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1. Introduction

1.1. To meet East Cambridgeshire’s development needs, the Local Plan identifies sites that are suitable and available to accommodate new development. Sites proposed for development in the Local Plan are referred to as “site allocations”.

1.2. Sites submitted during two rounds of Local Plan consultation, along with other suitable and available sites known to the Council, provided a ‘pool’ of potential sites from which the Council could select site allocations for inclusion in the Local Plan. Section 2 provides a summary of the methodology used in assessing sites. Section 3 discusses the role of other relevant considerations in assessing sites, such as the overall spatial distribution of growth.

1.3. The primary purpose of this report is to outline the Council’s assessment of sites, and present the reasons for each site’s selection or rejection from the Local Plan process. Section 4 is organised alphabetically by parish and presents site assessment findings for each site considered. Each site assessment report includes a map to identify the site’s location, and scoring against the assessment criteria.
2. Methodology

Background

‘Pool’ of sites

2.1. In February and March 2016, the Council published the Preliminary Draft Local Plan (PDLP) for consultation. As part of this public consultation, individuals and organisation were invited to suggest sites for potential inclusion in the Local Plan.

2.2. To ensure the process of submitting sites was straight-forward, respondents were encouraged to complete a short form, titled \textit{Form B: Site Suggestion Form}. The Call for Sites exercise generated a good deal of interest. Principally, responses were received from local landowners, agents, developers and house-builders, and also parish councils.

2.3. During consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan (Jan – Feb 2017), the Council invited further site submissions (referred to as Additional Site Suggestions).

2.4. In addition to sites received during the consultation exercise, the Strategic Planning Team also considered the following sites:

- Existing Local Plan 2015 site allocations which are undeveloped and do not have planning permission;
- Sites with extant planning permission, or resolution to grant planning permission, for 10 or more dwellings; and
- Existing business parks / areas of employment not currently allocated by the Local Plan 2015.

2.5. There was a general presumption that existing Local Plan 2015 site allocations would be carried forward as they have previously been tested through the planning process and demonstrated to be suitable. Existing allocations were rejected where:

- New evidence suggests the site would no longer provide a suitable location for new development;
- The site is no longer available for development or is considered to have little prospect of being delivered;
- The capacity of the site is less than the minimum threshold of 10 units; or
- The site has been developed and is now complete.

2.6. Similarly, large sites with extant planning permission (or resolution to grant planning permission) have also been determined to be suitable for development through the planning process. Allocation through the Local Plan secures the principle of development established through such decisions in the event that planning permission lapses or an alternative proposal is submitted. Sites with
extant planning permission for 10 or more units (as at 01 September 2017) are therefore identified as “Preferred Sites” in this assessment report.

**Site Assessment Methodology Report (Feb 16)**

2.7. The Council published a Site Assessment Methodology Report in February 2016. This report explained how the Council intended to assess suggested sites, identifying a range of specific assessment criteria and scoring matrices, and was published for consultation alongside the Preliminary Draft Local Plan (PDLP).

2.8. Following consultation, and as site assessment commenced, it was necessary to amend certain assessment criteria and include some additional criteria. This section provides an updated summary of the methodology employed in the assessment and selection of sites.

**General approach**

2.9. In summary, assessment of sites included the following stages:

I. **Data collection** – To inform the site assessment process, data was collected using a range of methods, including:

   a. Desktop analysis of sites using data already held by the Council or available in the public domain;

   b. A ‘Technical Consultation’ - Initially held in Spring 2016, and repeated in Spring 2017 for additional sites. Service providers and public bodies were invited to comment on each site;

   c. Parish Council consultation – Initially held in Spring 2016, and repeated in Spring 2017 for additional sites, Parish Councils within the district were invited to:

      - comment on each site suggested in their parish;
      - indicate whether they support the site (or not); and
      - rank each site in terms of preference.

   d. New and updated evidence base studies were commissioned, including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Water Cycle Study update;

   e. Site visits were undertaken by the Strategic Planning Team to collect information about each site’s features and to improve understanding of the local context.

---

1 The following organisations were invited to take part in the technical consultation – Cambridgeshire County Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Highways England, Historic England. NB: Bodies relating to water infrastructure and the water environment were consulted as part of the WCS & SFRA projects.
II. **Scoring and evaluation** – Using the data collected, each site was scored against a number of assessment criteria (see “Site Assessment Criteria”, para 2.16). Following this appraisal, the strategic planning team reviewed the results and considered these in the context of the spatial strategy (and other considerations including site visit findings and parish council comments). The Strategic Planning team took a decision as to whether each individual site should be taken forward as a possible site allocation, or not. Sites were determined as being either a –

- **Preferred Site**: where the site presents a suitable, available and deliverable option for development;
- **Has merit**: where a site was considered to have some potential, but not deemed to be appropriate for allocation at this time. For example where there is conflict with one or more minor criteria; or, taking into account the spatial distribution, other more suitable sites are available within the settlement; or
- **Rejected Site**: where the site was not suitable, due to conflict or harm in the context of the assessment criteria and/or the spatial strategy, or not available.

III. **Sustainability Appraisal** - the Strategic Planning team has undertaken a Sustainability Appraisal to ensure the Preferred Sites present a suitable and sustainable strategy for development.

**Assumptions**

2.10. Some site submissions did not indicate the number of dwellings a proposed housing site could provide, and as such it was necessary to estimate this value. To arrive at such an estimate, certain assumptions were employed.

2.11. Firstly a percentage was applied to the total site area (gross) to estimate the proportion of the site which might constitute ‘developable land’ (see Table 1). This provided an estimated ‘net site area’ value.

2.12. In estimating the net developable area for each site, it is assumed that the larger the site, the more associated infrastructure such as roads, open space and schools will be required, thereby reducing the proportion of the site available for residential development.

**Table 1: Net Developable Area Assumptions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gross area</th>
<th>Proportion of developable land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 0.4ha</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.41ha -2ha</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.01ha – 10ha</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01ha +</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.13. The Local Plan does not directly specify the density at which new developments should be built. The Council’s Annual Monitoring report 2014/15
calculated that, on average, new development in East Cambridgeshire is built to a density of 36 dwellings per hectare.

2.14. To estimate indicative site capacity, the net site area was multiplied by the 36 dwellings per ha density average.

2.15. For site allocations, indicative site capacity was reviewed in light of any constraints or characteristics identified on, or in proximity of the site.

**Site Assessment Criteria**

2.16. Prior to undertaking assessment, ‘Assessment Criteria’ were developed. These criteria address a wide range of factors to ensure relevant issues are taken into consideration. The assessment criteria were initially published in the ‘Site Assessment Methodology Report’ (Feb 2016) and later amended reflecting views received during consultation and engagement, namely from partner organisations.

2.17. Each assessment criterion is categorised as either ‘Major Criteria’ or ‘Minor Criteria’:

- **Major criteria**: Relates to matters of critical importance. Where a site results in conflict with one or more major criterion, development of the site would likely result in significant harm to human health, the environment, or conflict with national planning policy or legislation. For example, high flood risk; development in Green Belt, etc.

- **Minor criteria**: Relates to a wide range of important issues. Where there is conflict with one or more criterion, there is generally potential for the conflict to be overcome, managed or mitigated. For example, where a site is located within a Conservation Area, a higher standard of design quality may be required. Where appropriate to do so the Local Plan employs policy measures to address such matters.

**Scoring Matrices**

2.18. Each site was scored against the assessment criteria, based on the information collected during the ‘data collection’ stage (see 2.9)

2.19. For consistency, the assessment criteria have been scored using a five point matrix. A sites’ score against the criteria is represented by both a colour and a letter. Note that the letter and colour have the same value, but are intended to provide a clear and easy to understand scoring system for all users and devices / media. “A” / [bright green] is the highest score value, and “E” / [red] the lowest scoring value.

2.20. The use of colour provides a fair and consistent comparison for a single topic across all sites and also gives the reader an initial clear visual understanding of how a site has scored. However, this may not be suitable for readers with colour blindness or visual impairment. Black and white printing
would also render the colour score system useless. By also providing a letter overcomes these accessibility and printing issues, and enables data to be readily coded in the Council’s database. However, the letter category is likely to be less intuitive in representing positive and negative values for many readers, hence the inclusion of both a colour and letter score of equal value.

2.21. There has been a deliberate decision to avoid using numbers in scoring sites, as the use of numbers implies a relative measure, which often does not exist when comparing economic, social and environmental variables; for example, that a value of 4 is exactly twice the value of 2 or that the social benefit of having access to open space near one’s home is worth exactly twice that of creating an employment opportunity within walking distance of a development.

2.22. An example of the scoring matrix is provided below. In broad terms, if a site scores [red] / “E” it is considered that development could pose significant risk or harm, whereas if a site scores [bright green] / “A” it is considered that there is no risk and/or the site has the potential to bring about clear, economic, social or environmental benefits.

Table 2: Example of assessment criteria scoring matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme: [Title]</th>
<th>Question: [Assessment question]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Potential outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Potential to deliver major economic, environmental or social benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Potential to deliver minor economic, environmental or social benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Either neutral impact or middle value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Low risk of economic, environmental or social harm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>High risk of economic, environmental or social harm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment criteria

2.23. This section provides a summary of each of the Assessment Criteria and corresponding scoring matrices.

**Major Criteria**

**Assessment criteria 1: Compliance with National and Local Policy**

**Criterion 1a - Settlement type**

2.24. Policy LP3 sets out a “settlement hierarchy”. The settlement hierarchy ranks settlements, taking account of their population size and range of services and facilities.

2.25. All settlements could potentially play a role in meeting East Cambridgeshire’s growth needs, although the Local Plan generally aims not to make site allocations in Small Villages.

2.26. Sites which are physically isolated and located in the open countryside were attributed to their nearest settlement, for the purposes of recording data. Such sites would likely be determined to be not suitable for allocation, as they would likely result in significant environmental harm to the countryside, and/or may have negative social impacts through poor access to services.

2.27. Sites were scored against this criterion following desktop analysis. Table 3 provides a matrix which indicates how sites were scored against the criteria.

**Table 3: Assessment matrix – 1a. Settlement type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a. Settlement type</th>
<th>Is the site located within or adjoining an existing settlement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Potential outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Main settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Large village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Medium village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Small village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Not used</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criterion 1b - Site availability**

2.28. National policy places great weight on the ability to demonstrate a supply of specific available and deliverable sites, sufficient to provide five years’ worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer to ensure choice and competition in the market for housing.

2.29. For this reason sites which are available in the immediate and short term, and therefore enable the Council to meet the need for new homes in the five year period, are particularly favoured. However, a supply of sites over the mid and late stages of the plan period to 2036 is also required.
2.30. Any site unavailable for development within the plan period could be rejected on this basis. Sites were scored against this criterion using information collected through site submissions. The scoring matrix is outlined in table 4.

Table 4: Assessment matrix – 1b. Site availability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1b. Site Availability</th>
<th>When will site be available for development?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Potential outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Available for development in short term (0 - 5 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Available for development in medium term (6 - 10 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Available for development in long term (11 – 15 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Available for development in late plan period (16 years +)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Site unavailable for development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion 1c - Minerals and Waste: professional assessment

2.31. During consultation, Cambridgeshire County Council’s Minerals and Waste team provided comments on individual sites, and identified those sites affected by Minerals and Waste policies.

2.32. Due to the nature of the response, no specific scoring matrix was used. Where a site is in direct conflict with a minerals or waste policy, it would be possible to reject a site on this basis.

Assessment Criteria 2: Flood Risk

Criterion 2a – Flood Zone

2.33. The Council commissioned a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). The SFRA provided an assessment of each site’s flood risk from various sources. For each site, the SFRA calculated the percentage of the site area located in each Flood Zone; this data is presented as part of criterion 2a.

2.34. To provide each site with a clear score, the SFRA findings were generalised to classify each site in terms of the flood zone which covers the majority (more than 50%) of the site area. In some instances, no single flood zone applies to the majority of the site area. The Flood Risk scoring matrix is set out in table 5:

Table 5: Assessment matrix – Flood Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Flood Zone</th>
<th>Which Flood Zone is the site mainly located in?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Potential outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>&gt;50% of site area in Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>&gt;50% of site area in Zone 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>&gt;50% of site area in Zone 3a / Zone 3b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Multiple zones - see SFRA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criterion 2b – Surface water flood risk

2.35. For each site, the SFRA calculated the percentage of the site area at risk from a 30 year, 100 year and 1,000 year flood event. This data is presented as part of criterion 2b.

2.36. For the purpose of scoring each site, the SFRA data was generalised due to the complex nature of this data. The SFRA should therefore be read alongside this assessment criterion. Where a site had 0% risk of surface water flooding (30 yr event), the site was scored “A” / [bright green]. For all other sites, the SFRA should be consulted.

2.37. In addition, the criterion indicates whether each site is located within the administrative area of an Internal Drainage Board, and whether the site benefits from flood defences.

2.38. The SFRA Level 1 assessment was undertaken for all sites (with the exception of a small number of sites recently granted planning permission). In addition, a number of proposed site allocations were subject to SFRA Level. For further details, please refer to the SFRA Level 1 & 2 Hybrid Report.

Assessment Criteria 3: Proximity to hazardous pipelines and gas compressor stations

2.39. Desktop analysis was undertaken to identify the proximity of each site to hazardous pipelines and gas pressure stations.

2.40. Any development proposed to be located near to a major hazard chemical installation or pipeline has to be referred to the Health and Safety Executive (HSE), who will either “advise against development” or “not advise against development”. It is therefore possible a site be rejected where it is in close proximity to such apparatus and the HSE has recommended against development.

2.41. Housing sites were scored as either “A” / [bright green] where the site does not intersect the inner zone of a hazardous pipeline; or installation, or “E” / [red] where the site intersects the inner zone.

Assessment criterion 4: Impact on International and National Wildlife Sites

2.42. All sites were assessed to determine their proximity to internationally and nationally important wildlife sites through desktop analysis. Any site falling within an area designated as being of International or National Importance could be rejected on this basis. Table 6 sets out the scoring matrix for criterion 4.
Table 6: Assessment matrix – Proximity to Internationally / Nationally important wildlife sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4a. European / nationally important sites</th>
<th>Is the site located in proximity of a International / Nationally important wildlife site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Potential outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>More than 5km from the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.01km – 5km from the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>501m – 2km from the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Within site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact on designated sites: professional advice

2.43. To understand the potential impact on designated sites, it was intended to seek professional advice from Natural England. However, it is now understood that Natural England no longer provides this service directly.
Minor criteria

2.44. ‘Minor criteria’ relate to a wide range of planning issues and help to determine whether a site should be taken forward as an allocation in the plan. The minor criteria have been split into three categories:

- Site suitability;
- Access to services; and
- Impact on the environment.

Site suitability – Assessment Criteria 5

Assessment criterion 5a – Contaminated land

2.45. The Council’s Environmental Health team was consulted to identify any likely impacts arising from contaminated land on, or in close proximity to sites. The Environmental Health team scored each site based on its proximity, using the matrix set out in table 7. In addition, the team commented on specific sites, thereby providing additional information regarding the nature of the contamination and likely extent to which this may affect the site (criterion 5a(i) – Contaminated Land Professional Assessment).

2.46. Whilst land contamination may not necessarily render a site unsuitable for a development, the added cost and time in remediating contamination could impact upon a site’s viability and deliverability.

Table 7: Assessment matrix – Land contamination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Potential outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Site located more than 250m from contaminated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Site within 250m of contaminated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Site within 100m of contaminated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Site within 50m of contaminated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Site located on contaminated land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment criterion 5b – Local road impact

2.47. Cambridgeshire County Council’s Transport Team assessed each site to identify local road impacts and applied a score, using the matrix set out in table 8. In addition, the Transport Team provided comments and professional advice on each site (Criterion 5d).
Table 8: Assessment matrix – Local road impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Potential outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>No objection with minor mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>No objection with moderate mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Insurmountable safety issues that cannot be secured in accordance with CIL regulations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.48. Highways England was invited to comment on impacts relating to the strategic road network. However, no response was received.

Access to services – Assessment criteria 6 (a – h)

2.49. Providing good access to services is important in ensuring the sustainability of developments. Sites in close proximity to services and facilities are generally considered the most sustainable and are scored favourably in the site assessment.

2.50. Distance to different local services and facilities was estimated through desktop analysis, including:

- Public transport (criterion 6a.);
- Medical services (criterion 6b.);
- Shops providing basic goods to meet day-to-day needs (criterion 6c.);
- Primary school (criterion 6d.);
- Secondary school (criterion 6e.);
- Employment (existing employment allocations) (criterion 6h.).

2.51. Sites were scored on their proximity to those services, in increments of 400m i.e. the approximate distance covered in a 5 minute walk, as set out in table 9.

Table 9: Assessment matrix - Proximity to [services]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Potential outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt; 400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt; 800m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Less than 15 min walk (&lt; 1,200m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Less than 20 min walk (&lt; 1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.52. Through consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council’s Education Team, the capacity of local schools was assessed (primary school capacity - criterion 6f(i), and secondary school capacity – criterion 6g(i), using the matrix in table 10.

Table 10: Assessment matrix – Available school capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6f(i), 6g(i) [Primary/Secondary] School capacity</th>
<th>Do local [primary/secondary] schools have current capacity or opportunity for expansion?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Potential outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Spare capacity in every year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Spare capacity in some years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>No spare places but room for expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>No spare places, no room for expansion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.53. The Education Team provided comments on the potential for existing schools to expand. These comments were incorporated into the assessment as criteria 6f(ii) and 6g(ii) respectively.

Impact on the environment – Assessment criteria 7

2.54. To identify environmental impacts, sites were assessed against their proximity to certain environmental designations and classifications, including:

- County Wildlife Sites;
- Groundwater protection zones and aquifers (refer to WCS);
- Agricultural land classification;
- Public rights of way;
- Heritage assets and archaeology; and
- Landscape impact and key views.

Assessment criterion 7a – Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

2.55. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites was estimated through desktop analysis and scored in accordance with the matrix in table 11.

Table 11: Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</th>
<th>Is the site located in close proximity to a County Wildlife Site (CWS)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Potential outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>CWS within 2.01km – 5km of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>CWS within 501m – 1km of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>CWS within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>CWS located within site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.56. Cambridgeshire County Council was invited to comment on sites in terms of their potential impacts on County Wildlife Sites. However no response was received in respect of this criterion.

Assessment criterion 7c – Groundwater protection zones and aquifers

2.57. Initially, it was intended to provide scoring in respect of a site’s proximity and or impact to Groundwater Protection Zones and The Council commissioned an update to its Water Cycle Study. During the site assessment process the Water Cycle Study was yet to report its findings and therefore this criterion was not completed.

Assessment criterion 7d – Agricultural land classification

2.58. Much of East Cambridgeshire is rural farmland. Some of the land is high quality farming land which forms an important sustainability consideration. Loss of high grade agricultural land should be avoided, with development being directed to land of a lower grade, unless inconsistent with other sustainability considerations.

2.59. Desktop analysis was undertaken using the national agricultural land classification data to make an estimate about the land classification applying to the majority of the site area. It should be noted that the data is indicative only, does not offer a detailed assessment of the agricultural quality of each site.

2.60. Sites not in agricultural use were scored more favourably than sites likely to offer high quality agricultural land. The scoring matrix is presented in table 12.

Table 12: Agricultural land classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7d. Agricultural Land Classification</th>
<th>Is the site located on the best or most versatile agricultural land?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Potential outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 50% (of the site) or more is not agricultural land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 50% or more is Grade 4 or 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 50% or more is Grade 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 50% or more is Grade 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 50% or more is Grade 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment criterion 7e – Public Rights of Way

2.61. Public Rights of Way (PROW) enable vital access to the countryside and often provide opportunities for a range of leisure activities, such as walking, cycling and horse-riding. The PROW network therefore provides a significant opportunity to enhance the sustainability of sites. Cambridgeshire County Council’s Highways Team provided an assessment of each site, through scoring in accordance with the matrix in table 13, and provided additional comments and advice (as criterion 7e(ii)).
### Table 13: Public Rights of Way

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Potential outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>A – Opportunities to connect to multiple nearby PRoW within the site boundary – including at least one Bridleway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>B – Opportunities to connect to multiple nearby PRoW within the site boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>D – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoWs outside the site boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>E – No PRoW connection opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment criteria 7f(i) to (iv) – Historic environment**

2.62. Proximity to heritage assets (listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments and archaeological assets) and Conservation Areas was estimated using desktop analysis and using information supplied by stakeholders during the technical sites consultation. To limit harm to the historic environment, sites which do not include a heritage asset or are not within a conservation area were scored more favourably than sites which include a heritage asset or are located within the Conservation Area, in accordance with the matrix in table 14.

### Table 14: Proximity to heritage assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Potential outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>[Heritage asset] more than 2km from site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>[Heritage asset] within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>[Heritage asset] within 500.1 – 1000m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>[Heritage asset] within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>[Heritage asset] located on site or site is within a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment criterion 7g – Heritage / archaeology: Professional advice**

2.63. Comments and advice regarding possible impacts on heritage assets and Conservation Areas were received from Historic England, the Council’s Conservation Team and Cambridgeshire County Council’s Archaeology team.

