surrounding countryside.
Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:

Extension of the development boundary to include land at Gravel End, Coveney. Historically the site was included within the development boundary and has development on all edges with housing to the north. The site forms part of the built environment in Coveney and should be included within the development Envelope.
Development Envelope Ref: DE/08/02
Parish: Coveney CP
DE Name: Land west of Mansion Farm Yard

Address: Land west of Mansion Farm Yard
Settlement: Coveney
Gross area (ha): 0.29

Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:
Proposing to extend the development boundary to the rear (west) of Mansion Farm Yard, Coveney. The site currently forms part of a farm yard and its inclusion in the development boundary could provide an opportunity to develop a previously developed site in the centre of the village.
Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:

Please find attached a plan showing the excising line of the development area in Coveney. As you will see by the orange line on the drawing this a plot that I have just built, with a paddock of 0.8 of an acre to the rear elevation.

I would like to ask if there is any chance, at this stage, of this land to the rear of my property, being added into the development envelope.

I have an access of 3 meters to the side of my property.

Also I have a main sewer running to the rear of my property inside the envelope.

There is also a ditch indicated on the attached plan, which lends itself to a natural boundary line.
Development Envelope Ref: DE/10/01 Parish: Ely CP

DE Name: Cathedral Marina

Address: Cathedral marina, between River Great Ouse and Fen Line Rail Line.

Settlement City of Ely Gross area (ha): 5.59

Overlaps suggested site / allocation: Site/10/17

Location Plan

Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:
The Cathedral Marina is located just outside the development envelope situated on an area of land that falls between the River Great Ouse and the Fen Line railway line. We feel that the development envelope should be extended to the railway line, which already acts as a boundary to the south of the Marina, to include the parcel of land that makes up the Marina.
The consultation document highlights that there are a total of 4,212 housing units that still need to be allocated with the Local Plan. At present there is one large parcel of land that has been identified within Ely that can provide a mixed-use scheme that will contribute to the housing numbers within the District. Given that Ely is the focus of the three different options for distribution of growth over the Plan period, we consider that the inclusion of the Marina shows a logical inclusion within the development envelope that will enable an additional sustainable development to be brought forward.
Including the Marina within the development envelope will provide an additional opportunity to offer a site for development that will contribute to the housing supply demands of the town and the District. Our proposed modification to the development envelope is shown by the dashed black line below in Figure 1. The extension as shown will not encroach the open countryside to the east of the site as the railway line provides a clear, defensible boundary beyond which the development envelope could be maintained. The site is linked to the city by way of access to the site, it would therefore make sense to include it within the development envelope as it still forms part of the city.
Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:

We are proposing to include the northern part of the Westmill Foods Site within the development envelope of Ely. The site is well-related to the existing settlement boundary and is in a highly sustainable location. The northern, undeveloped portion of the site, forms a constituent part of the Westmill Foods Site, however, the development envelope currently divides the site in two. Given the previously developed nature of the southern part of the site the designation of the northern part of the site as countryside is not considered appropriate. The proposed change would assist in the future growth of the city.
Development Envelope Ref: DE/11/01  Parish: Fordham CP

DE Name: Land at 5 Station Road, Fordham

Address: Land at 5 Station Road, Fordham

Settlement: Fordham  Gross area (ha): 1.4

Overlaps suggested site / allocation: Site/11/02

Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:
The settlement boundary should be amended to include the land at 5 Station Road, Fordham to recognise the committed development of this site, as permitted under planning application E/97/00609/F – Change of use for change of use to light industrial – Approved 08.10.97, which has been partially implemented and as such could be developed out at any time.
Development Envelope Ref: DE/11/02     Parish: Fordham CP

DE Name: Land at Soham Road

Address: Land at Soham Road, Fordham

Settlement: Fordham     Gross area (ha): 2.31

Overlaps suggested site / allocation: Site/11/03

Location Plan

Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:
We would like to propose the extension of the village boundary to include the land as the enclosed plan. We see this as the natural village extension bringing a mixture of dwelling types along with much needed affordable homes required for the existing village community. The site extends the built form from Rule Gardens towards the heart of the village along with the village school. We are also able to offer a new estate road access on to Soham Road, with a pedestrian access on to Carter Street if required. The site would go some way towards the 5 year housing supply required by the N.P.P.F. Any application would look to provide the affordable homes as required by the local authority and these can be by way of housing association or community trust, or a mixture of both. The site is available for development as it is currently mostly paddock land used by the owners. The site is all within flood zone 1, which further emphasises it suitability for development and Sustainability.
Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:
The change is as a result of our submission of a site as a proposed allocation in response to the Call for Sites, as recorded on Form B. It adjusts the boundary to incorporate the proposed allocation within Fordham's settlement boundary.
Development Envelope Ref: DE/11/04 Parish: Fordham CP
DE Name: Scotsdale Garden Centre