**Assessment criterion 7h – Landscape impacts**

2.64. Potential impacts on the wider landscape and townscape, including the skyline and important views of assets and features such as Ely Cathedral and the isle and fen landscape, were assessed through undertaking a site visit. The scoring matrix is set out in table 15.
Table 15: Landscape impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7h. Landscape impacts</th>
<th>Is the site likely to affect the wider landscape / townscape (including the skyline)? Will it affect key views e.g. of Ely Cathedral, isle landscape and other important features?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score</strong></td>
<td><strong>Potential outcome</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Positively enhances landscape/townscape / enhances views of assets and features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Some improvement to landscape/townscape or key views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Significant harm to landscape/townscape or key views - severe visual intrusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional criterion 7i – Proximity to TPOs

2.65. The presence of Tree Protection Orders issued for trees on or in close proximity to the site was investigated through desktop analysis, and is scored as per table 16, as criterion 7i.

Table 16: Tree Preservation Orders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7h. TPOs</th>
<th>Proximity to TPO tree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score</strong></td>
<td><strong>Potential outcome</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>No TPO within 15m of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>TPO tree within 15m of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>TPO tree on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Not used</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Other Considerations

Spatial Distribution

3.1. Whilst the site assessment indicates whether a site is suitable for development, in selecting sites for inclusion in the emerging Local Plan, it is necessary to also have regard to the spatial strategy for the area.

3.2. Draft Policy LP2 sets out the expected level and distribution of growth to be delivered over the plan period:

**Policy LP2: Level and Distribution of Growth**

This Local Plan will facilitate the delivery of:

- 10,835 new dwellings (2016 - 2036);
- 6,000 new jobs (2014 - 2036); and
- appropriate other forms of development (such as retail) and infrastructure provision.

The distribution of growth and investment will be main towns-led, together with an element of proportionate growth across the district to boost delivery and supply, with specific allocations having been subject to consideration of deliverability and infrastructure capacity, constraints and opportunities.

For the purpose of identifying and updating annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years’ worth of housing against the Local Plan’s housing requirements, the 'Liverpool method' of spreading the backlog across the remainder of the plan period applies to East Cambridgeshire for all five year land supply reports published up to 31 December 2022.

3.3. Policy LP2 seeks to maintain a focus for growth at the Main Settlements whilst also distributing growth in a manner which is broadly proportionate to the size of the existing settlement, thereby promoting sustainability whilst also ensuring many settlements receive their ‘fair share’ of growth. The proportion of growth may be increased or decreased to reflect specific local circumstances, such as the deliverability or availability of sites, capacity of infrastructure, constraints (such as environmental features) and opportunities (for example to deliver community benefit).

3.4. Emerging policy LP3 sets out the Settlement Hierarchy, categorising settlements based on their size and provision of services and facilities. Therefore, the largest settlements (i.e. those at the ‘top’ of the Settlement Hierarchy) would generally receive the most growth and the smallest settlements (at the ‘bottom’) the least. Policy LP3 indicates that, site allocations will not be made for ‘Small
villages’ (except where consent is already issued) due to the limited services and lack of infrastructure available in these locations.

3.5. The Local Plan (2015) took a slightly different approach, and focussed new development *principally* within the main settlements of Ely, Littleport and Soham (and to a lesser extent in large villages, such as Burwell). Generally, site allocations from the Local Plan 2015 are carried forward into the new Local Plan.

3.6. The ability to achieve this proportionate distribution is dependent on a supply of suitable and available sites. The Call for Sites exercise generated a large ‘pool’ of sites to select from. Consequently, preferred sites are identified in all Main Settlements and Large Villages and most Medium Villages. For some medium villages, no sites were deemed suitable for development and no allocations were made in such locations.

3.7. In assessing and selecting sites for allocation, it was necessary to have regard to other sites within the same settlement to ensure the spatial distribution of growth reflects Policy LP2 and Policy LP3. In some settlements there were more sites than is required to meet the levels of growth suggested by the spatial strategy. Therefore, some sites were not selected on the basis that other more suitable sites are available within the same settlement.
Parish Council Comments (Form E & Form G exercise)

3.8. In spring 2016, the Strategic Planning Team consulted Parish Councils on sites received during the Call for Sites exercise. A workshop was held and Parish Councils were issued a form (Form E) on which to provide their response.

3.9. For each site in their parish, Parish Councils were invited to:

- Indicate whether they supported the site, or not;
- Assign each site a rank in order of preference from “first” to “fifth or more”; and
- Provide comments to explain their views about the site.

3.10. Most Parish Councils took part in this exercise. The results of the exercise provided an important indication of local opinion. The Strategic Planning team sought to select all sites supported by Parish Councils unless there were overriding sustainability reasons not to.

3.11. In spring 2017, following the submission of a number of Additional Site Suggestions, Parish Councils were issued a further form (Form G), and were invited to:

- Indicate whether they supported the site, or not;
- Indicate whether the sites should:
  - Be allocated in the Local Plan, in addition to sites already proposed for allocation;
  - Be allocated in the Local Plan, instead of a site proposed for allocation; or
  - Not be allocated in the Local Plan;
- Explain their reasons for their opinion of the site.

3.12. The results of the Form G exercise were treated in the same manner as the results of the Form E exercise.

3.13. Typically, Parish Council’s favoured sites were the promoter was willing to work with the community to deliver community-led development.

Public Consultation – Further Draft Local Plan

3.14. The Council published the Further Draft Local Plan in January – February 2017. The Further Draft Local Plan included proposed site allocations. Many individuals and organisations provided comments on specific sites. Comments received through public consultation were an important consideration in selecting sites for inclusion in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

3.15. The site reports in section 4 include a summary of key points raised during the FDLP consultation, where comments relate to a specific site.
Site visits

3.16. The Strategic Planning team undertook site visits for all new site submissions. To avoid duplication of work, existing Local Plan allocations and sites with extant planning permission were generally not visited.

3.17. Officers took photos and completed a form whilst visiting each site. Undertaking site visits was a valuable exercise, enabling officers to identify key features and characteristics and gain a greater understanding of the local context.

3.18. Officers had particular regard to each site’s accessibility; compatibility with neighbouring land uses; built and natural constraints; landscape value; likely visual impacts; and required mitigation measures. The site visit exercise informed the selection of site allocations.

Site allocations

3.19. The Strategic Planning team believes that the site allocations identified in the Local Plan (and as indicated on the Policies Map) presents the best option for meeting the district’s growth needs, which:

- Consists of the most suitable, sustainable and deliverable sites (as demonstrated by the results of the site assessment exercise);

- Directs most growth to the those settlements best served by infrastructure and facilities, whilst also enabling a proportion of growth across many settlements thereby reflecting the emerging plan’s spatial strategy; and

- Where possible, includes those sites most favoured by local communities (as indicated by the Form E and Form G exercise).
4. Results of Site Assessment

4.1. This section presents a summary of the main findings and conclusions from the site assessment exercise. It identifies which sites have been recommended for allocation in the Local Plan, and those which have not (see Table 17).

4.2. A site record report has been prepared for each individual site assessed, and is presented in Section 5. The site record reports are arranged by parish (in alphabetical order). Within each parish chapter, the site record reports are arranged sequentially by Site Allocation Policy Reference (i.e. the site reference used in the Local Plan), and then in sequential order of Site Assessment Reference. Superseded site record reports follow Preferred Site records.

4.3. The Site Allocation policy reference is different from the site assessment reference. This is to provide a sequential referencing system within the Local Plan.

4.4. Rejected sites are arranged sequentially by Site Assessment Reference number, and follow Preferred Sites.

Relationship between Site Submissions and Site Allocations

4.5. Site submissions received during the ‘Call for Sites’ exercise and as ‘Additional Site Suggestions’ provided a complex patchwork of proposals. Some site submissions overlapped with other sites; were located adjacent to another site; or competing proposals were submitted for the same site. Each individual site submission was assigned a unique Site Assessment reference (in the format “Site/XX/XX”).

4.6. The Site Assessment project was an iterative process, involving consultation with the public, parish councils and technical stakeholders. In certain circumstances the results of the assessment recommended the allocation of a different site area to that originally submitted by the site promoter.

4.7. For example, a Site Allocation may follow a different boundary to the original site submission where:

- To limit the overall scale of development (by reducing the size of the site); or
- To exclude an area considered not suitable for development, due to the presence of a physical constraint; or
- To provide a clear, defensible boundary; or
- To provide a single, coherent site where there are multiple, adjacent suitable sites.

4.8. Where the site assessment recommended an alternative site boundary, the new site area was also assigned a unique reference.

4.9. To avoid duplication of work, assessment against the Site Assessment Criteria was not repeated for these new submissions. For some site allocations, it is
therefore necessary to refer to one or more corresponding *superseded* site submissions.

4.10. For each site, the findings of the site assessment reached one of three possible conclusions:

- **Preferred site**: The Site Assessment has found the site to be suitable for development and recommends the site is allocated in the Local Plan;

- **Has Merit**: The Site Assessment has found the site to be potentially suitable for development, but more preferable sites are available;

- **Rejected**: The Site Assessment found the site to be not suitable for development and does not recommend allocation of the site.

4.11. All Preferred Sites are included as site allocations in the Local Plan, either wholly or in part.

4.12. All Superseded site submissions are concluded to be ‘Preferred Sites’. However it should be noted that the boundary of the Site Allocation may not include the full extent of the superseded site submission area.