Address: Scotsdale Garden Centre, Fordham
Settlement: Fordham Gross area (ha): 13.23
Overlaps suggested site / allocation: Site/11/09

Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:
Proposed amendment to the development envelope around the village of Fordham, to incorporate Scotsdales Garden Centre and surrounding land, as illustrated on the attached site plan. These changes are necessary to accommodate the proposed redevelopment of the Garden Centre and surrounding land.
Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:

We would like to see the Development Envelope extended to include land outlined edged blue on the attached Site Location plan. In the event that the Site is not otherwise allocated for residential development, inclusion of the land within the Development Envelope would enable consideration to be given to windfall residential development during the Plan Period. This would support greater flexibility in decision-making, particularly if East Cambridgeshire District Council encounters continued difficulty in housing supply (particularly Five Year Housing Land Supply). Inclusion of the Site would therefore suggest the principle of development is acceptable, subject to the satisfaction of all other material considerations, which would then be determined (in terms of quantum, layout of development and means of mitigating potential constraints where applicable). The Site is located within a sustainable location, and would continue a pattern of recent housing allocations along Mildenhall Road. The option for windfall development would help deter speculative applications for housing in other less suitable locations, which may be deemed acceptable if the Council cannot demonstrate a continuous supply of housing land for a five year period.
Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:

Proposed revision to the Development Envelope to allow for residential development at Land off Hod Hall Lane, Haddenham, Ely Cambridgeshire, CB6 3UX. It is proposed to move the development envelope boundary at the rear of 27, 29 and 29a Lode Way eastwards to include the area of land directly adjacent these within the development envelope.
**Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:**

For 22 The Borough, Aldreth, we are asking that the planning envelope be extended to the ditch joining the Cambridge Outdoor Club and in line with the southern boundary of the envelope. If the purpose of the Development Envelope is to prevent sprawl into the open countryside, there is no way this will happen with our proposals. As you can see from the map, the eastern side of our property borders the Cambridge Outdoor Club, with their car park the other side of the ditch and not open countryside. There are also a number of buildings there with a swimming pool and tennis court. Diagonally opposite us is the electricity substation where they have built two small outbuildings. When we bought the property in 1981 there were a number of outbuildings beyond the envelope which we demolished and turned into garden.
Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:

We are proposing the change to allow the site to become within the settlement boundary to allow for further development on new infill dwellings within the village envelope as described in the current local plan policy for the village, we are suggesting up to 5 dwellings on the site and or part of it. That would aid with the achieving of the 8 new dwellings suggested in the current local plan.
Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:

Northwards extension of the existing development envelope on the northern boundary of the village to include part of the ‘Rec Field’, which is bordered by the Recreation Ground to the east and Feoffees Primary School to the south.

The shifting of the development envelope would allow for modest new housing development without any loss of amenity to the village as a whole and with minimal visual impact.
Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:

Little Downham Parish Council proposes the infill of the development between the south east corner of Cannon Street along the west side of Ely Road to the development envelope south west of Ely Road.
**Development Envelope Ref:** DE/16/03  
**Parish:** Little Downham CP

**DE Name:** Land south west of Main Street

**Address:** Land south west of Main Street

**Settlement**  
Pymoor

**Gross area (ha):** 0.66

**Overlaps suggested site / allocation:** Site/16/05

**Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:**
To extend the development envelope south west of Main Street.
Development Envelope Ref: DE/16/04  Parish: Little Downham CP

DE Name: Land north west of School Lane

Address: Land north west of School Lane

Settlement: Pymoor  Gross area (ha): 0.65

Overlaps suggested site / allocation: Site/16/03

Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:
To extend the development envelope north west side of School Lane.
Development Envelope Ref: DE/16/05  Parish: Little Downham CP
DE Name: Land south of Pymoor Lane to opposite the Old Mill
Address: Land south of Pymoor Lane to opposite the Old Mill
Settlement Pymoor  Gross area (ha): 0.58
Overlaps suggested site / allocation:

Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:
To extend the development envelope south of Pymoor Lane to opposite the Old Mill.
Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:
To infill the development envelope on Pymoor Lane between Nos. 8b and 10.
Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:
We are proposing the change to allow the site to become within the settlement boundary to allow for further development on new infill dwellings within the village envelope, we are suggesting up to a max 5 dwellings on the site.
Declarative Envelope Ref: DE/16/08 Parish: Little Downham CP  
DE Name: Land rear of Tower Mill  

Address: Tower Mill, 37 Ely Road, Little Downham  
Settlement: Little Downham Gross area (ha): 0.15  

Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:

Tower Mill was designed taking care to maintain an access route beside the garage to the rear of 35 Ely Road, so as to potentially allow development of a bungalow similar to that approved under 12/00736/FUL (approved site plan appended). Services have been installed in anticipation.  

It is noted that the Officer's report (extract appended) on that approved application noted the site was within the development envelope. Map 21 from the approved 2009 Plan is appended.  

As the 2015 Plan has been shown to be inadequate it is suggested that this development opportunity should not be lost.  

It is acknowledged that the rear boundary of the approved, as built site of layout Tower Mill differ from 12/00736/FUL, and a proposed revision to Map 23 is appended.
Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:
Inset Map 24 should be revised to extend the settlement boundary around the former scaffolding site at Holt Fen, Little Thetford, which has recently been granted planning permission 15/01476/OUT for four dwellings. The proposed change will add clarity to the Local Plan and accurately portray the area where development will be supported within the village of Little Thetford. See attached site location plan and sketch based on the extract from the draft Local Plan Inset Map 24.
Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:

The development envelope for Reach currently cuts my garden and the land I rent in half. My garage is currently outside the Development Envelope. At the time of the Preliminary Draft Local Plan, two of the three criteria for including land in the development, both of which apply to my land were:

Would the suggested change be logical (in defining the limits of the built-up area of the village) and follow a physical or natural landscape feature? Is the land that would be brought within the development envelope brownfield (i.e. previously developed) or a garden?

Since that date, two dwellings have been approved outside the current development envelope adjacent to my land (16/01008/FUL and 16/01036/FUL). I ask that my land be included within the development envelope so as to regularize this with regard to the current built space. I attach a plan to illustrate this which shows the suggestion in relation to the current envelope and the recently approved dwellings.
Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:

Mr & Mrs Flack own and occupy the Manor House (CB7 5UB) at Barway and their ownership includes an extensive area of gardens and grounds surrounding the property. The Manor House and all of its gardens/grounds lie outside of the Development Envelope for Barway as defined in the adopted Local Plan 2015. We are unsure as to how the existing village Development Envelope has been defined but we do note that Pembroke Farm which lies to the south of the Manor House and is somewhat separated from the main part of the village, is included within the Development Envelope.

The gardens and grounds of the Manor House include a former agricultural building to the south of the Manor House and this building now benefits from planning permission (Reference 14/01089/FUL) for conversion to a residential dwelling (permitted 30/12/14). The site of the planning permission comprises a small grass area of approximately 0.1ha.

Although it is separated from the main formal gardens of the Manor House by a hedge/tree line it is considered that this land is a part of the gardens of the Manor House because of its past and current use.