4.13. For reference, Table 17 lists all sites assessed in the order their site record reports are presented in Section 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Local Plan Ref</th>
<th>Site Assessment Ref</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Site Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashley CP</td>
<td>Site/01/01</td>
<td>Site/01/01</td>
<td>Land to the south and east of Elms Farm, Ashley</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley CP</td>
<td>Site/01/02</td>
<td>Site/01/02</td>
<td>Land to the north of Potters House, Ashley</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottisham CP</td>
<td>BOT.H1</td>
<td>Site/02/02</td>
<td>Bell Road, Bottisham</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottisham CP</td>
<td>BOT.E1</td>
<td>Site/02/05</td>
<td>Existing employment allocation, extension to Tunbridge Lane Business Park</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottisham CP</td>
<td>see policy LP7</td>
<td>Site/02/07</td>
<td>Land at Muckdungle Corner, Newmarket Road, Bottisham</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottisham CP</td>
<td>Site/02/01</td>
<td>Site/02/01</td>
<td>Land off High Street, Bottisham</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottisham CP</td>
<td>Site/02/03</td>
<td>Site/02/03</td>
<td>West of Bell Road, Bottisham</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottisham CP</td>
<td>Site/02/04</td>
<td>Site/02/04</td>
<td>Land east of Bell Road, Bottisham</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottisham CP</td>
<td>Site/02/06</td>
<td>Site/02/06</td>
<td>Crystal Park, Tunbridge Lane, Bottisham</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brinkley CP</td>
<td>Site/03/01</td>
<td>Site/03/01</td>
<td>Land south of High Street</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brinkley CP</td>
<td>Site/03/02</td>
<td>Site/03/02</td>
<td>Land off Carlton Road</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrough Green CP</td>
<td>BRG.H1</td>
<td>Site/04/01</td>
<td>Land off Brinkley Road, Burrough Green</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrough Green CP</td>
<td>Site/04/02</td>
<td>Site/04/02</td>
<td>Land off the B1052</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burwell CP</td>
<td>BUR.H1</td>
<td>Site/05/04</td>
<td>Land at Newmarket Rd, Burwell</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burwell CP</td>
<td>BUR.M1</td>
<td>Site/05/06</td>
<td>Existing allocation with planning permission at Former D S Smith Site Reach Road Burwell</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burwell CP</td>
<td>BUR.E1</td>
<td>Site/05/03</td>
<td>Land at Reach Road</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burwell CP</td>
<td>Site/05/01</td>
<td>Site/05/01</td>
<td>Low Road, Burwell</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burwell CP</td>
<td>Site/05/02</td>
<td>Site/05/02</td>
<td>Land lying to the North-East of Factory Road, Burwell, Cambridge</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burwell CP</td>
<td>Site/05/05</td>
<td>Site/05/05</td>
<td>Land at Ness Road, Burwell</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burwell CP</td>
<td>Site/05/07</td>
<td>Site/05/07</td>
<td>Land at 56 Low Road</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burwell CP</td>
<td>Site/05/08</td>
<td>Site/05/08</td>
<td>Land to the north of Swaffham Road / Newstead Farm</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burwell CP</td>
<td>Site/05/09</td>
<td>Site/05/09</td>
<td>Land off Newmarket Road</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheveley CP</td>
<td>CHV.H1</td>
<td>Site/06/02</td>
<td>Allocated site with planning permission at Land between 199 and 209 High Street</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheveley CP</td>
<td>Site/06/01</td>
<td>Site/06/01</td>
<td>Existing housing allocation, land rear of Star and Garter Lane</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheveley CP</td>
<td>Site/06/03</td>
<td>Site/06/03</td>
<td>Land rear of 15-25 High Street</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chippenham CP</td>
<td>Site/07/01</td>
<td>Site/07/01</td>
<td>Land at Grange Farm, Red Lodge, Suffolk IP28 8LE</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chippenham CP</td>
<td>Site/07/02</td>
<td>Site/07/02</td>
<td>Land off Scotland End, Chippenham</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coveney CP</td>
<td>Site/08/01</td>
<td>Site/08/01</td>
<td>Land east of Main Street, Coveney</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coveney CP</td>
<td>Site/08/02</td>
<td>Site/08/02</td>
<td>Land off School Lane, Coveney</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dullingham CP</td>
<td>DUL.H1</td>
<td>Site/09/03</td>
<td>Land at Kettlefields</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Site No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dullingham CP</td>
<td>Site/09/01</td>
<td>Land south of Stetchworth Road, Dullingham</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dullingham CP</td>
<td>Site/09/02</td>
<td>Former highways depot, Brinkley Road, Dullingham</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dullingham CP</td>
<td>Site/09/04</td>
<td>Land west of Station Road</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely CP</td>
<td>ELY.H1</td>
<td>Site/10/30 Land Off Lynn Road</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely CP</td>
<td>ELY.H2</td>
<td>Site/10/31 Land At Barton Road Car Park</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely CP</td>
<td>ELY.H3</td>
<td>Site/10/32 Former depot, Lisle Lane</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely CP</td>
<td>ELY.M1</td>
<td>Site/10/13 Land to the north of Ely</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely CP</td>
<td>ELY.M2</td>
<td>Site/10/11 The Grange</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely CP</td>
<td>ELY.M3</td>
<td>Site/10/12 Paradise Leisure Centre</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely CP</td>
<td>ELY.M4</td>
<td>Site/10/19 Existing mixed-use allocation, Station Gateway</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely CP</td>
<td>ELY.M1</td>
<td>Site/10/16 Westmill Foods Site, Angel Drove</td>
<td>Superseded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely CP</td>
<td>ELY.M5</td>
<td>Site/10/18 Existing mixed-use allocation, Octagon Business Park</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely CP</td>
<td>ELY.M6</td>
<td>Site/10/28 Princess of Wales Hospital site</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely CP</td>
<td>ELY.E1</td>
<td>Site/10/25 Existing employment allocation, Ely Road and Rail Distribution Centre</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely CP</td>
<td>ELY.E2(a)</td>
<td>Site/10/01 Lancaster Way Business Park</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely CP</td>
<td>ELY.E2(b)</td>
<td>Site/10/02 Land south east of Lancaster Way Business Park</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely CP</td>
<td>ELY.E2(c)</td>
<td>Site/10/04 Land south of Lancaster Way Business Park - Phase IIib Extension</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely CP</td>
<td>ELY.E2(a-c)</td>
<td>Site/10/26 Lancaster Way Business Park</td>
<td>Superseded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely CP</td>
<td>ELY.L1</td>
<td>Site/10/20 Existing leisure allocation, land at Downham Road, Ely</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely CP</td>
<td>Site/10/03</td>
<td>Land south of Lancaster Way Business Park and ELY11 0 Phase Illa Extension</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely CP</td>
<td>Site/10/05</td>
<td>Orwell Pit Farm</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely CP</td>
<td>Site/10/06</td>
<td>Queen Adelaide South</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely CP</td>
<td>Site/10/07</td>
<td>Queen Adelaide North</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely CP</td>
<td>Site/10/08</td>
<td>Queen Adelaide Farmland</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely CP</td>
<td>Site/10/09</td>
<td>Greenacre Farm 1) West of Beald Drove; &amp; East of Beald Drove</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely CP</td>
<td>Site/10/10</td>
<td>Greenacre Farm (North)</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely CP</td>
<td>Site/10/14</td>
<td>Land to the south of Ely golf club and to the east of Cambridge Road</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely CP</td>
<td>Site/10/15</td>
<td>Land to the south of Witchford Road, Ely</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely CP</td>
<td>Site/10/17</td>
<td>Cathedral Marina</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely CP</td>
<td>Site/10/21</td>
<td>Existing mixed-use allocation, Waitrose car park area</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely CP</td>
<td>Site/10/22</td>
<td>Existing mixed-use allocation, land north of Nutholt Lane</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely CP</td>
<td>Site/10/23</td>
<td>The Gardens, Lynn Road Ely</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely CP</td>
<td>Site/10/24</td>
<td>Existing housing allocation, land adjacent to Putney Hill Road</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely CP</td>
<td>Site/10/27</td>
<td>Land at Klin Lane</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely CP</td>
<td>Site/10/29</td>
<td>Site to the North East of Witchford</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham CP</td>
<td>FRD.H1</td>
<td>Site/11/24</td>
<td>Land south of Mildenhall Road, East of Collin's Hill</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham CP</td>
<td>FRD.H1</td>
<td>Site/11/10</td>
<td>Land east of Collin's Hill</td>
<td>Superseded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham CP</td>
<td>FRD.H1</td>
<td>Site/11/21</td>
<td>Existing housing allocation, land east of 24 Mildenhall Road</td>
<td>Superseded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham CP</td>
<td>FRD.H2</td>
<td>Site/11/04</td>
<td>Rules Garden</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham CP</td>
<td>FRD.H3</td>
<td>Site/11/28</td>
<td>Land at Station Road</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham CP</td>
<td>FRD.H3</td>
<td>Site/11/02</td>
<td>Land at 5 Station Road, Fordham</td>
<td>Superseded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham CP</td>
<td>FRD.H4</td>
<td>Site/11/27</td>
<td>Land off Steward's Field</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham CP</td>
<td>FRD.H4</td>
<td>Site/11/13</td>
<td>Land fronting Soham Road and also accessed off Stewards Field</td>
<td>Superseded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham CP</td>
<td>FRD.M1</td>
<td>Site/11/09</td>
<td>Land at and adjoining Scotsdale Garden Centre, Fordham</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham CP</td>
<td>FRD.M2</td>
<td>Site/11/05</td>
<td>Land east of 67 Mildenhall Road</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham CP</td>
<td>FRD.E1(a)</td>
<td>Site/11/16</td>
<td>Existing employment allocation, land north of Turners</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham CP</td>
<td>FRD.E1(b)</td>
<td>Site/11/22</td>
<td>Turners Sohm Ltd</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham CP</td>
<td>FRD.E1(c)</td>
<td>Site/11/20</td>
<td>Existing employment allocation, land south of Landwade Road</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham CP</td>
<td>FRD.E1(d)</td>
<td>Site/11/19</td>
<td>Existing employment allocation, land at Horse Racing Forensic Laboratories.</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham CP</td>
<td>FRD.E1(e)</td>
<td>Site/11/18</td>
<td>Existing employment allocation, land north of Snailwell Road</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham CP</td>
<td>FRD.E1(f)</td>
<td>Site/11/17</td>
<td>Existing employment allocation, land south of Snailwell Road</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham CP</td>
<td>FRD.E1(g)</td>
<td>Site/11/23</td>
<td>Employment land at and adjoining Lynx Business Park</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham CP</td>
<td>Site/11/01</td>
<td></td>
<td>Land south of Fordham Road, Fordham</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham CP</td>
<td>Site/11/03</td>
<td></td>
<td>Land off Soham Road</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham CP</td>
<td>Site/11/06</td>
<td></td>
<td>Land south of Mildenhall Road / East of Chippenham Road, Fordham</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham CP</td>
<td>Site/11/07</td>
<td></td>
<td>Land south of Mildenhall Lane</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham CP</td>
<td>Site/11/08</td>
<td></td>
<td>Land adjoining 19 Station Road, Fordham,</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham CP</td>
<td>Site/11/11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Station Road, Fordham</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham CP</td>
<td>Site/11/12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Station Road, Fordham</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham CP</td>
<td>Site/11/14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Land off Grove Park, Fordham</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham CP</td>
<td>Site/11/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing housing allocation, land between 37 and 55 Mildenhall Road</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham CP</td>
<td>Site/11/25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Land to the East of Isleham Road</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham CP</td>
<td>Site/11/26</td>
<td></td>
<td>Allotment Gardens, Collin's Hill</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haddenham CP</td>
<td>HAD.H1</td>
<td>Site/12/16</td>
<td>Land off West End</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haddenham CP</td>
<td>HAD.H2</td>
<td>Site/12/12</td>
<td>Existing housing allocation, land at New Road</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haddenham CP</td>
<td>HAD.H3</td>
<td>Site/12/06</td>
<td>Land to the east of Chewells Lane, Haddenham</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haddenham CP</td>
<td>HAD.E1</td>
<td>Site/12/13</td>
<td>Existing employment allocation, land at Haddenham Business Park, Station Road</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haddenham CP</td>
<td>Site/12/01</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hinton Hedges Road</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Ref.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haddenham CP</td>
<td>Site/12/02</td>
<td>De-Freville Farmyard</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haddenham CP</td>
<td>Site/12/03</td>
<td>Land south of Aldreth Road</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haddenham CP</td>
<td>Site/12/04</td>
<td>Land adjacent to 4a High Street, Aldreth, Ely, Cambridgeshire, CB6 3PQ</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haddenham CP</td>
<td>Site/12/05</td>
<td>Metcalfe Way</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haddenham CP</td>
<td>Site/12/07</td>
<td>Residential development at land off Hod Hall Lane, Haddenham, Ely, Cambridgeshire, CB6 3UX</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haddenham CP</td>
<td>Site/12/08</td>
<td>Land at Hinton Hall Farm</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haddenham CP</td>
<td>Site/12/09</td>
<td>Anson Packaging Site</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haddenham CP</td>
<td>Site/12/10</td>
<td>Land off Bury Lane</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haddenham CP</td>
<td>Site/12/11</td>
<td>Land off Rowan Close, Haddenham</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haddenham CP</td>
<td>Site/12/14</td>
<td>Land North of Northumbria Close, Haddenham</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haddenham CP</td>
<td>Site/12/15</td>
<td>Land at Aldreth Road</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haddenham CP</td>
<td>Site/12/17</td>
<td>Land north of Haddenham Road</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isleham CP</td>
<td>ISL.H1</td>
<td>Site/13/18 Land south and west of Lady Frances Court</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isleham CP</td>
<td>ISL.H1</td>
<td>Site/13/08 Existing housing allocation, land south and west of Lady Frances Court</td>
<td>Superseded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isleham CP</td>
<td>ISL.H1</td>
<td>Site/13/15 Land at Station Road</td>
<td>Superseded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isleham CP</td>
<td>ISL.H2</td>
<td>Site/13/09 Existing housing allocation, land at 5a Fordham Road</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isleham CP</td>
<td>ISL.H3</td>
<td>Site/13/07 Land off Hall Barn Road</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isleham CP</td>
<td>ISL.H4</td>
<td>Site/13/03 Land off Fordham Road, Isleham</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isleham CP</td>
<td>ISL.E1</td>
<td>Site/13/02 Land adjacent to Hall Barn Road Industrial Estate</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isleham CP</td>
<td>ISL.H1</td>
<td>Site/13/01 Beck Road</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isleham CP</td>
<td>ISL.H1</td>
<td>Site/13/04 Land fronting Beck Road, Isleham</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isleham CP</td>
<td>ISL.H1</td>
<td>Site/13/05 Land fronting Hall Barn Road, Isleham</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isleham CP</td>
<td>ISL.H1</td>
<td>Site/13/06 Land north of 55 Sun Street</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isleham CP</td>
<td>ISL.H1</td>
<td>Site/13/10 Existing housing allocation, land west of Pound Lane</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isleham CP</td>
<td>ISL.H1</td>
<td>Site/13/11 Existing housing allocation, land at Church Lane</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isleham CP</td>
<td>ISL.H1</td>
<td>Site/13/12 Land at Floral Farm</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isleham CP</td>
<td>ISL.H1</td>
<td>Site/13/13 Land to the east of Wayside Farm</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isleham CP</td>
<td>ISL.H1</td>
<td>Site/13/14 Land at Sun Street</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isleham CP</td>
<td>ISL.H1</td>
<td>Site/13/16 Land off Beck Road</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isleham CP</td>
<td>ISL.H1</td>
<td>Site/13/17 Land to rear of 20 Waterside</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennett CP</td>
<td>KEN.M1</td>
<td>Site/14/09 Land to the west of Station Road</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennett CP</td>
<td>KEN.M1</td>
<td>Site/14/05 Land to the west of Station Road, Kennett, Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>Superseded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennett CP</td>
<td>Site/14/01</td>
<td>Wildtracks Offroad Activity Park</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennett CP</td>
<td>Site/14/02</td>
<td>Land to the east of Station Road</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennett CP</td>
<td>Site/14/03</td>
<td>Land to the south of Longstones Stud stable buildings</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennett CP</td>
<td>Site/14/04</td>
<td>Land to the rear of 42 Station Road, Kennett</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Site/Area</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennett CP</td>
<td>Site/14/06</td>
<td>Land north of Dane Hill Road</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennett CP</td>
<td>Site/14/07</td>
<td>Land west of Dane Hill Road</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennett CP</td>
<td>Site/14/08</td>
<td>Land east of Dane Hill Road</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennett CP</td>
<td>Site/14/10</td>
<td>Longstones Stud</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirtling CP</td>
<td>Site/15/01</td>
<td>Land at The Street, Kirtling</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Downham CP</td>
<td>LTD.H1</td>
<td>Site/16/01 Land west of Ely Road, Little Downham</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Downham CP</td>
<td>Site/16/02</td>
<td>Land off Ely Road, (GA Hobbs &amp; Sons Depot) Little Downham</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Downham CP</td>
<td>Site/16/03</td>
<td>Land adjacent to School Lane, Pymoor</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Downham CP</td>
<td>Site/16/04</td>
<td>Rec Field</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Downham CP</td>
<td>Site/16/05</td>
<td>Land south-west of Main Street, Pymoor</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Downham CP</td>
<td>Site/16/06</td>
<td>Land south-east of cemetery, Little Downham</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Downham CP</td>
<td>Site/16/07</td>
<td>Frithhead</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Downham CP</td>
<td>Site/16/08</td>
<td>Existing housing allocation, land north-east of 9 Straight Furlong</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Downham CP</td>
<td>Site/16/09</td>
<td>Land at Mount Pleasant Farm</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Downham CP</td>
<td>Site/16/10</td>
<td>Land at Straight Furlong</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Downham CP</td>
<td>Site/16/11</td>
<td>Former Memorial Hall</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Thetford CP</td>
<td>LTT.H1</td>
<td>Site/17/02 The Wyches, Little Thetford</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Thetford CP</td>
<td>LTT.H2</td>
<td>Site/17/04 Land south of Caravan Park, Two Acres</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Thetford CP</td>
<td>Site/17/01</td>
<td>Fish &amp; Duck Marina</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Thetford CP</td>
<td>Site/17/03</td>
<td>Land south of Popes Lane, Little Thetford</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Thetford CP</td>
<td>Site/17/05</td>
<td>Land east of Caravan Park</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleport CP</td>
<td>LIT.H1</td>
<td>Site/18/01 Old Station Goods Yard</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleport CP</td>
<td>LIT.H2</td>
<td>Site/18/17 Residential development (under construction) at Highfield Farm</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleport CP</td>
<td>LIT.H2</td>
<td>Site/18/18 Harvest Way, Littleport</td>
<td>Superseded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleport CP</td>
<td>LIT.H3</td>
<td>Site/18/20 Land to North East of 5 Back Lane, Littleport</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleport CP</td>
<td>LIT.H4</td>
<td>Site/18/19 Field West Of 1B Upton Lane, Littleport</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleport CP</td>
<td>LIT.H5</td>
<td>Site/18/12 Land west of Highfields, Littleport</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleport CP</td>
<td>LIT.M1</td>
<td>Site/18/10 Housing/employment allocation, west of Woodfen Road</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleport CP</td>
<td>LIT.M2</td>
<td>Site/18/22 Land south of Grange Lane</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleport CP</td>
<td>LIT.M2</td>
<td>Site/18/03 Land to the south of Grange Lane, Littleport</td>
<td>Superseded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleport CP</td>
<td>LIT.M2</td>
<td>Site/18/08 Land west of Ely Road and south of Grange Lane, Littleport</td>
<td>Superseded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleport CP</td>
<td>LIT.E1</td>
<td>Site/18/21 Land at Wisbech Road</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleport CP</td>
<td>LIT.E1</td>
<td>Site/18/06 FP McCann Phase 2</td>
<td>Superseded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleport CP</td>
<td>LIT.E1</td>
<td>Site/18/09 Land to west of A10, Littleport</td>
<td>Superseded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleport CP</td>
<td>LIT.E1</td>
<td>Site/18/16 Existing employment allocation, land north of Wisbech Road</td>
<td>Superseded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleport CP</td>
<td>LIT.E2</td>
<td>Site/18/15 Existing employment allocation, land west of 150 Wisbech Road</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Site No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleport CP</td>
<td>Site/18/02</td>
<td>Land off Mow Fen Drove</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleport CP</td>
<td>Site/18/04</td>
<td>Land to the north of Oak Lane, Littleport</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleport CP</td>
<td>Site/18/05</td>
<td>Land to the east of A10 and north of Blackbank Drove, Littleport</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleport CP</td>
<td>Site/18/07</td>
<td>Land to the south of Croft Park Road, Littleport</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleport CP</td>
<td>Site/18/11</td>
<td>Eastfield Farm</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleport CP</td>
<td>Site/18/13</td>
<td>Padnall, Littleport</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleport CP</td>
<td>Site/18/14</td>
<td>Hempfield</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleport CP</td>
<td>Site/18/23</td>
<td>Land west of the A10</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleport CP</td>
<td>Site/18/24</td>
<td>Land at Black Horse Drove</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleport CP</td>
<td>Site/18/25</td>
<td>Land north of Wisbech Road</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lode CP</td>
<td>LOD.H1</td>
<td>Sunny Ridge Farmyard</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lode CP</td>
<td>Site/19/01</td>
<td>Former Lode Station Yard</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lode CP</td>
<td>Site/19/02</td>
<td>Former Lode Station Yard</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mepal CP</td>
<td>Site/20/01</td>
<td>North-east Mepal</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mepal CP</td>
<td>Site/20/02</td>
<td>Land to the west of Mepal Church</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mepal CP</td>
<td>Site/20/03</td>
<td>Land south of Witcham Road</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mepal CP</td>
<td>Site/20/04</td>
<td>Land between New Road and Witcham Road</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snailwell CP</td>
<td>Site/22/01</td>
<td>Land south of Chippenham Road, Snailwell</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snailwell CP</td>
<td>Site/22/02</td>
<td>Land north of Chippenham Road, Snailwell</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>SOH.H1</td>
<td>LP15 allocation SOH1, Brook St, Soham</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>Site/23/03</td>
<td>Land Bound by Fordham Road, Staples Lane and Brook Street, Soham</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>SOH.H3</td>
<td>Site/23/34</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>SOH.H4</td>
<td>Site/23/23</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>SOH.H5</td>
<td>Site/23/08</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>SOH.H6</td>
<td>Site/23/20</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>SOH.H6</td>
<td>Site/23/06</td>
<td>Superseded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>SOH.H7</td>
<td>Site/23/24</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>SOH.H8</td>
<td>Site/23/23</td>
<td>Superseded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>SOH.H9</td>
<td>Site/23/03</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>SOH.H10</td>
<td>Site/23/48</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>SOH.H10</td>
<td>Site/23/01</td>
<td>Superseded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>SOH.H11</td>
<td>Site/23/14</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>SOH.H12</td>
<td>Site/23/33</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>SOH.H13</td>
<td>Site/23/37</td>
<td>Soham Health Centre, Pratt Street</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>SOH.H14</td>
<td>Site/23/35</td>
<td>90 Paddock Street, Soham</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>SOH.H15</td>
<td>Site/23/37</td>
<td>Grassed Area Opposite 2 The Shade</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>SOH.M1</td>
<td>Site/23/38</td>
<td>Eastern Gateway</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>SOH.M1</td>
<td>Site/23/12</td>
<td>Former Garden Centre site, Soham</td>
<td>Superseded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>SOH.M1</td>
<td>Site/23/18</td>
<td>Soham Eastern Gateway (SOH3)</td>
<td>Superseded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>SOH.M2</td>
<td>Site/23/39</td>
<td>Land north west of The Shade School</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>SOH.M2</td>
<td>Site/23/05</td>
<td>Parcels A and B</td>
<td>Superseded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>SOH.M2</td>
<td>Site/23/25</td>
<td>Existing employment allocation, land west of The Shade</td>
<td>Superseded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>SOH.M3</td>
<td>Site/23/40</td>
<td>Land off Station Road</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>SOH.M3</td>
<td>Site/23/27</td>
<td>Existing mixed-use allocation, land off Station Road</td>
<td>Superseded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>SOH.E1</td>
<td>Site/23/15</td>
<td>Land adjacent A142, Soham</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>Site/23/02</td>
<td>Land north of Cherry Tree Lane, Soham</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>Site/23/07</td>
<td>Land at the Shade, Soham</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>Site/23/11</td>
<td>Downfields, Soham</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>Site/23/16</td>
<td>Land to the north of The Shade, Soham</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>Site/23/17</td>
<td>Land off Fordham Road, Soham</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>Site/23/22</td>
<td>Existing housing allocation, land east of 5 Barway Road</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>Site/23/26</td>
<td>Existing employment allocation, land east of The Shade</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>Site/23/28</td>
<td>Existing mixed-use allocation, Fountain Lane recreation ground and car park</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>Site/23/29</td>
<td>Existing mixed-use allocation, town centre, Church hall area</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>Site/23/30</td>
<td>Existing mixed-use allocation, Cooperative store area</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>Site/23/31</td>
<td>Existing mixed-use allocation, Budgens site</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>Site/23/32</td>
<td>Land rear of 48-64, Station Road, Soham</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>Site/23/36</td>
<td>Existing housing allocation, land east of The Barn, Randalls Farm</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>Site/23/42</td>
<td>Land at 117 Mereside and paddock</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>Site/23/43</td>
<td>Land east of The Shade</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>Site/23/44</td>
<td>Land at Old Tiger Stables</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham CP</td>
<td>Site/23/45</td>
<td>Land at Northern Gateway</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stetchworth CP</td>
<td>Site/24/01</td>
<td>Stetchworth Park Stud</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streatham CP</td>
<td>STR.H1</td>
<td>Site/25/07</td>
<td>Land at Manor Farm, Streatham</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streatham CP</td>
<td>STR.H1</td>
<td>Site/25/02</td>
<td>Reserve land, Manor Farm, Streatham</td>
<td>Superseded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streatham CP</td>
<td>STR.H1</td>
<td>Site/25/04</td>
<td>Land Parcel to East of Meadowcroft, Streatham</td>
<td>Superseded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streatham CP</td>
<td>STR.H1</td>
<td>Site/25/05</td>
<td>Land Formerly 21 Road, Newmarket</td>
<td>Superseded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streatham CP</td>
<td>STR.H1</td>
<td>Site/25/06</td>
<td>Land formerly 21 Newmarket Road, Streatham</td>
<td>Superseded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Site Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stretham CP</td>
<td>Site/25/01</td>
<td>Land to the north of Berry Close, Stretham</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stretham CP</td>
<td>Site/25/03</td>
<td>Wilburton Road, Stretham</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stretham CP</td>
<td>Site/25/08</td>
<td>Land off A10 at Stretham/Lt Thetford</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton CP</td>
<td>MEP.H1</td>
<td>Site/26/01 Land off Brick Lane, Mepal</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton CP</td>
<td>SUT.H1</td>
<td>Site/26/05 Land off Mepal Road, Sutton</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton CP</td>
<td>SUT.H2</td>
<td>Site/26/04 Land east of Garden Close, Sutton</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton CP</td>
<td>SUT.E1</td>
<td>Site/26/10 Elean Business Park, Mepal Road</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton CP</td>
<td>SUT.E1</td>
<td>Site/26/07 Land north of Ely Road</td>
<td>Superseded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton CP</td>
<td>Site/26/02</td>
<td>Land off Station Road, Sutton</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton CP</td>
<td>Site/26/03</td>
<td>Land off The Row/The America</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton CP</td>
<td>Site/26/06</td>
<td>Land off A142, Sutton</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton CP</td>
<td>Site/26/08</td>
<td>East of Bury Lane, Sutton</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton CP</td>
<td>Site/26/09</td>
<td>West of Bury Lane, Sutton</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton CP</td>
<td>Site/26/11</td>
<td>Land at former Mepal Airfield</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton CP</td>
<td>Site/26/12</td>
<td>Sutton Saleground</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton CP</td>
<td>Site/26/13</td>
<td>Land at Mill Field</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton CP</td>
<td>Site/26/14</td>
<td>Land east of Garden Close</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton CP</td>
<td>Site/26/15</td>
<td>Land to the north of Bellairs</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaffham Bulbeck CP</td>
<td>SWB.H1</td>
<td>Site/27/01 Land off Heath Road and Quarry Lane, Swaffham Bulbeck</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaffham Bulbeck CP</td>
<td>SWB.H2</td>
<td>Site/27/04 Land fronting Heath Road, Swaffham Bulbeck</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaffham Bulbeck CP</td>
<td>SWB.H3</td>
<td>Site/27/06 Hillside Mill</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaffham Bulbeck CP</td>
<td>Site/27/02</td>
<td>Land off Heath Road, Swaffham Bulbeck</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaffham Bulbeck CP</td>
<td>Site/27/03</td>
<td>Land off Commercial End, Swaffham Bulbeck</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaffham Bulbeck CP</td>
<td>Site/27/05</td>
<td>Land at Gutter Bridge</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaffham Bulbeck CP</td>
<td>Site/27/07</td>
<td>Land north of Station Road</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaffham Bulbeck CP</td>
<td>Site/27/08</td>
<td>Land north of Green Bank Road</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaffham Prior CP</td>
<td>SWP.H1</td>
<td>Site/28/06 Land south of High Street</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaffham Prior CP</td>
<td>SWP.H1</td>
<td>Site/28/05 Part of Dale Field</td>
<td>Superseded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaffham Prior CP</td>
<td>SWP.H1</td>
<td>Site/28/06 Land between High Street and B1102, Swaffham Prior</td>
<td>Superseded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaffham Prior CP</td>
<td>SWP.E1</td>
<td>Site/28/02 Land at Goodwin Farm fronting Heath Road, Swaffham Prior</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaffham Prior CP</td>
<td>Site/28/03</td>
<td>Rogers Road</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaffham Prior CP</td>
<td>Site/28/04</td>
<td>Land at Lower End, Swaffham Prior</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaffham Prior CP</td>
<td>Site/28/07</td>
<td>Land adjacent to 38 Mill Hill</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wentworth CP</td>
<td>Site/29/01</td>
<td>Main Street, Wentworth</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wentworth CP</td>
<td>Site/29/02</td>
<td>Existing housing allocation, land opposite the Old Red Lion, Main Street</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wentworth CP</td>
<td>Site/29/03</td>
<td>Existing housing allocation, land east of 1 Main Street</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wentworth CP</td>
<td>Site/29/04</td>
<td>Land south of Witcham Toll</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Result</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wentworth CP</td>
<td>Site/29/05</td>
<td>Land at Marroway Lane</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicken CP</td>
<td>Site/31/01</td>
<td>Land south of Chapel Lane, Wicken</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicken CP</td>
<td>Site/31/02</td>
<td>Land off Lower Road, Wicken</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicken CP</td>
<td>Site/31/03</td>
<td>Land off Hawes Lane, Wicken</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicken CP</td>
<td>Site/31/04</td>
<td>Land at Lower Road, Wicken</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicken CP</td>
<td>Site/31/05</td>
<td>Land between 61 &amp; 71 Church Road Wicken</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicken CP</td>
<td>Site/31/06</td>
<td>Land south of Church Road</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicken CP</td>
<td>Site/31/07</td>
<td>Existing housing allocation, land north-west of The Crescent</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicken CP</td>
<td>Site/31/08</td>
<td>Land rear of 34 &amp; 36 Chapel Lane</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicken CP</td>
<td>Site/31/09</td>
<td>Land at Lower Road</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicken CP</td>
<td>Site/31/10</td>
<td>Land at Chapel Lane</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilburton CP</td>
<td>WIL.H1</td>
<td>Site/32/04 Land to the north of the Bernstead off Station Road, Wilburton</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilburton CP</td>
<td>WIL.H2</td>
<td>Site/32/01 Land west of Clarke’s Lane and south of Hinton Way, Wilburton</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilburton CP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Site/32/08 Land at Pony Lodge, Grunty Fen, Wilburton</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilburton CP</td>
<td>Site/32/02</td>
<td>Land off Townsend Mews, Streatham Road, Wilburton</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilburton CP</td>
<td>Site/32/03</td>
<td>Land to the south of School Lane, Wilburton</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilburton CP</td>
<td>Site/32/05</td>
<td>Land to the south of West End Road, Wilburton</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilburton CP</td>
<td>Site/32/06</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Berristead, Wilburton</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilburton CP</td>
<td>Site/32/07</td>
<td>Land adjacent to cemetery, Wilburton</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witcham CP</td>
<td>WTM.H1</td>
<td>Site/33/01 Kings Of Witcham Ltd, The Slade, Witcham</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witcham CP</td>
<td>Site/33/02</td>
<td>Land east of The Slade</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witchford CP</td>
<td>WFD.H1</td>
<td>Site/34/18 Land north of Field End</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witchford CP</td>
<td>WFD.H1</td>
<td>Site/34/05 Land south of Marroway Lane</td>
<td>Superseded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witchford CP</td>
<td>WFD.H1</td>
<td>Site/34/09 Land North Of Field End, Witchford</td>
<td>Superseded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witchford CP</td>
<td>WFD.H2</td>
<td>Site/34/14 Land at Common Road</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witchford CP</td>
<td>WFD.H3</td>
<td>Site/34/07 Land south of Main Street, Witchford</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witchford CP</td>
<td>WFD.H4</td>
<td>Site/34/19 Land to the rear of 1 to 7 Sutton Road, Witchford</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witchford CP</td>
<td>WFD.E1</td>
<td>Site/34/10 Sedgeway Business Park, Common Road</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witchford CP</td>
<td>Site/34/01</td>
<td>Land south of Sutton Road, Witchford</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witchford CP</td>
<td>Site/34/02</td>
<td>Land west of Mills Lane, Witchford</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witchford CP</td>
<td>Site/34/03</td>
<td>Land at Witchford</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witchford CP</td>
<td>Site/34/04</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Mills Barn, Mills Lane, Witchford, Ely, Cambridgeshire, CB26 2FA</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witchford CP</td>
<td>Site/34/06</td>
<td>Main Street, Witchford</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witchford CP</td>
<td>Site/34/08</td>
<td>Land to the east of Witchford</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witchford CP</td>
<td>Site/34/11</td>
<td>Land south of Sutton Road</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witchford CP</td>
<td>Site/34/12</td>
<td>223 Main Street</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witchford CP</td>
<td>Site/34/13</td>
<td>Land rear of 223 Main Street</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Site Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witchford CP</td>
<td>Site/34/15</td>
<td>Land rear of Needham's Farm Barn</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witchford CP</td>
<td>Site/34/16</td>
<td>Land south of Main Street</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witchford CP</td>
<td>Site/34/17</td>
<td>Land north east of Witchford</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodditton CP</td>
<td>Site/35/04</td>
<td>Site Adjacent To 37 St Johns Avenue</td>
<td>Site Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodditton CP</td>
<td>Site/35/01</td>
<td>Land fronting Peterhouse Drive, Wooditton</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodditton CP</td>
<td>Site/35/02</td>
<td>Land off Cricketfield Road</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodditton CP</td>
<td>Site/35/03</td>
<td>Land south of Stetchworth Road</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Report Format
4.14. To assist in interpreting the site reports, this section explains the content of each report field. Please note, where no information was available in respect of a specific assessment criterion, the corresponding report field has been left blank.