The land in question was purchased by the current owners in 2003 and prior to their purchase we understand it can be described as an area of amenity grassland. Since that time, it has been used for various domestic purposes, children’s play activities (including siting of a trampoline), for playing football, camping and other sports, for family activities and for events such as an annual bonfire etc. It is therefore the case that the lawful use of this land is as private garden space rather than amenity land or some form of agricultural use. Since purchasing the land it has always
been maintained by the current owners as a mown lawn area.
In addition to the above, planning permission 14/1089/FUL provides for a garden space between
the former agricultural building and the St Nicholas Church building to the east, which has been
converted to a dwelling. As a result of that permission, the nature of the land in question is likely
to change once the building is converted and occupied such that it will have a much more
domesticated appearance than at present.
We assume it is the case that the above planning permission was granted after the assessment
work which resulted in the definition of the village Development Envelope for Barway and
therefore, there has been a material change in circumstances since any such assessment work
was undertaken.
It is also the case that, during formulation of the last Local Plan, this was one area which the
District Council suggested as a possible location for additional housing development in the village.
Ultimately, that idea was not supported by the village or Parish through a consultation exercise.
However, the fact that the Council suggested this area (see attached plan) indicates that even
then the land in question was not considered as open countryside and was thought to be of a
different character such that residential development could potentially be accommodated.
In the light of the above circumstances we consider that the current village Development
Envelope boundary is inappropriate and we suggest an amended boundary which encompasses
all of the land that now benefits from planning permission for residential use plus immediately
adjoining land. It would be somewhat perverse and inconsistent, in our opinion, to include a
property such as Pembroke Farm in the village envelope but to also exclude the new dwelling that
has been permitted by ECDC.
We have enclosed plans showing the area of the planning permission which East Cambridgeshire
has granted and also a plan showing the total area of additional land which we consider should
now be included within the village Development Boundary. That area of land is well defined by
mature trees and hedges and forms a clear, logical and defensible village boundary. It is also a
boundary which we believe is consistent in its approach to other property boundaries found in the
village and whether they lie within or outside of the
Development Envelope.
We would be pleased to discuss the above matter in more detail with the Council if that would be
of benefit.
Development Envelope Ref: DE/23/02  Parish: Soham CP

DE Name: Rear of Pond House, 103 Mere Side

Address: Rear of Pond House, 103 Mere Side, Soham, CB7 5EE

Settlement: Soham  Gross area (ha): 2.67

Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:
The land relates to the property, curtilage and associated land to the rear of Pond House, 103 Mere Side, Soham Ely Cambridgeshire CB7 5EE.

At present the Development Envelope, which otherwise runs adjacent to the southern boundary of the railway line, kinks in to exclude this land from the Development Envelope which is inconsistent with the rest of the length of the settlement boundary. Whilst it is acknowledged that part of this site falls within County Wildlife Site 56 (CWS) initial high level appraisal work indicates that some of the land within the curtilage of Pond House falls outside of the CWS 56 designation. In accordance with the Council’s draft strategy for locating development within the higher order settlements it is appropriate that the Development Boundary envelope is extended at this point to meet this objective.
**Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:**

I would change the developments to the fields beside the cherry tree pub and the land at the back of the houses on Orchard Row. SOH5 and SOH6 and possibly the other developments coming onto Brook Street will impact dramatically on the local traffic. It is already difficult to drive along Brook St due to the amount of cars. This is also the case on Regal Drive where cars ad lorries are parked. It will also have an effect on Tanners lane where cars are parked and congestion is a common theme, even worse during the school run.

Alternative sites would be as suggested above as there would be no impact on the Soham fens and wildlife and the traffic would have direct access onto the A142 and the Wicken Road therefore not impacting on the already increasingly busy roads in Soham. Brook St and Regal are at times single lane carriageway due to parking.
**Development Envelope Ref:** DE/23/04  
**Parish:** Soham CP  
**DE Name:** Land west of Orchard Row  

**Address:** West of Orchard Row, Soham  
**Settlement** Soham  
**Gross area (ha):** 15.41  
**Overlaps suggested site / allocation:** Site/23/11  

**Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:**  
I would change the developments to the fields beside the cherry tree pub and the land at the back of the houses on Orchard Row. SOH5 and SOH6 and possibly the other developments coming onto Brook Street will impact dramatically on the local traffic. It is already difficult to drive along Brook St due to the amount of cars. This is also the case on Regal Drive where cars ad lorries are parked. It will also have an effect on Tanners lane where cars are parked and congestion is a common theme, even worse during the school run.  
Alternative sites would be as suggested above as there would be no impact on the Soham fens and wildlife and the traffic would have direct access onto the A142 and the Wicken Road therefore not impacting on the already increasingly busy roads in Soham. Brook St and Regal are at times single lane carriageway due to parking.
**Development Envelope Ref:** DE/24/01  
**Parish:** Stetchworth CP