Report Header
4.15. The report header provides the following information:

- **Current Status**: Indicates whether site is a Site Allocation, is superseded by an alternative proposal or is rejected and has not been selected as a Site Allocation.
- **Parish**: The parish in which the site is wholly or mostly located.
- **Site name**: Title describing site address / location
- **Site reference**: The unique reference code assigned to each site for the purpose of assessing the site.

Summary of Findings and Recommendations
4.16. This section provides the following information:

- **Overall recommendation from site assessment**: Indicates whether the site is -
  - *Preferred* – and therefore will be allocated in the Local Plan
  - *Has Merit* – is potentially suitable, but should not be selected for allocation.
  - *Rejected* – site not suitable for allocation in Local Plan.

- **Site Visit Date & Time**: Date and time site visit undertaken.

- **Supersedes site submission**: Indicates reference of sites superseded by this site record.

- **Main findings and recommendations**: Provides a short summary of the main reasons for selection / rejection of the site.

Site information
4.17. The section provides basic information about the site’s characteristics and features:

- **Site type**: The ‘source’ of the site i.e. –
  - *New site submission (Form B)* – sites suggested during the Call for Sites exercise (Feb – March 2016).
  - *FDLP Additional Site Suggestion* (Jan – Feb 2017) – Additional sites suggested during consultation on Further Draft Local Plan.
  - *Local Plan 2015 allocated site* – existing allocation, not resubmitted by landowner/agent during call for sites exercise.
Site with extant PP – site with extant planning permission (for at least 10 housing units).

Existing Business Park – area of developed employment land, as identified by Strategic Planning Team.

Strategic Planning Amended Submission – Alternative site area to original site submission, determined by Strategic Planning team following outcomes of assessment and/or consultation.

- Site address: street / postal address of site.
- ID: Unique reference ID within Strategic Planning Team’s site assessment database.
- Settlement: Town or village within which site is located, adjoining or nearest to.
- LP15 Allocation Ref: Where site is an existing Local Plan 2015 site allocation, the Local Plan 2015 policy reference.
- Planning Perm. Ref: Planning application reference number for site with planning permission.
- Site description: Summary of sites main features and characteristics, usually provided by promoter of site during Call for Sites exercise.
- Brownfield/Greenfield: Indicates whether the site is on land which has been previously developed. Based on information supplied by site promoter, desktop analysis or site visit.
- Known constraints: Summary of constraints which may affect development of the site, usually provided by promoter as part of site submission.
- Current use: Present land use of site. Based on information supplied by site promoter, desktop analysis or site visit.
- Proposed use: Site promoters’ preferred use of the site. Based on information provided as part of site submission.
- Current use info: Further explanation about current land use, where required. Based on information supplied by site promoter, desktop analysis or site visit.
- Proposed use info: Further explanation about proposed land use, where required. Based on information supplied by site promoter.
- Site area net (ha): Estimate of area of site (in hectares) which is available for development, excluding proportion of land which will be required for infrastructure, open space, etc. See table 1.
• **Site area gross (ha):** Total site area in hectares, as supplied by site promoter. Where not supplied, calculated via desktop analysis.

• **Indicative no. of dwellings:**
  
  o a) **Submitted / estimated:** The number of dwellings the site promoter suggested the site could provide; or estimated by the Strategic Planning Team based on the site area.

  o b) **Recommended:** The indicative number of dwellings it is recommended that the site is allocated for.

**Major Criteria & Minor Criteria**

4.18. The Major Criteria and Minor Criteria section of the sites reports provides the results and scoring against the assessment criteria. The Assessment Criteria are discussed in section 2.

**Parish Council Support and Rank**

4.19. The sites report includes the Parish Council’s support and rank. Full comments on each site are not reproduced in the site reports, as many responses received were quite detailed and lengthy. However, these comments were taken into account in assessing and selecting sites.

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) – Summary of comments received**

4.20. A list of key points raised about the site during the consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan.
5. Site Record Reports
Site Name: Land to the south and east of Elms Farm, Ashley

Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Parish: Ashley CP
Site Ref: Site/01/01

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected
Date and time of site visit: 26/7/2016 at 1:40pm
Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
Site rejected due to visual impact on built form of village and impact on setting of Ashley Hall and conservation area. Likely to cause harm to landscape setting and views of countryside. Site was not favoured by Parish Council.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  ID: 1
Site Address: Land to the south and east of Elms Farm, Ashley
Settlement: Ashley
LP15 Allocation Ref:
Planning Perm. Ref:

Site Description: Site in agricultural use and benefits from thick mature landscaping to the perimeter and an existing pond. Hedgerow to be retained to minimise impact on Conservation Area.

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: 0.5 ha of site (gross) available for community-led development. Landowner owns village recreation ground and willing to gift to parish.

Current Use: Agriculture  Proposed Use: Housing

Indicative no. of dwellings:
a) Submitted / estimated 37

Site Area Net (ha): 1.70
Site Area Gross (ha): 4

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Medium Village  
1b. Site Availability Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)  
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone >50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land to the south and east of Elms Farm, Ashley  
**Parish:** Ashley CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/01/01

### Minor Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Site Suitability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a(i) Contaminated land profesional assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5b. Local road impact</th>
<th>No objections with Moderate mitigation measures</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access off Church Street NOT off The Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6a. Proximity to public transport</th>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>No spare places, no room for expansion</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Very constrained site in village conservation area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6f(ii) Available secondary school capacity</th>
<th>Limited capacity</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6g(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6h. Proximity to employment sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6h. Proximity to employment sites</th>
<th>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 7. Environmental Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</th>
<th>CWS within 501m – 1km of site</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers | |
|--------------------------------||
| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower | D |
| 7e. Public Rights of Way | E – No PRoW connection opportunities | E |
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Land to the south and east of Elms Farm, Ashley
Site Ref: Site/01/01

Parish Council support and rank
Does Parish Council support this site? No
Form E - Parish Council site ranking: First
Form G - Parish Council's view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received
Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

7e.(i) PROW comments

7f.(i) Conservation Area
- Site is within CA

7f.(ii). Listed building
- LB within 500m of site

7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
- SAM within 500m of site

7f.(iv) Archaeological asset
- Archaeological assets within 500m of site

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
ECDC: Site located to the rear of two listed buildings and access within conservation area - against the grain of development in the area. Would have potential to cause harm to the setting of the designated heritage assets.

HE: 01/01 and 01/02: both sites are partially in a conservation area with the remainder affecting the setting of a conservation area.

CCC: Site 01/01 adjacent to medieval Ashley Hall. MCB9037 Former Hospitaller chapel rebuilt during C15 and used as parish church S end of Chapel Row 160m to west. Now demolished. Two designated moated sites to S (250m): SCHEDULED MONUMENT NHLE1017886 Sylhall moated site; and SE (500m): SCHEDULED MONUMENT NHLE1017885 Gesyns moated site. MCB9286 Roman and Medieval artefact scatter to E of Gesyns moat. Designated SCHEDULED MONUMENT NHLE 1006791/MCB9277- St Mary’s Church (ruined remains of) and graveyard lie approx 900m further E. The settings of the designated sites will need to be taken into consideration for the development of this proposal area and a full evidence base, including field work, should present the archaeological character and significance in any planning submission. EIA recommended. NGR 570040 261470

7h. Visual Impact
- Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views

Justification for score:
Development of the site would result in loss of open space but most of the natural features can be retained and included in the development.

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
- No TPO within 15m of the site

7f.(iv) Archaeological asset
- Archaeological asset within 500m of site

Parish: Ashley CP
Site Ref: Site/01/01
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit: 26/7/2016 at 1:30pm

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
Site rejected due to likely impacts on heritage assets and their settings, including listed buildings and conservation area. Development is likely to result in loss of views and would result in loss of farming land. Site not favoured by Parish Council.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B) ID: 2
Site Address: Land to the north of Potters House, Church Street, Ashley
Settlement: Ashley
LP15 Allocation Ref: 
Planning Perm. Ref: 
Site Description: Site is currently in agricultural use with access from an existing track. Close to Conservation Area. Hedge line, tree belt and built form along Church Street protects views of site.
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: Landowner willing to provide a car park to serve neighbouring church and cemetery, and provide 20% community led development.
Current Use: Agriculture Proposed Use: Housing
Current Use info:
Proposed Use info:
Site Area Net (ha): 1.50 Site Area Gross (ha): 1.7
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 30 b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Medium Village C
1b. Site Availability Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22) A
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment
1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations
2a. Flood zone >50% of site area in Zone 1 A
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00% Flood Zone 2: 0.00% Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%
2b. Surface Water flood risk Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land to the north of Potters House, Ashley  
**Parish:** Ashley CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/01/02

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- More than 5km from site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

### 5. Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

#### 5b. Local road impact
- No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

Access of Church Street  
Potential visibility splay issues  
Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places, no room for expansion

#### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

Very constrained site in village conservation area

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Limited capacity

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 500m of site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification
- All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land to the north of Potters House, Ashley  
**Parish:** Ashley CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/01/02

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7e. Public Rights of Way</th>
<th>E – No PRoW connection opportunities</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7e.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>Site is within CA</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 500.1 – 1000m of site</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td>Archaeological assets within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7g. Heritage / archaeology comments**

ECDC: Grade I listed church to the north of the site - Historic England would need to be consulted. Very careful consideration will need to be given to the setting of the church.

HE: 01/01 and 01/02: both sites are partially in a conservation area with the remainder affecting the setting of a conservation area.

CCC: Site 01/02 MCB14118 Flint scatter 260m to NE of Site 01/02 proposal area. NGR 569900 261780

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7h. Visual Impact</th>
<th>Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justification for score:</td>
<td>Development of the site would result in loss of open space but most of the natural features can be retained and included in the development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional criterion 7i. TPOs</td>
<td>TPO tree within 15m of the site</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td>Second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council's view:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**
- Preferred site

**Date and time of site visit:**
- 21/07/2016 at 10:45am

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**
The site is currently allocated in Local Plan 2015 as policy BOT 1. The principle of development has therefore already been accepted through the planning process and should be retained. Development proposals should have regard to heritage issues, particularly the Scheduled Ancient Monument located nearby.

---

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Land east of Bell Road Bottisham, CB25 9DF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Bottisham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref</td>
<td>BOT1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>Agricultural land east of Bell Road Bottisham, CB25 9DF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints</td>
<td>Land to be developed in accordance with adopted Local Plan policy BOT1 and adopted Bottisham Masterplan SPD. Outline planning application pending consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha)</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
- Large Village

1b. Site Availability
- Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
- >50% of site area in Zone 1

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**
- Flood Zone 1: 100.00% [A]
- Flood Zone 2: 0.00% [A]
- Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% [A]
- Flood Zone 3b: 0.00% [A]

2b. Surface Water flood risk
- Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMSW):**
- 30 Year: 0.35%
- 100 Year: 0.96%
- 1,000 Year: 3.00%
**Current Status:** Site Allocation BOT.H1  
**Parish:** Bottisham CP  
**Site Name:** Bell Road, Bottisham  
**Site Ref:** Site/02/02

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation</strong></td>
<td>Site does not intersect Inner Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites</strong></td>
<td>More than 5km from site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site within 250m of contaminated land

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
- RAF Bottisham

#### 5b. Local road impact
- Major infrastructure required to offset safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact
- |

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
Access off Ox Meadow - UNADOPTED ROAD  
NO access to existing public highway  
Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Statement based on 50 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Bottisham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Bottisham, the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.

### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

#### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- The school could be expanded by another 120 places. Using the Council’s standard multiplier for pupil generation this would equate with development of up to 340 homes in the catchment area.

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- The school is being expanded to 10 FE - 1500 places 11-16. This is to address the forecast demand for places and makes no allowance for any further housing development. The pupils are already in the primary feeder schools for Bottisham VC. The VC will NOT expand beyond 10FE even if the site allows it.

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 501m – 1km of site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
- |
### Site Name: Bell Road, Bottisham

**Current Status:** Site Allocation BOT.H1

**Parish:** Bottisham CP

**Site Ref:** Site/02/02

#### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Education needs of site (and other draft site allocations in village) can be mitigated.
- Site is within the Swaffham Internal Drainage District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off. Board does not object to draft site allocation, but requires that necessary surface water accommodation is put in pace prior to development of site.
- A masterplan has been completed for the site; Bottisham Parish Council supports the principle of this masterplan and draft policy for the site (Bottisham4).
- Representor requests that development should include, from the start, the provision of a children's play area, due to existing deficiency in provision in the village.
- Development of the site should protect and where possible enhance the conservation area, listed buildings and scheduled monument and their settings. The development should be of high quality design. These requirements should be included in the policy and supporting text of the Plan. Representor welcomes the first bullet point of Policy Bottisham 4 which references views of the Church and the third bullet point which refers to the scheduled monument and proposed buffer zone.
- The buffer zone between the housing and the scheduled monument should only contain soft landscaping and footpaths. It would be inappropriate for it to incorporate any hard landscaping, such as formal play areas, parking or roads, and

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

| D |

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification

**All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower**

| D |

#### 7e. Public Rights of Way

**E – No PRoW connection opportunities**

| E |

#### 7f. (i) PROW comments

| D |

#### 7f. (ii) Conservation Area

**CA within 500m of site**

| D |

#### 7f. (iii) Listed building

**LB within 500m of site**

| D |

#### 7f. (iv) Scheduled Ancient Monument

**SAM within 500m of site**

| D |

#### 7f. (v) Archaeological asset

**Archaeological assets within 500m of site**

| D |

#### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

**ECDC: Already allocated - masterplan addresses heritage issues**

**HE: 02/02: adjacent to scheduled monument – we would refer you to our comments that we made in respect of BOT 1 as part of the 2015 Local Plan process.**

**CCC: Site 02/02 Adjacent to designated SCHEDULED MONUMENT of Bendyshe Hall: NHLE1019175. Proposal area is to immediate south of prehistoric occupation evidence and Saxon to Medieval remain of Bendyshe Hall's manor farm: e.g. MCBs 19744, 20188, 19801. Undated remains found at St Petersfield to immediate north (MCB15535 and 18228). Predetermination evidence base required in support of any application. Scale of development on east side should be less than on west to prevent over-development at the SM buffer zone NGR 554220 260310**

#### 7h. Visual Impact

**Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views**

| C |

#### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

**No TPO within 15m of the site**

| A |

### Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>including allotments.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The built development also should not be allowed to extend too far to the south so that it forms a visual blinker to the west when looking out to the open countryside from the scheduled monument.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Overall recommendation from site assessment:

**Preferred site**

### Date and time of site visit:

- **Supersedes site submission(s)**

### Main findings and recommendations:

> Site is currently allocated for employment uses in Local Plan 2015. The principle of development has already been accepted through the planning process. The allocation should therefore be retained. Proposals should have particular regard to archaeological issues.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>Local Plan 2015 allocated site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID:</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Tunbridge Lane Business Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Bottisham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>BOT2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Existing employment allocation, extension to Tunbridge Lane Business Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Site in Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated b) Recommended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Criteria

#### 1a. Settlement Hierarchy

| Large Village | B |

#### 1b. Site Availability

| | |

#### 1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

This site lies almost entirely within the Safeguarding Area for the Bottisham Waste Water Treatment Works (Policy W7D) designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012). The overarching policy for this designation is Policy CS31 of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011). This policy places a presumption against allowing development which would be occupied by people; and where new development is proposed an odour assessment report should accompany any planning application. Permission should only be granted when it has been demonstrated that the proposed development would not be adversely affected by the continued operation of the existing waste water treatment works. It is suggested that consideration should be given to these policies prior to allocation, but in this instance it is also noted that there is residential development which could be considered to be more sensitive than employment development, already existing between the proposed allocation site and the Bottisham Waste Water Treatment Works.

#### 1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

| | |

#### 1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

| W7D |

#### 2a. Flood zone

| >50% of site area in Zone 1 | A |

---

**Note:** The map shows the site location and coverage area.
Site Name: **Existing employment allocation, extension to Tunbridge Lane Business Park**

**Current Status:** Site Allocation BOT.E1  
**Parish:** Bottisham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/02/05

### Percent (% of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening)):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1:</th>
<th>100.00%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2:</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a:</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b:</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 2b. Surface Water flood risk

Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))

### Percent (% of site area at risk (uFMfSW)):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 Year:</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
<th>100 Year:</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
<th>1,000 Year:</th>
<th>0.37%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

- **5a. Proximity to contaminated land**  
  Site within 250m of contaminated land  
  **B**

- **5a.(i) Contaminated land profesional assessment**
  Within 250m of 02/06 (former industrial use) which is being remediated for residential use.

- **5b. Local road impact**  
  Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations  
  **D**

- **5c. Strategic Road Network impact**

- **5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**

  Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Bottisham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Bottisham, the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.

#### 6. Access to services

- **6a. Proximity to public transport**
  Less than 5 min walk (<400m)  
  **A**

- **6b. Proximity to medical services**
  Less than 5 min walk (<400m)  
  **A**

- **6c. Proximity to shops**
  Less than 5 min walk (<400m)  
  **A**

- **6d. Proximity to Primary School**
  Less than 10 min walk (<800m)  
  **B**

- **6e. Proximity to Secondary School**
  Less than 10 min walk (<800m)  
  **B**

- **6f.(i) Available primary school capacity**
  No spare places but room for expansion  
  **D**

- **6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity**
  No spare places but room for expansion  
  **D**

- **6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**
  The school could be expanded by another 120 places. Using the Council’s standard multiplier for pupil generation this would equate with development of upto 340 homes in the catchment area.

- **6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**
  The school is being expanded to 10 FE - 1500 places 11-16. This is to address the forecast demand for places and makes no allowance for any further housing development. The pupils are already in the primary feeder schools for Bottisham VC. The VC will NOT expand beyond 10FE even if the site allows it.