**DE Name:** Land at Stetchworth park Stud, Church Lane

**Address:** Stetchworth park Stud, Church Lane

**Settlement**  
Stetchworth

**Gross area (ha):** 16.11

**Overlaps suggested site / allocation:** Site/24/01

---

**Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:**

The proposed change is to include, within an amended development envelope, land off Church Lane which is currently part of Stetchworth Park Stud. The changes are necessary to allow this land to be allocated for a mixed-use development which could include residential, employment, tourism, leisure, equestrian and community-led development uses. The land, which is shown on drawing no. 180-DS-LP-001 is 15.9 hectares and benefits from an existing vehicular access together with additional footpath links to the centre of the village. The site is in one ownership, is readily available, is surplus to the requirements of the stud operation at Stetchworth and has no known constraints. In addition to traditional market and affordable housing, employment and community-led development uses the site would be ideally suited to follow the American model of equestrian centres where individuals make use of equestrian facilities linked to adjacent tourist or holiday accommodation.
Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:
When we purchased the property at 17 Short Road a Certificate of Lawfulness was approved in November 2008, Ref: 08/01001/CLE, changing the use of the land at the rear of the property from open countryside to residential curtilage. With this change, our understanding is that this land should be incorporated in the proposed revised development envelope for Stretham. Should Stretham require expansion, this could be a potential site for development.
Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:

The current boundary to the south of Station Road in the vicinity of Rectory Farm appears illogical. At present there are no definable features on the ground on which the boundary is based and it appears to arbitrarily cut through domestic gardens. There are some buildings which lie immediately outside of the boundary and some areas of open land within it. It also differs from the Conservation Area boundary for no obvious reason.

At the eastern end of the village Station Road, on its south side, comprises a linear strip of detached dwellings and farmhouses generally in large mature plots. The area is also characterised by a number of outbuildings including traditional farm buildings, stables and modern outbuildings that have been permitted by the Council. The sports and recreation ground to the east of these properties is a key permanent open space. Not only does this form a clear limit to the Development Envelope in an easterly direction but it rightly falls outside of the Envelope. The western boundary of the sports fields therefore marks the true ‘end’ of the village built up framework and in our view that point should be the eastern extent of the Development Envelope.

To overcome uncertainty and inconsistency in the southern boundary of the Development Envelope in this part of Sutton we also believe that the this should be moved slightly further south so as to encompass all of the outbuildings and gardens that are present as it is not currently based on any clear boundaries.

Alteration of the boundary in the way we have suggested to the east would encompass a part of a small paddock on the south side of Station Road and we believe that this plot of land is suitable...
Development Envelope Ref: DE/26/01 Parish: Sutton CP

DE Name: Land at Rectory Farm, south of Station Road

for a modest residential development of, say, 2 dwellings which would slightly extend the current linear housing development eastwards but only to the point where development on the north side of Station Road already exists.
**Development Envelope Ref:** DE/26/02  
**Parish:** Sutton CP

**DE Name:** land north of Bellairs  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Gross area (ha):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land north of Bellairs, Sutton</td>
<td>Sutton</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overlaps suggested site / allocation:**

**Location Plan**

---

**Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:**

We request inclusion of the land to the north of the village into East Cambs Local Plan. This site, half of which has already been developed on well drained flat land in the centre of the village, not on a flood plain, with services up to the boundary for a second phase development.

Land to the north of Tower road has already passed. Our site is ideally suited to give access to all local amenities and to any future by-pass or access road to the north of the village. The site is ready and waiting for development and we are of the opinion this is where future development should take place in Sutton and we strongly recommend this site to you to be included in the Local Plan.
Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:
The land is clearly related to the built up areas within the village having existing development adjacent to all of its boundaries. As such it should not be regarded as lying in the countryside because it clearly sits within the village. There are no designations on the land which would suggest that it needs to be excluded from the village framework. Sensitively designed development on this land would ensure integration within this part of the village and would bring parts of the village community together in an inclusive way.
Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:
The land is 0.892 ha and access points are already situated within the development envelope and could be improved to enhance the density of development.
The land has been within our family since 1929 and in our opinion is a natural extension to the development envelope for further residential housing.
Based on a low density of 20 dwellings per hectare we anticipate that this site could accommodate 15-17 houses.
Development Envelope Ref: DE/28/02  
Parish: Swaffham Prior CP