- **6h. Proximity to employment sites**
  Less than 5 min walk (<400m)  
  **A**

#### 7. Environmental impact

- **7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**
  CWS within 500m of site  
  **D**

---

**Note:** The text has been formatted and divided into sections for clarity. The table entries have been transcribed into markdown for easier readability. The colors in the table represent the assessment levels: red (A), green (B), yellow (C), and orange (D). The assessment levels are based on the criteria and standards set by the locality or regulatory body. The text provides a detailed analysis of the site's suitability, access to services, and environmental impact.
### Parish Council support and rank

**Does Parish Council support this site?**

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council's view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Site lies entirely within the Safeguarding Area for the Bottisham Waste Water Treatment Works (Policy W7D) (adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012)). This policy places a presumption against allowing development which would be occupied by people; and where new development is proposed an odour assessment report should accompany any planning application.
- Site was released from Green Belt. Representor requests that, if site no longer required to meet employment needs it should be returned to Green Belt; and/or if an alternative use is proposed, national policy tests for development of land in Green Belt should be applied.
- Supported by Bottisham Parish Council.
- Landowner supports draft site allocation and indicates site is free from constraints and is deliverable. Archaeological investigation has been carried out, and indicates no archaeological constraints.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment:  
Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:

Site is currently allocated in Local Plan 2015 for Gypsy & Traveller pitches. Retain existing site allocation to ensure continued provision of pitches.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>Local Plan 2015 allocated site</th>
<th>ID: 258</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land at Muckdungle Corner, Newmarket Road, Bottisham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Bottisham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>HOU9(i)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Existing allocation for Gypsy and Traveller site - 2 pitches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Site within Greenbelt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated</td>
<td>b) Recommended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy | Large Village |
1b. Site Availability |  |
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment |  |
1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies |  |
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations |  |
2a. Flood zone | >50% of site area in Zone 1 |
| Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening): |  |
| Flood Zone 1: | 86.96% | Flood Zone 2: | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3a: | 13.04% | Flood Zone 3b: | 0.00% |
2b. Surface Water flood risk | Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA |
| Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW): |  |
| 30 Year: | 0.00% | 100 Year: | 3.89% | 1,000 Year: | 18.63% |
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</th>
<th>Site located more than 250m from contaminated land</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Bottisham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Bottisham, the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6a. Proximity to public transport</th>
<th>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Less than 15 min walk (&lt;1,200m)</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>No spare places but room for expansion</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>No spare places but room for expansion</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The school could be expanded by another 120 places. Using the Council’s standard multiplier for pupil generation this would equate with development of up to 340 homes in the catchment area.

#### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</th>
<th>CWS within 501m – 1km of site</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>E – No PRoW connection opportunities</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The school is being expanded to 10 FE - 1500 places 11-16. This is to address the forecast demand for places and makes no allowance for any further housing development. The pupils are already in the primary feeder schools for Bottisham VC. The VC will NOT expand beyond 10FE even if the site allows it.
Site Name: Land at Muckdungle Corner, Newmarket Road, Bottisham

Parish: Bottisham CP

Site Ref: Site/02/07

Current Status: Site Allocation see policy LP7

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

ECDC: No heritage impact

CCC: Site 02/07. MCB8012: Mesolithic and Neolithic flint implements 75m to N; MCB7670, 7656, 8210-11: Roman artefacts (metal, pot, quern) between 200-300m SE & E. Planning condition depending on construction information. NGR: 555790 259900.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Rejected**

Date and time of site visit: 21/07/2016 at 11:20am

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
Site is located in the Green Belt. The site is therefore rejected due to likely conflict with national policy which strictly limits development in the Green Belt.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
<th>ID:</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land off High Street, Bottisham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Bottisham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Site located on the eastern edge of Bottisham. Approx. 500m east of village centre, north of High St. Site comprises two open fields bounded by mature hedgerows.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Site lies within green belt. Site located behind Grade II listed Bottisham House. Existing footpath located adjacent to western boundary of site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 96  b) Recommended 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy | Large Village | B |
1b. Site Availability | Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22) | A |
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment |
1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies |
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations |
2a. Flood zone | >50% of site area in Zone 1 |
   | Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening): |
   | Flood Zone 1: 100.00% |
   | Flood Zone 2: 0.00% |
   | Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% |
   | Flood Zone 3b: 0.00% |
2b. Surface Water flood risk | Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA |
   | Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW): |

Date and time of site visit: 21/07/2016 at 11:20am

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
Site is located in the Green Belt. The site is therefore rejected due to likely conflict with national policy which strictly limits development in the Green Belt.
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land off High Street, Bottisham  
**Parish:** Bottisham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/02/01

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- More than 5km from site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

#### 5. Site Suitability

##### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site within 250m of contaminated land

##### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

##### 5b. Local road impact
- No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

##### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

##### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

- Main access off High Street
- Potential visibility splay issues
- Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment based on 96 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines and demonstrate how the site can be made accessible on foot, by cycle and by public transport together with identifying any remaining off-site highway implications and required mitigation. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Bottisham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Bottisham, the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.

##### 5e. Proximity to employers on public transport

##### 5f. Proximity to shops
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

##### 6. Access to services

##### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

##### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

##### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

##### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

##### 6g.(i) Available secondary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

##### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The school is being expanded to 10 FE - 1500 places 11-16. This is to address the forecast demand for places and makes no allowance for any further housing development. The pupils are already in the primary feeder schools for Bottisham VC. The VC will NOT expand beyond 10FE even if the site allows it.

##### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

### 7. Environmental impact
| 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites | CWS within 501m – 1km of site | C |
| 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment | |
| 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers | |
| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower | C |
| 7e. Public Rights of Way | C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PROW within the site boundary | C |
| 7e.(l) PROW comments | |
| 7f.(i) Conservation Area | Site is within CA | E |
| 7f.(ii). Listed building | LB within 500m of site | D |
| 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument | SAM within 500m of site | D |
| 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset | Archaeological assets on-site | E |
| 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments | |
| 7h. Visual Impact | Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views | C |
| Justification for score: | |
| Current landscape may have some biodiversity value. | |
| Additional criterion 7i. TPOs | No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

### Parish Council support and rank

| Does Parish Council support this site? | |
| Form E - Parish Council site ranking: | |
| Form G - Parish Council's view: | |

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

Site promoter disagrees with rejection of site, and indicates that:
- the site could help meeting housing need, and contribute toward infrastructure and community facilities including public open space, such as play area and allotments;
- The site has no technical constraints;
- They consider the proposed development takes into account the character of the surrounding area, and setting of village and heritage assets;
- Site should be released from Green Belt.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit:
21/07/2016 at 10:25am

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
Site is located in the Green Belt. The site is therefore rejected due to likely conflict with national policy which strictly limits development in the Green Belt.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B) ID: 40

Site Address: Land west of Bell Road, Bottisham, CB25 9DF

Settlement: Bottisham

LP15 Allocation Ref: Planning Perm. Ref:

Site Description: Undeveloped agricultural land bounded by Bell Road to the east, residential development and school playing fields to the north and agricultural land to the south and west.

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints: Community-led development to be discussed. Site within Greenbelt.

Current Use: Agriculture Proposed Use: Housing

Current Use info:

Proposed Use info:

Site Area Net (ha): 2.25 Site Area Gross (ha): 3

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 50 b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Large Village B

1b. Site Availability
Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22) A

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1 A

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

Flood Zone 1: 100.00% Flood Zone 2: 0.00% Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

30 Year: 0.00% 100 Year: 0.00% 1,000 Year: 1.46%
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** West of Bell Road, Bottisham  
**Parish:** Bottisham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/02/03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site does not intersect Inner Zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5km from site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Minor Criteria**

**5. Site Suitability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site located more than 250m from contaminated land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No objections with minor mitigation measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acess off Bell Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Statement based on 50 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Bottisham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Bottisham, the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.

**6. Access to services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No spare places but room for expansion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No spare places but room for expansion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school could be expanded by another 120 places. Using the Council's standard multiplier for pupil generation this would equate with development of up to 340 homes in the catchment area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school is being expanded to 10 FE - 1500 places 11-16. This is to address the forecast demand for places and makes no allowance for any further housing development. The pupils are already in the primary feeder schools for Bottisham VC. The VC will NOT expand beyond 10FE even if the site allows it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6h. Proximity to employment sites</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7. Environmental impact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWS within 501m – 1km of site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii) Listed building</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECDC: No heritage impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC: Site 02/03 Low density stray find and metal detection evidence from arable fields and Village College playing field of low significance. Archaeological character of plot is unknown. Planning condition to secure evaluation. NGR 553900 260520</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parish Council support and rank</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does Parish Council support this site?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Form G - Parish Council's view:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation  
Parish: Bottisham CP  
Site Name: Land east of Bell Road, Bottisham  
Site Ref: Site/02/04

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected  
Date and time of site visit: 21/07/2016 at 10:05am  
Supersedes site submission(s)  
Main findings and recommendations:  
Site is located in the Green Belt. The site is therefore rejected due to likely conflict with national policy which strictly limits development in the Green Belt.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
<th>ID: 41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Land east of Bell Road, Bottisham, CB25 9DF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Bottisham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>Undeveloped agricultural land bounded by the A3103 to the south and, Bell Road to the west and LP15 allocation &quot;BOT1&quot; to the north east.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints</td>
<td>Site within Greenbelt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha)</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated</td>
<td>b) Recommended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  
Large Village  
1b. Site Availability  
Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)  
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment  
1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies  
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations  

2a. Flood zone  
>50% of site area in Zone 1  
Percent (% of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):  
Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  
Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  
Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  
Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%  

2b. Surface Water flood risk  
Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))  
Percent (% of site area at risk (uFMfSW):  
30 Year: 0.00%  
100 Year: 0.00%  
1,000 Year: 0.00%
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site within 50m of contaminated land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5km from site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to services</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No spare places but room for expansion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No spare places but room for expansion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school could be expanded by another 120 places. Using the Council's standard multiplier for pupil generation this would equate with development of up to 340 homes in the catchment area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school is being expanded to 10 FE - 1,500 places 11-16. This is to address the forecast demand for places and makes no allowance for any further housing development. The pupils are already in the primary feeder schools for Bottisham VC. The VC will NOT expand beyond 10FE even if the site allows it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6h. Proximity to employment sites</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 15 min walk (&lt;1,200m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental impact</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWS within 501m – 1km of site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**

**Site Name:**  *Land east of Bell Road, Bottisham*

**Parish:**  *Bottisham CP*

**Site Ref:**  *Site/02/04*

---

**7d. Agricultural land classification**
- All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower  
  - D

**7e. Public Rights of Way**
- E – No PRoW connection opportunities  
  - E

**7f.(i) PROW comments**

**7f.(i) Conservation Area**
- CA within 500m of site  
  - D

**7f.(ii) Listed building**
- LB within 500m of site  
  - D

**7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument**
- SAM within 500m of site  
  - D

**7f.(iv) Archaeological asset**
- Archaeological assets within 500m of site  
  - D

**7g. Heritage / archaeology comments**

ECDC: No heritage impact

HE: 02/04: affecting setting of a scheduled monument

CCC: Site 02/04  Medieval ridge and furrow cultivation remains (MCB8081) to S of A1303 and undated remains found at St Petersfield to north (MCB15535 and 18228). Minimum evidence base for planning condition is a high quality geophysical survey, may require trenching at this stage depending on the results of the survey. NGR 554000 260240

**7h. Visual Impact**
- Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive  
  - D

Justification for score:

**Additional criterion 7l. TPOs**
- No TPO within 15m of the site  
  - A

---

**Parish Council support and rank**

**Does Parish Council support this site?**

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council's view:**

---

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Parish:** Bottisham CP  
**Site Name:** Crystal Park, Tunbridge Lane, Bottisham  
**Site Ref:** Site/02/06

## Summary of Findings and Recommendations

| Overall recommendation from site assessment: | **Rejected** |
| Date and time of site visit: | |
| Supersedes site submission(s): | |

### Main findings and recommendations:
Sites monitoring indicates that development of the site is now complete.

## Site Information

| Site Type: | Site with extant planning permission | ID: 248 |
| Site Address: | Crystal Park, Tunbridge Lane, Bottisham |
| Settlement: | Bottisham |
| LP15 Allocation Ref: | |
| Planning Perm. Ref: | 14/01239/FUM |
| Site Description: | Crystal Park, Tunbridge Lane, Bottisham |
| Brown/Greenfield: | Brownfield |
| Known Constraints: | |
| Current Use: | Employment |
| Proposed Use: | Mixed use |
| Current Use info: | |
| Proposed Use info: | |
| Site Area Net (ha): | 0.67 |
| Site Area Gross (ha): | 0.79 |
| Indicative no. of dwellings: | a) Submitted / estimated 24 | b) Recommended 0 |

## Major Criteria

| 1a. Settlement Hierarchy | Large Village |
| 1b. Site Availability | |
| 1c. Minerals and Waste assessment | |

This site lies almost entirely within the Safeguarding Area for the Bottisham Waste Water Treatment Works (Policy W7D) designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012). The overarching policy for this designation is Policy CS31 of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011). This policy places a presumption against allowing development which would be occupied by people; and where new development is proposed an odour assessment report should accompany any planning application. Permission should only be granted when it has been demonstrated that the proposed development would not be adversely affected by the continued operation of the existing waste water treatment works. It is suggested that consideration should be given to these policies prior to allocation, but in this instance it is also noted that there is residential development already existing between the proposed allocation site and the Bottisham Waste Water Treatment Works.

| 1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies | |
| 1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations | W7D |

| 2a. Flood zone | >50% of site area in Zone 1 |
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

##### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### 5b. Local road impact

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Statement based on 24 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Bottisham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Bottisham, the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.

#### 6. Access to services

##### 6a. Proximity to public transport

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### 6b. Proximity to medical services

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### 6c. Proximity to shops

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### 6d. Proximity to Primary School

Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

No spare places but room for expansion

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

No spare places but room for expansion

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

The school could be expanded by another 120 places. Using the Council’s standard multiplier for pupil generation this would equate with development of up to 340 homes in the catchment area.

##### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The school is being expanded to 10 FE - 1500 places 11-16. This is to address the forecast demand for places and makes no allowance for any further housing development. The pupils are already in the primary feeder schools for Bottisham VC. The VC will NOT expand beyond 10FE even if the site allows it.

##### 6h. Proximity to employment sites

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7. Environmental impact

##### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

CWS within 500m of site

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Site Name: Crystal Park, Tunbridge Lane, Bottisham

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Parish:** Bottisham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/02/06

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification

- All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower: C

#### 7e. Public Rights of Way

- E – No PRoW connection opportunities: E

#### 7e.(i) PROW comments

#### 7f.(i) Conservation Area

- CA within 500m of site: D

#### 7f.(ii). Listed building

- LB within 500m of site: D

#### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

- SAM within 500m of site: D

#### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

- Archaeological assets on-site: E

#### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

CCC: Site 02/06 Tunbridge Lane, Crystal Park. Planning permission granted. Roman villa site (MCB20322) and former military barracks (MCB20680) of Bottisham airfield.

#### 7h. Visual Impact

Justification for score:

#### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

- TPO tree on site: C

### Parish Council support and rank

- **Does Parish Council support this site?**

- **Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

- **Form G - Parish Council's view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Education needs of site (and other draft site allocations in village) can be mitigated.
- Development of site is nearly completed.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Rejected**

Date and time of site visit: 27/06/2017 at 12:30pm

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
Development of the site would be visually intrusive to the open countryside, and may result in harm to the built form of the village. The site is relatively isolated from local facilities and services.

Site Information

Site Type: **FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17**

Site Address: High Street, Brinkley, Newmarket

Settlement: Brinkley

LP15 Allocation Ref: ID: 381

Planning Perm. Ref:

Site Description: The site is located to the south of the High Street, Brinkley adjacent to the existing development envelope for the village. Site currently in agricultural use, proposed for housing development.

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints:
Submission indicates site has capacity for 9 dwellings along the frontage of High Street, with new access to/from public highway. **Net site area estimated**

Current Use: Agriculture

Proposed Use: Housing

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 9

Site Area Net (ha): 1.70

Site Area Gross (ha): 2

Site Area Polygon (ha): 2.11

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy: Small Village

1b. Site Availability: Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone:

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

- Flood Zone 1: 100.00%
- Flood Zone 2: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk: Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):
### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 501m - 2km from the site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
- Sewage works 170m to NW

#### 5b. Local road impact
- No objections with minor mitigation measures

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

#### 6. Access to services

##### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

##### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- Limited capacity

##### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Limited capacity

##### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- The first three developments listed (03/02; 03/02; 04/02) will all feed into Burrough Green Primary School. A forward look at catchment forecasts combined with the child yield from the new developments suggests that a limited expansion of the school will be required. The school site has sufficient potential for a limited expansion to take place.

##### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 7. Environmental impact

##### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 500m of site

##### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

##### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

##### 7d. Agricultural land classification
- All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation  
Site Name: Land south of High Street  
Parish: Brinkley CP  
Site Ref: Site/03/01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7e. Public Rights of Way</th>
<th>E – No PRoW connection opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7e.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site abuts the conservation area to the north and east and there is a Grade II listed building directly opposite the most northern part of the site. Dependant on form, development on this site would be more in keeping with the built form of the village which is quite linear in nature.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
<td>Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification for score:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional criterion 7l. TPOs</td>
<td>TPO tree within 15m of the site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site?  
No

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:  

Form G - Parish Council’s view:  
(c) not add this site to the Local Plan

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**
Site Name: **Land off Carlton Road**
Parish: **Brinkley CP**
Site Ref: **Site/03/02**

### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** 
Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:**
27/06/2017 at 12:40pm

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**
Development of the site would be visually intrusive to the open countryside, and may result in harm to the built form of the village. The site is relatively isolated from local facilities and services.

### Site Information

**Site Type:** FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb'17

**Site Address:** Carlton Road, Brinkley, Newmarket

**Settlement:** Brinkley

**LP15 Allocation Ref:** 

**Planning Perm. Ref:**

**Site Description:** Bare agricultural land with access off Carlton Road, Brinkley. There are no tenancies in place and the land is owner occupied. Proposed for housing development.

**Brown/Greenfield:** Greenfield

**Known Constraints:** **Submission does not indicate number of proposed dwellings. Dwelling figure is therefore calculated from site area and does not reflect site constraints or characteristics.**

**Current Use:** Agriculture

**Proposed Use:** Housing

**Current Use info:**

**Proposed Use info:**

**Site Area Net (ha):** 2.25

**Site Area Gross (ha):** 3

**Indicative no. of dwellings:**

a) Submitted / estimated 81

b) Recommended 0

### Major Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>1a. Settlement Hierarchy</strong></th>
<th>Small Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1b. Site Availability</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1c. Minerals and Waste assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies**

**1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations**

**2a. Flood zone**

>50% of site area in Zone 1

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

- Flood Zone 1: 100.00%
- Flood Zone 2: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

**2b. Surface Water flood risk**
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):** -
Site Name: Land off Carlton Road

Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

Parish: Brinkley CP
Site Ref: Site/03/02

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- Within 500m of site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

#### 30 Year: 5.20%  
100 Year: 2.66%  
1,000 Year: 12.87%

- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

#### 5. Site Suitability

##### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

##### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
- Sewage works on western boundary

##### 5b. Local road impact
- No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations

##### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

##### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

#### 6. Access to services

##### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

##### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- Limited capacity

##### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Limited capacity

##### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- Bottisham VC is in the process of being expanded from 7FE to 10FE an additional 450 places 11-16. Future catchment forecasts indicate that there will be some limited capacity available at the school to accommodate growth. In addition, there are plans for a new secondary school to the east of Cambridge to serve that areas development needs. The school will be in part of Bottisham VC current catchment area. If pupils in this area are served by the new school that will free up further capacity to accommodate the growth proposed within the Local Plan and the sites identified in this second round.

##### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- Limited capacity

#### 7. Environmental impact

##### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 500m of site

##### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

##### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

### 5.20% Site suitability

---

The first three developments listed (03/02; 03/02; 04/02) will all feed into Burrough Green Primary School. A forward look at catchment forecasts combined with the child yield from the new developments suggests that a limited expansion of the school will be required. The school site has sufficient potential for a limited expansion to take place.

The first three developments are from the original list of 03/02, 03/02, and 04/02. These developments are subsequently named as 03/02, 03/02, and 04/02. The school, Burrough Green Primary School, is expected to receive additional students from these developments, which will require a limited expansion of the school. The school site has sufficient potential to accommodate a limited expansion. Future catchment forecasts are expected to show some limited capacity available at the school to accommodate growth. In addition, there are plans for a new secondary school to be built in part of Bottisham VC's catchment area. If pupils from this area are served by the new school, it will free up further capacity to accommodate the growth proposed within the Local Plan and the sites identified in this second round.
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land off Carlton Road  
**Parish:** Brinkley CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/03/02

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.

---

| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower | D |
| 7e. Public Rights of Way | B – Opportunities to connect to multiple nearby PRoW within the site boundary | B |
| 7f.(i) PROW comments | FP12 runs along the eastern boundary of the site. There is currently a network of permissive paths which cross the site and provide links between FPs10, 12, 8 and 11. At least one link across the site to be included to protect the Public Rights of Way network |
| 7f.(i) Conservation Area | CA within 500m of site | D |
| 7f.(ii). Listed building | LB within 500m of site | D |
| 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument | SAM within 500.1 – 1000m of site | C |
| 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset | |
| 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments | The site is some distance from the conservation area and listed buildings with a modern housing development located between the site and the older part of the village. The site location would reflect the adjacent modern development but would appear to be at odds with the built form of the settlement. |
| 7h. Visual Impact | Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive | D |

**Parish Council support and rank**

Does Parish Council support this site? No

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council’s view: (c) not add this site to the Local Plan
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment:

Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:
26 July 2016 at 10:20am

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is accessible and is surrounded by residential uses. The site is supported by the Parish Council. It is therefore concluded that the site provides a suitable site for development. There are high hedges on East and South boundaries which should be retained to reduce impact on the open countryside.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  ID: 4
Site Address: Land off Brinkley Road, Burrough Green, Newmarket, Cambridgeshire, CB8 0PJ
Settlement: Burrough Green
LP15 Allocation Ref:  Planning Perm. Ref:
Site Description: Paddock and stable to rear of housing at Brinkley Road.
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: Site is located within Flood Zone 1 - low risk of flooding. No heritage assets within the vicinity of the site. Existing access to Brinkley Road. Pedestrian link to Borough Green. Bus stop within 100m linking the site with Newmarket and beyond. Access rights exist to public highway. Successful bid to purchase made by HPB Management Limited.