DE Name: Land at Lower End

Address: Land at Lower End

Settlement: Swaffham Prior  
Gross area (ha): 0.14

Overlaps suggested site / allocation:

Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:
Straighten the envelope to the natural line of the Boundary shown in Green. The section between the current boundary and the suggested would allow for further dwelling development.
**Development Envelope Ref:** DE/28/03  
**Parish:** Swaffham Prior CP  
**DE Name:** Dencora Field, west of B1102, adjacent to Rogers Road  

**Address:** Dencora Field, west of B1102, adjacent to Rogers Road  
**Settlement** Swaffham Prior  
**Gross area (ha):** 5.65

**Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:**

I propose that the Development Envelope be extended to include the whole of Dencora field (West of the B1102, adjacent to Rogers Road) since,

1) It is clear that the village will have to expand to accommodate Government set growth targets for the region and this area provides ample room for expansion.

2) A reasonably large development area such as Dencora field could accommodate useful village facilities such as shops (of which there are currently none) which the majority of the village could easily access.

3) This area would be relatively easy to integrate into the main village as it is away from the B1102 (an increasingly busy road).

4) Development has already been undertaken on the area designated SWP1 so further building would be more likely to complement the existing development in this region. The development envelope to the East of the B1102 should be left intact as,

1) Any building in this area is away from established infrastructure.

2) Building would encroach on actively worked farmland.

3) Development would only add more access points to the B1102 further complicating access to this road.

4) Any dwellings to the East of the B1102 will be further from public facilities in the village such as schools, and would require more residents and their children to cross a busy road to access village facilities.
Development Envelope Ref: DE/28/04  Parish: Swaffham Prior CP

DE Name: Land north of 49 Lower End

Address: Land north of 49 Lower End

Settlement: Swaffham Prior  Gross area (ha): 0.43

Overlaps suggested site / allocation:

Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:
I propose that if required, the following additional areas are considered:
- Land north of 49 Lower End
- Land adjacent to 75 High Street
Development Envelope Ref: DE/28/05  Parish: Swaffham Prior CP

DE Name: Land adjacent to 75 High Street

Address: Land adjacent to 75 High Street

Settlement: Swaffham Prior  Gross area (ha): 0.51

Overlaps suggested site / allocation: Site/28/05

Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:
I propose that if required, the following additional areas are considered:
- Land north of 49 Lower End
- Land adjacent to 75 High Street
Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:

We are proposing to change the settlement boundary to include land adjacent to ‘Garwood Lodge’ Main Street, Wentworth. Since the last Local Plan was adopted a play park has been developed on land to the west and the site has planning permission for the erection of a single dwelling. The site can be accessed via main street and there are no constraints to the site. The site is well located to the centre and provides a sensible extension to the village and built development. Whilst securing Planning Permission for the existing dwelling on site (yet to be implemented) it was confirmed that there were no constraints to the site. The site is available, developable and deliverable.
Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:
The Peeling family own farmland at Wentworth – within and around the village. We propose that the existing village Development Envelope boundary is amended to reflect changing circumstances since adoption of the last Proposals map boundary for Wentworth.
The current Development Envelope includes three completely separate areas for Wentworth – each tightly drawn around areas of built mainly residential development. The adopted Local Plan also identified two areas of land (WEN1 and WEN2) as proposed housing allocations. These housing allocations are located on the south side of Main Street.
Since that boundary was defined there have been two changes of circumstances. Firstly, the Peeling family leased an area of land on the north side of Main Street to the Parish Council and that land has now been successfully developed as a children’s playground and playing field. That land lies outside of the currently defined Development Envelope. Secondly, on the south side of Main Street residential development has occurred on the two sites which were allocated in the 2015 Local Plan and indeed construction work is ongoing at present. A total of four new residential properties will be delivered on these two separate sites.
The combined effect of the above two changes of circumstance is to somewhat alter the built character of Wentworth along Main Street and it is now much more of a continuous linear development than the three separate developed areas that are reflected in the existing Local Plan proposals map. Of the three ‘developed’ areas – the middle area has now virtually joined the eastern main part of the village. On the southern side of Main Street this new linear character is
particularly evident but the effect is emphasised
by the children’s playground/playing field on the north side as this is a ‘developed’ site rather than
open agricultural land.
We therefore suggest that the Development Envelope should be revised so as to:
• Include the new residential properties developed on the local plan allocation sites;
• Include the children’s playground/playing field; and
• Include the small gap between the children’s playground/playing fields and No. 3 Main Street.
The small area of open land that would be included in the above could potentially accommodate
approximately six further dwellings. Dwellings on this site would effectively be infill development
on what is otherwise a built, linear frontage. This site is also opposite one of the areas allocated
for development and now being built for housing and hence the past intermittent open gaps along
Main Street have already been largely lost.
Note, we have filled in a separate Form B Site Suggestion but we are aware that the site, at
0.6ha, is unlikely to yield 10 dwellings in a location such as Wentworth and we have suggested
six dwellings.
We would be pleased to discuss the above matter in more detail with the Council if that would be
of benefit.
Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:

We believe the land rear of no 3 Main Street should be included within the development framework to enable additional development in the village (see attached plan). This would mirror the framework to the east.
Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:

This is a proposal to extend the existing development boundary to the north west of Wicken incorporating no. 10 Streatham Road and land immediately to the North West with frontage to the main road.

Following a positive response at a parish council meeting last year, we believe there may be broad support for this land to be included within the development boundary as a strategic housing allocation site.
Development Envelope Ref: DE/31/02  Parish: Wicken CP
DE Name: Land south of Lower Road

Address: Land south of Lower Road
Settlement: Wicken  Gross area (ha): 0.96
Overlap suggested site / allocation: Site/31/02; Site/31/04

Location Plan

Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:
Wicken Parish Council proposes extension of the Development Envelope in the following locations:
  a - Land south of Lower Road - See DE/31/02
  b - Land south of Chapel Lane - See DE/31/03
  c - Land north of Church Road - See DE/31/04
  d - Land north west of Stretham Road, with access from Hawes Lane. - See DE/31/01
Each of these locations should normally accommodate up to 8 properties in a cul-de-sac or crescent style arrangement with offroad parking for a minimum of 2 vehicles per property. This style of development already exists in Wicken, ie The Crescent, and a recent planning application off Chapel Lane.
Preference should be given for the development of smaller units to re-balance the skewed demographic that currently exists. There is a need for smaller units, 1-2 beds, as explained below.

Note that all of the sites are expected to come forward for development as they have been subject to previous attempts or to informal enquiries.
Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:

Wicken Parish Council proposes extension of the Development Envelope in the following locations:

a - Land south of Lower Road - See DE/31/02
b - Land south of Chapel Lane - See DE/31/03
c - Land north of Church Road - See DE/31/04
d - Land north west of Stretham Road, with access from Hawes Lane. - See DE/31/01

Each of these locations should normally accommodate up to 8 properties in a cul-de-sac or crescent style arrangement with offroad parking for a minimum of 2 vehicles per property. This style of development already exists in Wicken, ie The Crescent, and a recent planning application off Chapel Lane.

Preference should be given for the development of smaller units to re-balance the skewed demographic that currently exists. There is a need for smaller units, 1-2 beds, as explained below.

Note that all of the sites are expected to come forward for development as they have been subject to previous attempts or to informal enquiries.
Development Envelope Ref: DE/31/04  Parish: Wicken CP

DE Name: Land north of Church Rd

Address: Land north of Church Rd

Settlement: Wicken  Gross area (ha): 0.48

Overlaps suggested site / allocation: Site/31/05

Location Plan

Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:
Wicken Parish Council proposes extension of the Development Envelope in the following locations:

a - Land south of Lower Road - See DE/31/02
b - Land south of Chapel Lane - See DE/31/03
c - Land north of Church Road - See DE/31/04
d - Land north west of Stretham Road, with access from Hawes Lane. - See DE/31/01

Each of these locations should normally accommodate up to 8 properties in a cul-de-sac or crescent style arrangement with offroad parking for a minimum of 2 vehicles per property. This style of development already exists in Wicken, ie The Crescent, and a recent planning application off Chapel Lane.
Preference should be given for the development of smaller units to re-balance the skewed demographic that currently exists. There is a need for smaller units, 1-2 beds, as explained below.