Current Use: Other (please specify)  Proposed Use: Housing
Current Use info: Paddock and stable

Proposed Use info:

Site Area Net (ha): 0.36  Site Area Gross (ha): 0.36
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 10  b) Recommended 11

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  Medium Village
1b. Site Availability  Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone  >50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Current Status: Site Allocation BRG.H1
Site Name: Land off Brinkley Road, Burrough Green
Parish: Burrough Green CP
Site Ref: Site/04/01

Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

5a.(l) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact
Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
NO highways frontage OR shown access to highway
Massive problems to access the highway
Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
Limited capacity

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
No spare places but room for expansion

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
The school could potentially be expanded by a further 105 places if required. Using the Council's standard multipliers this would equate with development of upto 300 homes in the catchment area

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
The school is being expanded to 10 FE - 1500 places 11-16. This is to address the forecast demand for places and makes no allowance for any further housing development. The pupils are already in the primary feeder schools for Bottisham VC. The VC will NOT expand beyond 10FE even if the site allows it.

6h. Proximity to employment sites
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
CWS within 501m – 1km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
Site Ref: Site/04/01
Parish/04/01
Parish: Burrough Green CP
Site Name: Land off Brinkley Road, Burrough Green
Current Status: Site Allocation BRG.H1

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers
D

7d. Agricultural land classification
All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower
D

7e. Public Rights of Way
E – No PRoW connection opportunities
E

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received
Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
- There is spare capacity in the primary school to allow for a small increase in catchment numbers arising from site.
- Site promoter welcomes allocation of site, but objects to requirement to retain boundary hedge, suggesting this should be addressed through tree survey and assessment at planning application stage.
- Site promoter indicates site is misquoted as 0.4ha; 0.36ha is a more accurate figure.
- Planning permission 16/01498/OUT has recently been granted for up to eight dwellings on the site.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit: 27/06/2017 at 12:02pm

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is physically separate from the built area of the village and is isolated from local services and facilities. Development would likely be visually intrusive to the open countryside.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17</th>
<th>ID:</th>
<th>383</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land off B1052, Burrough Green, Newmarket</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Burrough Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Bare agricultural land with access off the B1052. There are no tenancies in place and the land is owner occupied. Proposed for housing development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td><strong>Submission does not indicate number of proposed dwellings. Dwelling figure is therefore calculated from site area and does not reflect site constraints or characteristics.</strong> <strong>Net site area estimated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 57</td>
<td>b) Recommended 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

| 1a. Settlement Hierarchy | Medium Village |
| 1b. Site Availability | |
| 1c. Minerals and Waste assessment | |
| 1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies | |
| 1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations | |
| 2a. Flood zone | >50% of site area in Zone 1 |
| Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening): | |
| Flood Zone 1: 100.00% | Flood Zone 2: 0.00% | Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% | Flood Zone 3b: 0.00% |
| 2b. Surface Water flood risk | Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr)) |
| Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW): | |
## Minor Criteria

### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 501m - 2km from the site

### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

### 5. Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site within 250m of contaminated land

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
- Unknown filled ground 21m to NW

#### 5b. Local road impact
- No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- Limited capacity

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Limited capacity

#### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- The first three developments listed (03/02; 03/02; 04/02) will all feed into Burrough Green Primary School. A forward look at catchment forecasts combined with the child yield from the new developments suggests that a limited expansion of the school will be required. The school site has sufficient potential for a limited expansion to take place.

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- Bottisham VC is in the process of being expanded from 7FE to 10FE an additional 450 places 11-16. Future catchment forecasts indicate that there will be some limited capacity available at the school to accommodate growth. In addition, there are plans for a new secondary school to the east of Cambridge to serve that areas development needs. The school will be in part of Bottisham VC current catchment area. If pupils in this area are served by the new school that will free up further capacity to accommodate the growth proposed within the Local Plan and the sites identified in this second round.

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 501m – 1km of site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

---

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Site Name:** Land off the B1052

**Parish:** Burrough Green CP

**Site Ref:** Site/04/02
### Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

### Site Name: Land off the B1052

### Site Ref: Site/04/02

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7d. Agricultural land classification</th>
<th>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>E – No PRoW connection opportunities</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 500.1 – 1000m of site</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 500.1 – 1000m of site</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td>Listed building to the southwest but sufficient distance involved to have limited impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual impact</td>
<td>Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification for score:**

| Additional criterion 7l. TPOs        | No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

### Parish Council support and rank

**Does Parish Council support this site?**

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council's view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

**Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:**

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit: 26/7/2016 at 4:00pm

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 site allocation which has recently been granted planning permission. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and should be retained. The site boundary of the allocation should be amended to reflect this site submission.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  ID: 42
Site Address: Land at Newmarket Rd, Burwell
Settlement: Burwell
LP15 Allocation Ref: BUR1  Planning Perm. Ref: 15/01175/OUM
Site Description: The Council has a planning application awaiting determination and is providing the policy compliant area for a new Sports Hub together with extra land that will be sold to the Parish Council. The Sports hub land will be transferred once planning consent has been granted
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints:
Current Use: Agriculture  Proposed Use: Housing
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 350  b) Recommended 350

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Large Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRAS 0.00%
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW): -
Site Name: Land at Newmarket Rd, Burwell
Parish: Burwell CP
Site Ref: Site/05/04

Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
5a(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact
No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
Access to the site would be off Heath Road
Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Statement, based on 60 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. In total proposals for Fordham amount to some 1400 units. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of their proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Fordham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Fordham the cumulative impact could be significant, especially on A142 junctions and the A142/A14 junction.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6c. Proximity to shops
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f(i) Available primary school capacity
No spare places but room for expansion

6f(ii) Available secondary school capacity
Limited capacity

6g(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
The school is being expanded by 1FE or 210 places. The scheme will complete in 2017. The school is being expanded in anticipation of a 350 unit development being promoted by CCC some additional development could also be accommodated.

6g(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites
Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
CWS within 501m – 1km of site
Current Status: Site Allocation BUR.H1  
Site Name: Land at Newmarket Rd, Burwell

Parish: Burwell CP  
Site Ref: Site/05/04

---

**Parish Council support and rank**

Does Parish Council support this site?  
Form E - Parish Council site ranking:  
Form G - Parish Council's view:

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Support for BUR.H1 - from 350 homes to 420 homes and significantly larger 5ha Sports Hub.
- BUR.H1 and Policy Burwell 4 - Although no designated heritage assets within the site, a grade II listed Mill to the west of the site. Any development will need to protect and enhance the listed buildings and its settings and should be of high quality design.
Site Information

Site Type: Local Plan 2015 allocated site
Site Address: Former D S Smith Site Reach Road Burwell Burwell CB25 0AH
Settlement: Burwell
LP15 Allocation Ref: BUR3
Planning Perm. Ref: 14/00046/OUM
Site Description: Existing allocation with planning permission at Former D S Smith Site Reach Road Burwell
Brown/Greenfield: Brownfield
Known Constraints:
Current Use: Employment
Proposed Use: Mixed use
Proposed Use info:
Site Area Net (ha): 2.30
Site Area Gross (ha): 3.06
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 70 b) Recommended 67

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Large Village
1b. Site Availability
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
-50% of site area in Zone 1
Percent (% of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 88.89% Flood Zone 2: 0.00% Flood Zone 3a: 11.11% Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA
Percent (% of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
30 Year: 0.34% 100 Year: 1.36% 1,000 Year: 3.98%
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

**5a. Proximity to contaminated land**

- **5a(i) Contaminated land professional assessment**

**5b. Local road impact**

- **No objections with minor mitigation measures**

**5c. Strategic Road Network impact**

- 

**5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**

Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry. No comment. Planning permission has been granted, and mitigation package has been agreed.

#### 6. Access to services

**6a. Proximity to public transport**

- **Less than 5 min walk (<400m)**

**6b. Proximity to medical services**

- **Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)**

**6c. Proximity to shops**

- **Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)**

**6d. Proximity to Primary School**

- **Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)**

**6e. Proximity to Secondary School**

- **Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)**

**6f(i) Available primary school capacity**

- **No spare places but room for expansion**

**6g(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**

The school is being expanded by 1FE or 210 places. The scheme will complete in 2017. The school is being expanded in anticipation of a 350 unit development being promoted by CCC some additional development could also be accommodated.

**6f(ii) Available secondary school capacity**

- **Limited capacity**

**6g(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

**6h. Proximity to employment sites**

- **Less than 5 min walk (<400m)**

#### 7. Environmental impact

**7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**

- **CWS located within site**

**7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**

**7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers**

- 

**7d. Agricultural land classification**

- **All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower**

**7e. Public Rights of Way**

- **E – No PRoW connection opportunities**

**7e(i) PROW comments**

- 

---

**Current Status:** Site Allocation BUR.M1  
**Site Name:** Existing allocation with planning permission at Former D S Smith Site Reach Road Burwell  
**Parish:** Burwell CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/05/06
**Site Name:** Existing allocation with planning permission at Former D S Smith Site Reach Road Burwell

**Parish:** Burwell CP

**Current Status:** Site Allocation BUR.M1

**Site Ref:** Site/05/06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7g. Heritage / archaeology comments**

- CCC: Excavation in progress

**7h. Visual Impact**

**Justification for score:**

**Additional criterion 7i. TPOs**

- No TPO within 15m of the site: A

### Parish Council support and rank

**Does Parish Council support this site?**

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

**Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:**

- The proposals will require the necessary surface water accommodation in place to reduce flood risk.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit: 

Supersedes site submission(s) 

Main findings and recommendations:
Site has extant planning permission for development of a mobile home park. The site should be allocated to retain this planning decision.

Site Information

Site Type: Site with extant planning permission
Site Address: Stanford Park Weirs Drove Burwell
Settlement: Burwell
LP15 Allocation Ref: 
Planning Perm. Ref: 16/00686/OUM
Site Description: Outline application for change use of existing caravan touring park site for the siting of up to a maximum of 91 Mobile Homes with new access to include communal open space, resident meeting hall, park office and associated park infrastructure.
Brown/Greenfield: Brownfield
Known Constraints: 
Current Use: Leisure facility (commercial)
Proposed Use: Other (please specify)
Proposed Use info: Site has planning permission for mobile home park
Site Area Net (ha): 3.64
Site Area Gross (ha): 4.85
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 91 b) Recommended 91

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Large Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+M Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+M Allocations

2a. Flood zone
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 
Flood Zone 2: 
Flood Zone 3a: 
Flood Zone 3b: 

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation</td>
<td>Site does not intersect Inner Zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Site Suitability</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land profesional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Access to services</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Environmental impact</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii) Listed building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

Does Parish Council support this site?  

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:  

Form G - Parish Council’s view:  

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit: 26/7/2016 at 4:30pm

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is an existing Local Plan allocation. The principle of development has already been accepted through the planning process and should therefore be retained.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  ID: 7
Site Address: Reach Road, Burwell
Settlement: Burwell
LP15 Allocation Ref: BUR2  Planning Perm. Ref: 
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: Overhead power line crossing site. Small section of site in flood zone 3.
Current Use: Agriculture  Proposed Use: Employment
Current Use info: 
Proposed Use info: 
Site Area Net (ha): 1.88  Site Area Gross (ha) 2.5
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated  b) Recommended

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  Large Village
1b. Site Availability
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment
1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone 1</td>
<td>79.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 2</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3a</td>
<td>17.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3b</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Year</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 Year</td>
<td>7.97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA -
Site Name: Land at Reach Road

Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site within 250m of contaminated land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Former factory or works 117m to SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5b. Local road impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No objections with minor mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

Access to the site would be off Reach Road
Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Statement, based on 60 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. In total proposals for Fordham amount to some 1400 units. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of their proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Fordham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Fordham the cumulative impact could be significant, especially on A142 junctions and the A142/A14 junction.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6b. Proximity to medical services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less than 15 min walk (&lt;1,200m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6c. Proximity to shops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less than 15 min walk (&lt;1,200m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6d. Proximity to Primary School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less than 20 min walk (&lt;1,600m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6e. Proximity to Secondary School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No spare places but room for expansion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No spare places but room for expansion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

The school is being expanded by 1FE or 210 places. The scheme will complete in 2017. The school is being expanded in anticipation of a 350 unit development being promoted by CCC some additional development could also be accommodated.

6f.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

6h. Proximity to employment sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CWS within 500m of site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
**Current Status:** Site Allocation BUR.E1  
**Site Name:** *Land at Reach Road*  

| **Site Ref:** Site/05/03 | **Parish:** Burwell CP |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Parish Council support and rank</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does Parish Council support this site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council's view:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- There are two scheduled monuments (Devils Ditch and a Roman Villa) and Burwell Castle. Burwell Conservation Area to the north east. Development of this site has the potential to impact upon the setting these historic asset. The proposals will require the necessary surface water accommodation in place to reduce flood risk.
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Parish:** Burwell CP  
**Site Name:** Low Road, Burwell  
**Site Ref:** Site/05/01

---

**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**  
Has merit

**Date and time of site visit:**  
26/7/2016 at 4pm

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site has some merit, but is not proposed for allocation as other more suitable sites are available in the village. Were the site to be developed, particular consideration should be given to heritage and archaeology issues on and in close proximity to the site.

---

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Land south of 76 Low Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Burwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref</td>
<td>15/01064/FUL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>Agricultural land west of Low Road, Burwell.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints</td>
<td>Landowner indicates there are no significant constraints. Part of site (identified as 'front') has extant planning permission for three dwellings at frontage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Proposed Use</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info</td>
<td>Front (2ha) - grassland not in use. Back (3ha) - agricultural.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha)</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha)</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>b) Recommended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Major Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a. Settlement Hierarchy</td>
<td>Large Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. Site Availability</td>
<td>Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Minerals and Waste assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Flood zone</td>
<td>&gt;50% of site area in Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3a</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3b</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Surface Water flood risk</td>
<td>Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Year</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Year</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 Year</td>
<td>1.38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
   Site within 250m of contaminated land
   Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

5b. Local road impact
   No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
   Highways: Access to the site would be off Low Road
   Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

TA Team & TIPF: The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Statement, based on 60 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. In total proposals for Fordham amount to some 1400 units. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of their proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Fordham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Fordham the cumulative impact could be significant, especially on A142 junctions and the A142/A14 junction.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
   Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
   Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6c. Proximity to shops
   Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
   Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
   Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
   No spare places but room for expansion

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
   The school is being expanded by 1FE or 210 places. The scheme will complete in 2017. The school is being expanded in anticipation of a 350 unit development being promoted by CCC some additional development could also be accommodated.

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
   No spare places but room for expansion

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
   The school is being expanded to 10 FE - 1500 places 11-16. This is to address the forecast demand for places and makes no allowance for any further housing development. The pupils are already in the primary feeder schools for Bottisham VC. The VC will NOT expand beyond 10FE even if the site allows it.

6h. Proximity to employment sites
   Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
   CWS within 501m – 1km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
### Site Name: Low Road, Burwell

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Parish:** Burwell CP

**Site Ref:** Site/05/01

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification

| All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower | C |

#### 7e. Public Rights of Way

| E – No PRoW connection opportunities | E |

#### 7f.(i) PROW comments

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 7f.(i) Conservation Area

| CA within 500m of site | D |

#### 7f.(ii). Listed building

| LB within 500m of site | D |

#### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

| SAM within 500.1 – 1000m of site | C |

#### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

| Archaeological assets on-site | E |

#### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

**HE: 05/01:** adjacent to a grade II listed building

CCC: MCB13382 Medieval house platform recorded within this plot (non-designated), associated with further earthwork features to the immediate N (MCB13380) and a range of other HER entries indicating Medieval and later settlement evidence (eg MCB1428, 14590). Mesolithic axe (MCB7850) found 50m to the N. The designated SCHEDULED MONUMENT of Burwell Castle is 750m to the south (NHLE1015596), the setting of which should be considered in any planning application. Due to further earthworks being present on site and in the vicinity, pre-determination evaluation should preceded any planning submission.

#### 7h. Visual impact

| Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views | C |

**Justification for score:**

Loss of open space in the village but will provide housing for local community.

**Additional criterion 7i. TPOs**

| No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

### Parish Council support and rank

**Does Parish Council support this site?**

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received

**Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:**

The site is suitable for residential development and is immediately available for development unlike the viability and deliverability of sites in the north of the District.
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**

Parish: **Burwell CP**

**Site Ref:** Site/05/02

**Site Name:** Land lying to the North-East of Factory Road, Burwell, Cambridge

**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

| Overall recommendation from site assessment: | **Rejected** |
| Date and time of site visit: | 2/8/2016 at 2:35pm |
| Supersedes site submission(s): | |

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is rejected on the basis that it is isolated from the main part of the village, and therefore would have poor access to services and facilities offered within the village. Other more suitable site are available.

### Site Information

| Site Type: | New site submission (Form B) |
| Site Address: | Land lying to the North-East of Factory Road, Burwell, Cambridge |
| Settlement: | Burwell |
| LP15 Allocation Ref: | |
| Planning Perm. Ref: | |
| Site Description: | Vacant site adjacent to employment site |
| Brown/Greenfield: | Brownfield |
| Known Constraints: | Agent indicates that marginal area on the eastern and southern boundaries located in Flood Zone 3 but benefits from flood defences at Burwell Lode. Remainder of site in zone 1. |
| Current Use: | Employment |
| Proposed Use info: | Vacant site adjacent to employment site |
| Current Use info: | Mixed-use development of small start-up business units and residential accommodation. |
| Proposed Use info: | Mixed-use development of small start-up business units and residential accommodation. |
| Site Area Net (ha): | 0.48 |
| Site Area Gross (ha): | 0.56 |
| Indicative no. of dwellings: | a) Submitted / estimated 4 b) Recommended 0 |

### Major Criteria

#### 1a. Settlement Hierarchy

| Large Village |

#### 1b. Site Availability

| Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22) |

#### 1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

| |

#### 1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

|  |

#### 1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

|  |

#### 2a. Flood zone

| >50% of site area in Zone 1 |

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

| Flood Zone 1: 66.18% | Flood Zone 2: 17.65% | Flood Zone 3a: 16.18% | Flood Zone 3b: 0.00% |

#### 2b. Surface Water flood risk

| Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA |

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):**

| 30 Year: 0.00% | 100 Year: 3.08% | 1,000 Year: 4.25% |
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Site Name:** Land lying to the North-East of Factory Road, Burwell, Cambridge

**Parish:** Burwell CP

**Site Ref:** Site/05/02

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 501m - 2km from the site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

### 5. Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located on contaminated land

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
- On old gravel pit. Chemical site to south

#### 5b. Local road impact
- No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

Access to the site would be off Factory Road. Factory Road is very narrow at the point of the site access. Any increase in domestic or commercial vehicle usage will require the mitigation measures either in the form of road widening or passing bays. The road at this point is in poor condition and may require works to bring it up to a standard that will support the increase in traffic. Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

A Transport Statement (TS) will need to accompany the development proposals for this site. The applicant will need to contact CCC to determine the scope of the TS.

### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

#### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- The school is being expanded by 1FE or 210 places. The scheme will complete in 2017. The school is being expanded in anticipation of a 350 unit development being promoted by CCC some additional development could also be accommodated.

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- The school is being expanded to 10 FE - 1500 places 11-16. This is to address the forecast demand for places and makes no allowance for any further housing development. The pupils are already in the primary feeder schools for Bottisham VC. The VC will NOT expand beyond 10FE even if the site allows it.

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 500m of site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Site Name:** Land lying to the North-East of Factory Road, Burwell, Cambridge

**Parish:** Burwell CP

**Site Ref:** Site/05/02

### 7d. Agricultural land classification

- All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

### 7e. Public Rights of Way

- E – No PRoW connection opportunities

### 7f. PROW comments

#### 7f.(i) Conservation Area

- CA within 1.01km – 2km of site

#### 7f.(ii). Listed building

- LB within 1.01km – 2km of site

#### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

- SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site

#### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

- Archaeological assets within 500.1 – 1000m of site

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

**ECDC:** No heritage impact

**CCC:** On the skirtland fen edge of Burwell where late prehistoric and Roman fen deposits cover earlier prehistoric former dry land surfaces. A Bronze Age flanged axe was found 580m NW. Neolithic flint tools found to the S (MCB7823). Clunch quarries are known 150m to the N (MCB17720). The plot is within the site of Burwell Brick works and N of the Chemical Manure Works. A planning condition is advised.

### 7h. Visual Impact

- Some improvement to landscape/townscape or key views

**Justification for score:**

- Any development on site would improve its appearance.

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

- No TPO within 15m of the site

### Parish Council support and rank

**Does Parish Council support this site?**

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council's view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Site promoter objects to rejection of site and wishes site to be reconsidered, as they feel site is suitable for more beneficial use than the current permitted use, and has sought pre-application advice (PREAPP/00091/16).
- Site previously used for open storage. Site promoter suggests neighbouring residents would prefer alternative uses, and seeks a residential or commercial scheme.
- Site promoter recognises that there could be some reliance on the car in this location, but suggests this would not conflict with national policy.
- Reconsider site 05/02 as location for housing due to lack of 5 year land supply.
Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Rejected**

Date and time of site visit: 26/7/2016 at 3:30pm

Site Information

- **Site Type:** New site submission (Form B)
- **Site Address:** Land at Ness Road, Burwell
- **Settlement:** Burwell
- **LP15 Allocation Ref:**
- **Planning Perm. Ref:**
- **Site Description:** Site split into two parcels of land. The eastern parcel fronts Ness Road on its eastern edge and is situated to the rear of residential properties on Toyse Close. Western parcel is located to the rear of residential properties on Toyse Lane to the south and Chestnut rise to the west.
- **Brown/Greenfield:** Greenfield
- **Known Constraints:** No known constraints.
- **Current Use:** Agriculture
- **Proposed Use:** Housing
- **Site Area Net (ha):** 5.18
- **Site Area Gross (ha):** 6.9
- **Indicative no. of dwellings:**
  - a) Submitted / estimated: 150
  - b) Recommended: 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

- **Large Village**

1b. Site Availability

- Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

2a. Flood zone

- >50% of site area in Zone 1

2b. Surface Water flood risk

- Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Main findings and recommendations:

The site consists of two land parcels. Vehicular access to the western parcel is not achievable due to insurmountable highway safety issues and therefore this land parcel should be rejected. The parish council does not support the site. Other more suitable sites are available in the village.
Site Name: Land at Ness Road, Burwell

Parish: Burwell CP

Site Ref: Site/05/05

Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land | Site within 250m of contaminated land |
5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment |

5b. Local road impact | Insurmountable safety issues that cannot be secured in accordance with CIL regulations |
5c. Strategic Road Network impact |
5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment |

EAST SITE
Access to the site would be off Ness Road - Scoring CAT A
Potential need for speed limit to be re-located in order to reduce speeds low enough to achieve required visibility
Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

WEST SITE
Safe access of Toyse Lane is not possible therefore this site has insurmountable safe issues - Scoring CAT E

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Statement, based on 60 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. In total proposals for Fordham amount to some 1400 units. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of their proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Fordham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Fordham the cumulative impact could be significant, especially on A142 junctions and the A142/A14 junction.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) |
6b. Proximity to medical services | Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m) |
6c. Proximity to shops | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) |
6d. Proximity to Primary School | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) |
6e. Proximity to Secondary School | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) |
6f.(i) Available primary school capacity | No spare places but room for expansion |
6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity | Limited capacity |
6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment |
6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment |

6h. Proximity to employment sites | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) |
### Site Name: Land at Ness Road, Burwell

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Parish:** Burwell CP

**Site Ref:** Site/05/05

### 7. Environmental impact

| 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites | CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site | B |
| 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment | | |
| 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers | | |
| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower | D |
| 7e. Public Rights of Way | D – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoWs outside the site boundary | D |
| 7f.(i) Conservation Area | CA within 500m of site | D |
| 7f.(ii). Listed building | LB within 500m of site | D |
| 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument | SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site | B |
| 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset | Archaeological assets within 500m of site | D |
| 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments | | |
| ECDC: Minimal heritage impact | | |
| CCC: We have commented on this for 14/00692/OUM (Toyse Lane Ness Road, Land north of 17-45 & 111). Requires pre-determination field works to enable evidence base to be supplied with any planning application. MCB18178 ring ditch of barrow recorded 150m to NW on HER. Pre-app advice given for western site of these two (Chesnut Rise, land off) land parcels together as Site 05/05. We advised a condition for that, but together a comprehensive geophysical survey and field work will be requied in advance of masterplan work. | | |
| 7h. Visual Impact | Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive | D |
| Justification for score: | Loss of agricultural land and open countryside. | |

### Parish Council support and rank

| Does Parish Council support this site? | No |
| Form E - Parish Council site ranking: | Fifth or more |
| Form G - Parish Council’s view: | |

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

Should be reconsidered as it is in sustainable location and well linked to the village.
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Parish: Burwell CP
Site Name: Land at 56 Low Road
Site Ref: Site/05/07

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected
Date and time of site visit: 16/05/2017 at 3:00pm
Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
Development of the site would likely result in adverse harm to the historic built character of the village. The site would not complement the built form, and could result in harm to the setting of listed buildings and the conservation area. There are concerns regarding the suitability of Low Road as a principal vehicular access; Low road is very narrow and is constrained by historic buildings and structures.

Site Information

Site Type: FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17
Site Address: 56 Low Road, Burwell, CB25 0EJ
Settlement: Burwell
LP15 Allocation Ref:
Programme: Planning Permit Ref:
Site Description: The site is located to the west of Low Road, Burwell and to the south of the farmstead. Access to this site could be achieved directly from Low Road, either as a combined access with the farmstead site or as a separate access directly onto Low Road. The number of dwellings which could be achieved is 30 dwellings. The landowner controls land to the west, which whilst not being promoted for development could be used for green infrastructure, community woodland or to reinforce the landscape setting of Burwell.
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: Submission indicates that site has capacity for 30 dwellings.
**Net site area estimated**
Current Use: Agriculture
Proposed Use: Housing
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 30 b) Recommended 0

Site Area Net (ha): 0.88
Site Area Gross (ha): 1.03

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Large Village
1b. Site Availability Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone >50% of site area in Zone 1
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**  
Site Name: **Land at 56 Low Road**  
Parish: **Burwell CP**  
Site Ref: **Site/05/07**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2b. Surface Water flood risk**  
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA  

| Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 Year</th>
<th>100 Year</th>
<th>1,000 Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.97%</td>
<td>1.91%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation**  
Site does not intersect Inner Zone

**4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites**  
501m - 2km from the site

**4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment**

**Minor Criteria**

**5. Site Suitability**

**5a. Proximity to contaminated land**  
Site within 50m of contaminated land

**5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment**

Unknown filled ground 30m to NW

**5b. Local road impact**  
No objections with minor mitigation measures

**5c. Strategic Road Network impact**

**5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**  
Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

**6. Access to services**

**6a. Proximity to public transport**  
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

**6b. Proximity to medical services**  
Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

**6c. Proximity to shops**  
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

**6d. Proximity to Primary School**  
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

**6e. Proximity to Secondary School**  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

**6f.(i) Available primary school capacity**  
Spare capacity in every year

**6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity**  
Limited capacity

**6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**

The two sites proposed take overall development levels in Burwell to around 650 units. Future catchment forecasts and the 1FE extension of the school to provide 3FE or 630 places will remain sufficient to provide for the higher level of development now proposed. However, the CCC has forward funded an expansion of this size in anticipation of housing development and will be seeking contributions from all developments towards the capital cost.

**6f.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**

Bottisham VC is in the process of being expanded from 7FE to 10FE an additional 450 places 11-16. Future catchment forecasts indicate that there will be some limited capacity available at the school to accommodate growth. In addition, there are plans for a new secondary school to the east of Cambridge to serve that areas development needs. The school will be in part of Bottisham VC current catchment area. If pupils in this area are served by the new school that will free up further capacity to accommodate the growth proposed within the Local Plan and the sites identified in this second round.

**6h. Proximity to employment sites**  
Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

**7. Environmental impact**

**7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**  
CWS within 501m – 1km of site

**7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**
### Site Ref: Site/05/07
#### Site Name: Land at 56 Low Road

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Parish:** Burwell CP

| 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers |  
|-------------------------------|---|
| 7d. Agricultural land classification | Site is not located on agricultural land |
| 7e. Public Rights of Way | E – No PRoW connection opportunities |

**7e.(i) PROW comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>CA within 500m of site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 500.1 – 1000m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7g. Heritage / archaeology comments**

ECDC - Listed building 50m to the north, potential impact of setting dependant on built form/number/etc

HE - Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary there are a couple of grade II listed buildings close to the site. The site wraps around Poplars Farmhouse to the south east and Newnham Farmhouse lies to the north of the site. Burwell North Street Conservation Area also lies to the north of the site. Any development of the site therefore has the potential to impact upon these heritage assets. In particular, the development is likely to have a significant impact upon Poplar’s Farmhouse and its setting within the rural landscape and alter the relationship of the building with the land it worked. We would suggest that the site should more appropriately be limited to the northern portion which is currently developed and the eastern portion adjacent to Low Road, leaving the land to the rear of the farmouse open and so securing the relationship between the farmouse and the agricultural land. In any event, it is important that any development of this site will need to preserve the listed buildings and their settings conserve and where opportunities arise enhance the conservation area. Should the site be allocated, these requirements should be included in the policy and supporting text of the Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7h. Visual Impact</th>
<th>Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Justification for score:**

**Additional criterion 7i. TPOs**

No TPO within 15m of the site

**Parish Council support and rank**

Does Parish Council support this site?  No

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council’s view: (c) not add this site to the Local Plan

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**

Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:**

16/05/2017 at 2:35pm

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

Main findings and recommendations:

The site does not relate well to the existing built area of Burwell village, and is some distance from village amenities. The site extends some distance into the open countryside and would likely be visually intrusive, resulting in harm to the landscape.

---

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17</th>
<th>ID:</th>
<th>385</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Newstead Farm, Swaffham Road, Burwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Burwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>There are no known constraints to development and the southern part of the site falls within the development envelope of Burwell with the remaining representing arable farmland. The number of dwellings which could be achieved is up 210 dwellings, however, with the need to provide a landscape offset and biodiversity enhancements to Paula’s Swamp this figure may be lower.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Submission indicates site could accommodate up to 210 dwellings. <strong>Net site area estimated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 210</td>
<td>b) Recommended 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

Large Village

1b. Site Availability

Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

>50% of site area in Zone 1

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1:</th>
<th>100.00%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2:</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a:</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b:</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))
Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
Within 100m of former factory site (05/06) to East which is being remediated for housing use

5b. Local road impact
No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

6c. Proximity to shops
Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
Spare capacity in every year

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
Limited capacity

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
The two sites proposed take overall development levels in Burwell to around 650 units. Future catchment forecasts and the 1FE extension of the school to provide 3FE or 630 places will remain sufficient to provide for the higher level of development now proposed. However, the CCC has forward funded an expansion of this size in anticipation of housing development and will be seeking contributions from all developments towards the capital cost.

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
Bottisham VC is in the process of being expanded from 7FE to 10FE an additional 450 places 11-16. Future catchment forecasts indicate that there will be some limited capacity available at the school to accommodate growth. In addition, there are plans for a new secondary school to the east of Cambridge to serve that areas development needs. The school will be in part of Bottisham VC current catchment area. If pupils in this area are served by the new school that will free up further capacity to accommodate the growth proposed within the Local Plan and the sites identified in this second round.

6h. Proximity to employment sites
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
CWS located within site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land to the north of Swaffham Road / Newstead Farm  
**Parish:** Burwell CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/05/08

| 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers |  
| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower | D |  
| 7e. Public Rights of Way | E – No PRoW connection opportunities | E |  
| 7e.(i) PROW comments |  
| 7f.(i) Conservation Area | CA within 500m of site | D |  
| 7f.(ii). Listed building | LB within 500m of site | D |  
| 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument | SAM within 500m of site | D |  
| 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset |  
| 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments |  
| ECDC - Conservation Area to the northeast but sufficient distance involved to have limited impact |  
| HE - Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, there are two scheduled monuments (Devil’s Ditch and a Roman Villa) to the south west of the site and a scheduled monument, Burwell Castle, and Burwell Conservation Area to the north east. Development of this site has the potential to impact upon the setting these historic assets. Any development of this site will need to protect and enhance the scheduled monuments and conservation area their settings. If the site is allocated, these requirements should be included in policy and the supporting text of the Plan. The proposed site extends significantly into the countryside and would inevitably alter the character of the settlement at this approach to the village. |  
| 7h. Visual Impact | Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive | D |  
| Justification for score: |  
| Additional criterion 7i. TPOs | No TPO within 15m of the site | A |  

**Parish Council support and rank**

| Does Parish Council support this site? | No |  
| Form E - Parish Council site ranking: |  
| Form G - Parish Council's view: | (c) not add this site to the Local Plan |  

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**

Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:**

16/05/2017 at 2:20 pm

**Supersedes site submission(s)**

Main findings and recommendations:

The submission proposed increasing the site area of draft site allocation BUR.H1 (see Site/05/04) eastward to increase the scale of development and inclusion of sporting facilities. This extended site boundary encroaches into the open countryside and would likely be visually intrusive, causing harm to the landscape. The proposal was not supported by the parish council, therefore the increased community benefit of the sports facility is questionable. A high pressure pipeline crosses the site and advice from the HSE should be sought.

---

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17</th>
<th>ID: 386</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Newmarket Road, Burwell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Burwell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Increase of draft allocation (BUR.H1) site area to provide 420 dwellings and 5ha of land for Sports Hub, and extension to foot/cycle path.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>This site is an amended proposal for FDLP draft site allocation BUR.H1. Submission indicates site could deliver 420 dwellings. <strong>Net site area estimated</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td>Housing and Sports Hub (recreation/leisure)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>20.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>34.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 420</td>
<td>b) Recommended 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

| Large Village | B |

1b. Site Availability

| Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22) | A |

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

- 1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
- 1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

| >50% of site area in Zone 1 | A |

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

- Flood Zone 1: 100.00%
- Flood Zone 2: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk

| Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr)) | A |

---

**Date and time of site visit:**

16/05/2017 at 2:20 pm

**Supersedes site submission(s)**

Main findings and recommendations:

The submission proposed increasing the site area of draft site allocation BUR.H1 (see Site/05/04) eastward to increase the scale of development and inclusion of sporting facilities. This extended site boundary encroaches into the open countryside and would likely be visually intrusive, causing harm to the landscape. The proposal was not supported by the parish council, therefore the increased community benefit of the sports facility is questionable. A high pressure pipeline crosses the site and advice from the HSE should be sought.
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Land off Newmarket Road
Parish: Burwell CP
Site Ref: Site/05/09

3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
   Site intersects Inner Zone

4a. Proximity to internationally /
nationally important wildlife sites
   501m - 2km from the site

4b. European and nationally important
wildlife sites - professional assessment

Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
   Site within 50m of contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
   Small areas of filled ground to East

5b. Local road impact
   No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL
   regulations

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
   Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and
   junction geometry

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
   Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
   Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6c. Proximity to shops
   Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
   Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
   Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
   Spare capacity in every year

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
   Limited capacity

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
   This site was included in the FDLP but for 350 homes. The impact of this development has been considered
   in our previous response to Site/05/08 but for the additional 70.

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
   Bottisham VC is in the process of being expanded from 7FE to 10FE an additional 450 places 11-16.
   Future catchment forecasts indicate that there will be some limited capacity available at the school to
   accommodate growth. In addition, there are plans for a new secondary school to the east of Cambridge
   to serve that areas development needs. The school will be in part of Bottisham VC current catchment area.
   If pupils in this area are served by the new school that will free up further capacity to accommodate the
   growth proposed within the Local Plan and the sites identified in this second round.

6h. Proximity to employment sites
   Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
   CWS within 501m – 1km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Land off Newmarket Road
Parish: Burwell CP
Site Ref: Site/05/09

7d. Agricultural land classification
All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower
D

7e. Public Rights of Way
E – No PRoW connection opportunities
E

7f.(i) Conservation Area
CA within 500m of site
D

7f.(ii) Listed building
LB within 500m of site
D

7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
SAM within 500.1 – 1000m of site
C

7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
ECDC - Listed building to the east, development should consider the setting of this building and preserve or enhance the building and its setting

HE - Much of this site is currently allocated in the current draft of the Local Plan. However, this proposal extends the site to the east, further into the countryside and beyond the current line of built development on the opposite site of Newmarket Road, which would seem the most appropriate limit to development. We would therefore suggest that the site is limited to that shown in the current Plan. Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, there is a grade II listed Mill to the west of the site. Development of this site has the potential to impact upon the setting this listed building. Any development of this site will need to protect and enhance the listed buildings and its settings. These requirements should be included in the policy and supporting text of the Plan.

7h. Visual Impact
Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive
D

Justification for score:

Additional criterion 7l. TPOs
TPO tree within 15m of the site
B

Parish Council support and rank
Does Parish Council support this site? No

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council’s view: (c) not add this site to the Local Plan

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received
Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Preferred site

**Date and time of site visit:**

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

This site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation with extant planning permission for housing development. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process. The allocation should therefore be retained.

---

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Local Plan 2015 allocated site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Land between 199 and 209 High Street, Cheveley, NEWMARKET, CB8 9DG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Cheveley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>CHV2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td>13/01139/FUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Allocated site with planning permission at Land between 199 and 209 High Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

- Medium Village

1b. Site Availability

- A

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

- >50% of site area in Zone 1

| Flood Zone 1: | 100.00% | Flood Zone 2: | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3a: | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3b: | 0.00% |

2b. Surface Water flood risk

- Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))

| 30 Year: | 0.00% | 100 Year: | 0.00% | 1,000 Year: | 0.00% |
**Current Status:** Site Allocation CHV.H1  
**Parish:** Cheveley CP  
**Site Name:** Allocated site with planning permission at Land between 199 and 209 High Street  
**Site Ref:** Site/06/02

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

### 4. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- More than 5km from site

### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

### Minor Criteria

**5. Site Suitability**

5a. Proximity to contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact
- No objections with minor mitigation measures

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- Access off High Street  
  Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry  
  This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places, no room for expansion

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Limited capacity

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- Very constrained site in village conservation area

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

### 7. Environmental Impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification
- All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

7e. Public Rights of Way
- E – No PRoW connection opportunities

7e.(i) PROW comments
### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- **CHV.H1** - The site is south of Cheveley Conservation Area and is near to a number of grade II listed buildings. Development of this site will need to conserve and enhance the conservation area and listed buildings and their settings.
**Current Status:** Site Allocation CHV.H2  
**Parish:** Cheveley CP  
**Site Name:** Land at Brook Stud  
**Site Ref:** Site/06/04

### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

| Overall recommendation from site assessment: | Preferred site |
| Date and time of site visit: | 29/06/2017 at 11:45am |
| Supersedes site submission(s): | |
| **Main findings and recommendations:** | Site offers a suitable location for housing development, as an extension to adjacent Site/06/02. Site access should be achieved via site Site/06/02. |

### Site Information

| Site Type: | FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17 |
| Site Address: | Brook Stud, High Street, Cheveley |
| Settlement: | Cheveley |
| LP15 Allocation Ref: |  | Planning Perm. Ref: |
| Site Description: | The site is a green-field site located immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary. The land comprises a series of paddocks of varying size bounded by mature trees and hedgerows. The site adjoins the housing development currently under construction (at land between 199 and 209 High Street). |
| Brown/Greenfield: | Greenfield |
| Known Constraints: | Site submission indicates site could deliver 10 dwellings. **Net site area estimated** |
| Current Use: | Agriculture |
| Current Use info: | Paddocks |
| Proposed Use: | Housing |
| Proposed Use info: | |
| Site Area Net (ha): | 1.02 |
| Site Area Gross (ha): | 1.2 |
| Indicative no. of dwellings: | a) Submitted / estimated 10 | b) Recommended 10 |

### Major Criteria

| 1a. Settlement Hierarchy | Medium Village |
| 1b. Site Availability | Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22) |
| 1c. Minerals and Waste assessment | |
| 1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies | |
| 1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations | |
| 2a. Flood zone | >50% of site area in Zone 1 |
| **Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):** | | |
| Flood Zone 1: | 100.00% | Flood Zone 2: | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3a: | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3b: | 0.00% |
| 2b. Surface Water flood risk | Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr)) |
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

**5a. Proximity to contaminated land**
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

**5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment**

**5b. Local road impact**
- Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

**5c. Strategic Road Network impact**

**5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**
- Does not appear to have access to highways frontage OR shown access to highway. Potential problems to access the highway.
- Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

#### 6. Access to services

**6a. Proximity to public transport**
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

**6b. Proximity to medical services**
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

**6c. Proximity to shops**
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

**6d. Proximity to Primary School**
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

**6e. Proximity to Secondary School**
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

**6f.(i) Available primary school capacity**
- No spare places, no room for expansion

**6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity**
- Limited capacity

**6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**
- The catchment forecasts suggest that the scale of development proposed across the two sites (35) can be accommodated in this village school

**6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**
- Bottisham VC is in the process of being expanded from 7FE to 10FE an additional 450 places 11-16. Future catchment forecasts indicate that there will be some limited capacity available at the school to accommodate growth. In addition, there are plans for a new secondary school to the east of Cambridge to serve that areas development needs. The school will be in part of Bottisham VC current catchment area. If pupils in this area are served by the new school that will free up further capacity to accommodate the growth proposed within the Local Plan and the sites identified in this second round.

**6h. Proximity to employment sites**
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 7. Environmental impact

**7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**
- CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

**7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**

**7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers**
**Current Status:** Site Allocation CHV.H2  
**Site Name:** Land at Brook Stud  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref:</th>
<th>Site/06/04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parish:</td>
<td>Cheveley CP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7d. Agricultural land classification
- All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

### 7e. Public Rights of Way
- C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary

### 7e.(I) PROW comments
- FP 2 runs along the eastern boundary of the site. Provide a link from the site to this route

### 7f.(I) Conservation Area
- CA within 500m of site

### 7f.(II) Listed building
- LB within 500m of site

### 7f.(III) Scheduled Ancient Monument
- SAM within 500.1 – 1000m of site

### 7f.(IV) Archaeological asset

### 7f. Heritage / archaeology comments
- Conservation area and a number of listed buildings to the north and one to the south, development could potentially have an impact on the setting of the designated heritage assets.