Note that all of the sites are expected to come forward for development as they have been subject to previous attempts or to informal enquiries.
Development Envelope Ref: DE/31/05    Parish: Wicken CP
DE Name: Land at Lower Road

Address: Land at Lower Road

Settlement: Wicken    Gross area (ha): 1.54

Overlaps suggested site / allocation: Site/31/02; Site/31/04

Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:
Inclusion of land to the south of Lower Road, as a site for residential development.
Development Envelope Ref: DE/31/06  Parish: Wicken CP

DE Name: Land at Upware Road

Address: Land at Upware Road

Settlement: Upware  Gross area (ha): 0.72

Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:

Upware is a small village in the parish of Wicken, and is close to the boundary of South Cambridgeshire. The village is situated in a very rural position surrounded by open countryside, with three sites of Special Scientific Interest and a former County Wildlife Site. The River Cam passes through the village and provides a range of boating and leisure opportunities for locals and visitors. The main features of the village are shown on.

Facilities in the village are limited but include a riverside public house and a marina. Public transport services are limited with one bus service to Ely every Thursday. The village relies heavily on Soham for its primary and secondary schools, medical services and nearest shops.

One new housing allocation site is proposed on the western side of the Upware Road. A development envelope has been drawn around Upware to define the built up part of the village and this new allocation should be included in the development envelope.
Reasons promoter believes Development Envelope should be amended:

This letter is submitted to the Council on behalf of the landowner, in order to promote the above site for residential use. This is with a view to gaining a boundary amendment for Woodditton, to accommodate approximately two dwellings in the emerging Local Plan. The site is located off Ditton Green, Woodditton, adjacent to the existing development envelope for the village. The site comprises 0.2 hectares of amenity land, although it has been used by the Parish Council and local residents for public events on an occasional and intermittent basis. This was without the knowledge or permission of the owner and no prescriptive rights exist. The site is not allocated as a Local Green Space in the adopted or draft Local Plan. A site location plan is attached to this letter. It should be noted that a planning application for two dwellings at the site was refused by Members at planning committee on 03 August 2016 (application reference 16/00726/FUL). This was despite a clear recommendation for approval by Officers. The planning committee report is attached to this letter and clearly identifies that the principle of development at the site is appropriate and acceptable.
Form C - Suggested Changes to Development Envelope

As part of the Local Plan consultation we would like to know if you have any suggested changes to development envelopes. Please use this form to submit any proposed changes to a development envelope, please use a separate form for each boundary change that you are suggesting. The existing development envelopes can be viewed at: http://www.eastcambs.gov.uk/local-development-framework/east-cambridgeshire-local-plan-2015-policies-map

This form should only be used to suggest changes to the development envelopes. Please use Form A if you want to comment more generally on the East Cambridgeshire Preliminary Draft Local Plan available on our website at: http://www.eastcambs.gov.uk/local-development-framework/local-plan-review

Please return your suggested development envelope changes and map to us by 11.59pm on Thursday 24 March 2016.

By e-mail: to planningpolicy@eastcambs.gov.uk
Post to: Local Plan Consultation, East Cambs District Council, The Grange, Nutholt Lane, Ely, CB7 4EE

Part A: Your Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation (if applicable):</th>
<th>Agent organisation (if applicable):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode:</td>
<td>Postcode:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td>Email:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel:</td>
<td>Tel:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature: (not required if submitted electronically)  Date: 

Please tick this box if you would like us to notify you consultations on the emerging East Cambs Local Plan

Data Protection and Freedom of Information

All personal information that you provide will be used solely for the purpose of the Local Plan consultation. Please note that each comment and the name of the person who made the comment will be featured on the East Cambs website- comments will not be confidential. Full comments, including addresses, will also be available to view on request. By submitting this form you are agreeing to these conditions.

For Office Use only

Representor Number........................
Site Number..............................
Part B – Your suggested change to a development envelope

Name of Settlement: 

What changes are you proposing and why are these changes necessary?

Please clearly show the suggested change on a map and send this to us with this form. Please include your name on the map.

Please submit your suggested change to development envelope to: planningpolicy@eastcambs.gov.uk or to Local Plan Consultation, East Cambs District Council, The Grange, Nutholt Lane, Ely, CB7 4EE.

All suggested development envelope changes will be assessed and any proposed changes will be included in the next version of the Local Plan due for public consultation in summer 2016

THANK YOU FOR TAKING TIME TO RESPOND

For Office Use only
Representor Number
Site Number