### 7g. Visual impact
- Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive

### Justification for score:

### Additional criterion 7I TPOs
- TPO tree on site

## Parish Council support and rank

| Does Parish Council support this site? | No |

### Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

### Form G - Parish Council's view:
- (c) not add this site to the Local Plan

## FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
- This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**

Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:**

---

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

---

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The capacity of this existing allocated site is below the minimum threshold (i.e. site capacity is fewer than 10 units). It is therefore proposed the allocation be removed, but that the site remain in the development envelope. In principle, development is generally acceptable within the Development Envelope, thereby enabling the site to come forward for development through the planning application process.

---

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>Local Plan 2015 allocated site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID:</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land rear of Star and Garter Lane, Cheveley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Cheveley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>CHV1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Existing housing allocation, land rear of Star and Garter Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 7 b) Recommended 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy: Medium Village

1b. Site Availability:  

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment:  

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies:  

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations:  

2a. Flood zone: >50% of site area in Zone 1

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

| Flood Zone 1: | 100.00% |
| Flood Zone 2: | 0.00% |
| Flood Zone 3a: | 0.00% |
| Flood Zone 3b: | 0.00% |

2b. Surface Water flood risk: Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMSW):**

| 30 Year: | 0.00% |
| 100 Year: | 0.00% |
| 1,000 Year: | 0.00% |
**Site Name:** Existing housing allocation, land rear of Star and Garter Lane  
**Parish:** Cheveley CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/06/01  

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</th>
<th>Site located more than 250m from contaminated land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5b. Local road impact</th>
<th>Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment | Does not abut adopted highway  
Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry  
This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry |

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6a. Proximity to public transport</th>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>No spare places, no room for expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) |

#### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</th>
<th>CWS within 501m – 1km of site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>E – No PRoW connection opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Name: Existing housing allocation, land rear of Star and Garter Lane

Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

ECDC: Already allocated - same issues as before

CCC: Designated SCHEDULED MONUMENT of Cheveley Castle 1015199 (14th-20thC) 550m to NW and Registered Park and Garden of Cheveley Park (MCB14458). Medieval church of Saint Mary and the Holy Host (MCB12286) is 250m S, Medieval village remains newly found along the High Street (eg MCB20926) 640m S. A planning condition would ne required for any planning consent awarded. NGR 568460 261110.

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**

Parish: **Cheveley CP**

Site Name: **Land rear of 15-25 High Street**

**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:** 29/06/2017 at 10:32am

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**
The site should be rejected as it has a poor relationship to the built form. Development of the site would likely be visually intrusive to the open countryside. Access to the site may be constrained.

**Site Information**

- **Site Type:** FDLP Additional Site Suggest Jan-Feb’17
- **Site Address:** 15-25 High Street, Cheveley, Newmarket
- **Settlement:** Cheveley
- **LP15 Allocation Ref:**
- **Planning Perm. Ref:**
- **Site Description:** Site in agricultural use, proposed for housing development. Access to the site would be achieved through demolition of 25 High Street.
- **Brown/Greenfield:** Greenfield
- **Known Constraints:** Submission indicates site could deliver ccc. 25 dwellings.
- **Current Use:** Agriculture
- **Proposed Use:** Housing
- **Current Use info:**
- **Proposed Use info:**
- **Site Area Net (ha):** 0.94
- **Site Area Gross (ha):** 1.1
- **Indicative no. of dwellings:**
  - a) Submitted / estimated: 25
  - b) Recommended: 0

**Major Criteria**

1. **Settlement Hierarchy**
   - Medium Village

2. **Site Availability**

3. **Minerals and Waste assessment**

4. **Flood zone**
   - Percentage (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
     - **Flood Zone 1:** 100.00%
     - **Flood Zone 2:** 0.00%
     - **Flood Zone 3a:** 0.00%
     - **Flood Zone 3b:** 0.00%

5. **Surface Water flood risk**
   - Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))
   - Percentage (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

Site Name: Land rear of 15-25 High Street

Parish: Cheveley CP

Site Ref: Site/06/03

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact
- No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

#### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places, no room for expansion

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Limited capacity

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- Bottisham VC is in the process of being expanded from 7FE to 10FE an additional 450 places 11-16. Future catchment forecasts indicate that there will be some limited capacity available at the school to accommodate growth. In addition, there are plans for a new secondary school to the east of Cambridge to serve that areas development needs. The school will be in part of Bottisham VC current catchment area. If pupils in this area are served by the new school that will free up further capacity to accommodate the growth proposed within the Local Plan and the sites identified in this second round.

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

#### 7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification
- All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower
**Site Name:** Land rear of 15-25 High Street  
**Parish:** Cheveley CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/06/03

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Parish Council support and rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(c) not add this site to the Local Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Form G - Parish Council's view:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(c) not add this site to the Local Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:** 18/08/2016 at 11:45am

**Supersedes site submission(s)**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is located at the boundary of Chippenham parish, with the nearest settlement being Red Lodge in Suffolk. Whilst there is some existing development located north east of the site, the site is located some distance from, and is physically separate from, the main built area of Red Lodge. Access to services and facilities is likely to be poor. Therefore the site should be rejected.

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
<th>ID:</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land at Grange Farm, Red Lodge, Suffolk IP28 8LE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Chippenham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Land at Grange Farm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Good access to B1085. Constrains not known at present.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated</td>
<td>b) Recommended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a. Settlement Hierarchy</th>
<th>Small Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b. Site Availability</td>
<td>Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Minerals and Waste assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This site lies partly within the Waste Consultation Area for the allocation at The Carrops, Red Lodge, and the existing Kennett Landfill site which is designated by Policy W8BB of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012). The Carrops, Red Lodge site is an existing waste transfer station and is allocated for additional waste management uses which may include materials recovery facility; in vessel composting; inert waste recycling and new waste technologies. The Kennett Landfill site is an active landfill site. The overarching policy for this designation is Policy CS30 of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011). This policy seeks to safeguard waste management facilities which make a significant contribution to managing Cambridgeshire’s waste; and the policy states that development will only be permitted where it is demonstrated that this will not prejudice existing or future planned waste management operations. In addition the site falls in a Mineral Consultation Area for Kennett (Policy M9J) designated under the adopted Site Specific Plan (2012). The overarching policy in the adopted Core Strategy is CS27 which states that development will only be permitted in this area when it has been demonstrated that it will not prejudice the, in this case, existing mineral extraction. Consideration should be given to these policies prior to allocation in the interests of deliverability.

**1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies**
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Site Name:** Land at Grange Farm, Red Lodge, Suffolk IP28 8LE

**Parish:** Chippenham CP

**Site Ref:** Site/07/01

---

### 1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

W8B; M9J

---

### 2a. Flood zone

>50% of site area in Zone 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1:</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2:</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a:</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81.20%</td>
<td>4.24%</td>
<td>4.02%</td>
<td>10.54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### 2b. Surface Water flood risk

Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Year:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 Year:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation

Site does not intersect Inner Zone

---

### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites

2.01km - 5km from the site

---

### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

---

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

**5a. Proximity to contaminated land**

Site within 50m of contaminated land

**5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment**

Old pit or quarry to E

---

**5b. Local road impact**

No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations

---

**5c. Strategic Road Network impact**

---

**5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**

Access off Turn Pike Road

Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on 400 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines and demonstrate how the site can be made accessible on foot, by cycle and by public transport together with identifying any remaining off-site highway implications and required mitigation. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area.

---

#### 6. Access to services

**6a. Proximity to public transport**

Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

**6b. Proximity to medical services**

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

**6c. Proximity to shops**

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

**6d. Proximity to Primary School**

Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

**6e. Proximity to Secondary School**

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

**6f.(i) Available primary school capacity**

No spare places, no room for expansion

---

**6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity**

Limited capacity

---

**6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**

Extremely restricted site with no further development potential

---

**6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.
**Site Name:** Land at Grange Farm, Red Lodge, Suffolk IP28 8LE

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Parish:** Chippenham CP

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

CWS located within site [E]

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

FP9 which runs within the site provides a link to Preserve this link and in view of the size of the site provide a network of links for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians.

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

All or part of site intersected by Grade 4 or 5 [B]

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification

All or part of site intersected by Grade 4 or 5 [B]

#### 7e. Public Rights of Way

C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary

#### 7f. Proximity to employment sites

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) [E]

#### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

**ECDC:** No heritage impact

**CCC:** Site adjacent to River Kennett. MCB18459 Medieval site of Chippenham Grange. Earthwork of unknown mound in field opposite, 170m to NW (MCB9090). Neolithic and Bronze Age flint scatters and fieldwalking finds form Kennet Hall Farm, roughly 200m to south, along with multi-period remains found through evaluation exercises (eg MCB15728 and numerous other HER refs). At further distance, flint scatter evidence was recorded in advance of reservoir creation on land at Badlingham Manor (MCB19101). A planning condition would be required for any planning consent granted. NGR 569390 269400

#### 7h. Visual Impact

Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views [C]

### Justification for score:

#### 7i. Conservation Area

CA more than 2km from site [A]

#### 7ii. Listed building

LB within 500.1 – 1000m of site [C]

#### 7iii. Scheduled Ancient Monument

SAM within 500.1 – 1000m of site [C]

#### 7iv. Archaeological asset

Archaeological assets on-site [E]

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

No TPO within 15m of the site [A]

### Parish Council support and rank

**Does Parish Council support this site?** No

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:** First

**Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Land off Scotland End, Chippenham
Parish: Chippenham CP
Site Ref: Site/07/02

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected
Date and time of site visit: 9/8/2016 at 2:40pm
Supersedes site submission(s): No

Main findings and recommendations:
Development would potentially impact on the setting of the conservation area; narrow site with poor opportunity to create quality layout; some access concerns; and, site is not supported by Parish Council.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  ID: 44
Site Address: Land off Scotland End, Chippenham, Ely, Cambridgeshire, CB7 5PN
Settlement: Chippenham
LP15 Allocation Ref: Site Assessment Evidence Report 36/17 Planning Perm. Ref: 
Site Description: Agricultural land off Scotland End
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: Agent indicates site is located in Flood Zone 1 - low risk. Access to Scotland End exists (no ransom strip).
Current Use: Agriculture  Proposed Use: Housing
Current Use info:
Proposed Use info:
Site Area Net (ha): 0.45  Site Area Gross (ha): 0.524
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 16  b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  Small Village  D
1b. Site Availability  Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)  A
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment
   This site lies within the Mineral Safeguarding Area for Sand and Gravel, designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Core Strategy and shown on Proposals Map C (2011). The overarching policy is CS26 Mineral Safeguarding Areas which sets out criteria which must be met in order for development to be permitted. However, in this instance the proposed site is in close proximity to existing development and the mineral resource is an isolated area. It is unlikely to be an economic resource therefore no objections would be raised in this context to this site being allocated.
   1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies  CS26
   1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone  >50% of site area in Zone 1  A
   Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
   Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%
2b. Surface Water flood risk  Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))  A
**Minor Criteria**

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land  | Site located more than 250m from contaminated land [A]

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact  | Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations [D]

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

Does not appear to have access to highways frontage OR shown access to highway
Potential problems to access the highway
Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport  | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) [A]

6b. Proximity to medical services  | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) [E]

6c. Proximity to shops  | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) [E]

6d. Proximity to Primary School  | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) [E]

6e. Proximity to Secondary School  | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) [E]

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity  | Spare capacity in some years [B]

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity  | Limited capacity [C]

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

The school is being expanded in size from 1FE to 2FE (210 places to 420 places) This is in part to meet an existing need but also in anticipation of a certain level of further housing development in the village

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites  | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) [E]

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites  | CWS within 500m of site [D]

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land off Scotland End, Chippenham  
**Parish:** Chippenham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/07/02

### 7d. Agricultural land classification
- All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower  
  - **Score:** C

### 7e. Public Rights of Way
- D – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoWs outside the site boundary  
  - **Score:** D

### 7e.(i) PROW comments

FP4 runs adjacent to the North West boundary of the site. Provide a link from FP4 to Scotland End.

### 7f.(i) Conservation Area
- Site is within CA  
  - **Score:** E

### 7f.(ii). Listed building
- LB within 500m of site  
  - **Score:** D

### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
- SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site  
  - **Score:** B

### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset
- Archaeological assets within 500m of site  
  - **Score:** D

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

*ECDC:* On boundary of conservation area and listed buildings nearby - consideration to setting needs to be given

*HE:* 07/02: affecting the setting of a conservation area

*CCC:* Designation: Registed Park and Garden of Chippenham Hall: NHLE 1000615, lies 250m S and the Park and Garden of Chippenham Lodge 480m to the SE: MCB19292. Saint Margaret’s Church lies 200m S (MCB9049). Bronze Age finds and Roman settlement remains are known from the field N of Chippenham Hall, 300m W of the proposal area (eg MCBs14766, 14708 13562), where cropmarks also occur (MCB10820). A planning condition would be required for any planning consent granted. NGR: 566300 270040

### 7h. Visual Impact
- Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views  
  - **Score:** C

**Justification for score:**

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
- No TPO within 15m of the site  
  - **Score:** A

## Parish Council support and rank

- **Does Parish Council support this site?** No
- **Form E - Parish Council site ranking:** Second
- **Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

## FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Site should be for reconsidered for allocation for housing.
## Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**

Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:**

09:35 25 July 2016

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

The site has designated village green status and should be rejected. Furthermore, development of the site would likely result in harm to the isle landscape setting and harm key views of Ely Cathedral and the fenland countryside.

## Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
<th>ID: 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land east of Main Street, Coveney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Coveney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Land east of Main Street, Coveney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>None known. Owner would consider including open space and other community benefits and housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Recommended 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Major Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a. Settlement Hierarchy</th>
<th>Small Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b. Site Availability</td>
<td>Available for devl in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Minerals and Waste assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2a. Flood zone

>50% of site area in Zone 1

#### Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

- Flood Zone 1: 100.00%
- Flood Zone 2: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

### 2b. Surface Water flood risk

Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))

#### Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMSW):

- 30 Year: 0.00%
- 100 Year: 0.00%
- 1,000 Year: 0.00%
**Site Name:** Land east of Main Street, Coveney

**Parish:** Coveney CP

**Site Ref:** Site/08/01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation</strong></td>
<td>Site does not intersect Inner Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites</strong></td>
<td>2.01km - 5km from the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site Suitability**

- **5a. Proximity to contaminated land**
  - Site within 250m of contaminated land
  - **B**

- **5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment**
  - unknown filled ground 150 to west
  - **B**

- **5b. Local road impact**
  - No objections with minor mitigation measures
  - **A**

- **5c. Strategic Road Network impact**

- **5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**
  - Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.
  - This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

**Access to services**

- **6a. Proximity to public transport**
  - Less than 5 min walk (<400m)
  - **A**

- **6b. Proximity to medical services**
  - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)
  - **E**

- **6c. Proximity to shops**
  - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)
  - **E**

- **6d. Proximity to Primary School**
  - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)
  - **E**

- **6e. Proximity to Secondary School**
  - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)
  - **E**

- **6f.(i) Available primary school capacity**
  - No spare places, no room for expansion
  - **E**

- **6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**
  - The site would accommodate another 15 pupils only using DfE recommended site area guidelines hence an E rather than a D classification

- **6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity**
  - Limited capacity
  - **C**

**Environmental impact**

- **7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**
  - CWS within 2.01km – 5km of site
  - **A**

- **7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**

- **7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers**

- **7d. Agricultural land classification**
  - All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower
  - **C**

- **7e. Public Rights of Way**
  - C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary
  - **C**

- **7f.(i) PROW comments**

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation
### Site Name:
Land east of Main Street, Coveney

### Current Status:
Rejected - not a site allocation

### Parish:
Coveney CP

### Site Ref:
Site/08/01

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>CA more than 2km from site</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td>Archaeological assets within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

ECDC: Listed building to the north and south - minimal impact on designated assets - care would need to be taken in regards to scale as very rural character and built form

CCC: Medieval moated site 450m NE (MCB1342), undated enclosure remains (MCB11316) 650m to E. Strip field boundaries and square enclosures to the E of the Manor Farm at the S end of Main Street and N of Short Lane, 200-400m the S and SW (MCB7119) A planning condition would be required for any planning consent granted. NGR 548890 282020

### 7h. Visual Impact

Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive | D |

### Justification for score:

Loss of key views from Main Street of Ely cathedral. Site enables clear views from isle over fen landscape.

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

---

### Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site? | No |

Form E - Parish Council site ranking: |

Form G - Parish Council's view: |

---

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

---
Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Rejected**

Date and time of site visit: 09:20 25 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site should be rejected as more than 50% of the site is located in Flood Zone 3a.

Site Information

- **Settlement Hierarchy:** Small Village
- **Site Address:** School Lane, Coveney
- **Settlement:** Coveney
- **LP15 Allocation Ref:** [ID: 10]
- **Planning Perm. Ref:**
- **Site Description:** Land off School Lane, Coveney
- **Brown/Greenfield:** Greenfield
- **Current Use:** Agriculture
- **Proposed Use:** Housing
- **Current Use info:**
- **Proposed Use info:**
- **Site Area Net (ha):** 1.36
- **Site Area Gross (ha):** 1.6032
- **Indicative no. of dwellings:**
  - a) Submitted / estimated: 49
  - b) Recommended: 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone 1</td>
<td>23.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 2</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3a</td>
<td>71.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3b</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year: 10.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Year: 14.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 Year: 16.18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Site Name:** Land off School Lane, Coveney

**Parish:** Coveney CP

**Site Ref:** Site/08/02

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

### Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):
- Yes

### Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):
- Yes

### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation

- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites

- 2.01km - 5km from the site

### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land

- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

### 5b. Local road impact

- No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

Access off School Lane/Green Drove
Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Statement based on 49 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area.

### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport

- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services

- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops

- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School

- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School

- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

- No spare places, no room for expansion

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

- Limited capacity

### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

The site would accommodate another 15 pupils only using DfE recommended site area guidelines hence an E rather than a D classification

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites

- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

- CWS within 2.01km – 5km of site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

### 7d. Agricultural land classification

- All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

### 7e. Public Rights of Way

- E – No PRoW connection opportunities
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Parish:** Coveney CP  
**Site Name:** Land off School Lane, Coveney  
**Site Ref:** Site/08/02

### 7f.(i) Conservation Area
- CA more than 2km from site  
- **Score:** A

### 7f.(ii). Listed building
- LB within 500m of site  
- **Score:** D

### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
- SAM more than 2km from site  
- **Score:** A

### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset
- Archaeological assets within 500m of site  
- **Score:** D

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
ECDC: Listed buildings to the northwest and southwest - minimal impact on designated assets - care would need to be taken in regards to scale as very rural character and built form.

CCC: Medieval moated site 370m NE (MCB1342), undated enclosure remains (MCB11316) 400m to NE. Strip field boundaries and square enclosures to the E of the Manor Farm at the S end of Main Street and N of Short Lane, 200-400m the S and SW (MCB7119) A planning condition would be required for any planning consent granted.  NGR 549180 281930

### 7h. Visual Impact
- Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive  
- **Score:** D

**Justification for score:**
Likely to cause harm - site is in open farmland, Would result in development encroaching from isle and out to the fenland below.

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
- No TPO within 15m of the site  
- **Score:** A

### Parish Council support and rank
**Does Parish Council support this site?** No

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received
Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment:  
Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:  
14:45 27/6/2017

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site provides a logical extension to Kettlefields with clear, defined boundaries and therefore relates well to Dullingham's built form. The site is in close proximity to the primary school.

Site Information

Site Type:  
FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17

Site Address:  
Kettlefields, Dullingham

Settlement:  
Dullingham

LP15 Allocation Ref:  

Planning Perm. Ref:  

Site Description:  
Agriculture site, proposed for housing development.

Brown/Greenfield:  
Greenfield

Known Constraints:  
**Submission does not indicate number of proposed dwellings. Dwelling figure is therefore calculated from site area and does not reflect site constraints or characteristics.**

**Net site area estimated**

Current Use:  
Agriculture

Proposed Use info:

Proposed Use:  
Housing

Indicative no. of dwellings:

a) Submitted / estimated  
17

b) Recommended  
15

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  
Medium Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone  
>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

- Flood Zone 1: 100.00%
- Flood Zone 2: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yrs))

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):  

**Site Name:**  
*Land at Kettlefields*

**Site Ref:**  
*Site/09/03*

**Parish:**  
*Dullingham CP*

**Current Status:**  
*Site Allocation DUL.H1*

### Minor Criteria

5. **Site Suitability**

5a. **Proximity to contaminated land**  
Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

5a.(i) **Contaminated land professional assessment**

5b. **Local road impact**  
No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

5c. **Strategic Road Network impact**

5d. **Transport impacts - professional assessment**  
Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

6. **Access to services**

6a. **Proximity to public transport**  
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. **Proximity to medical services**  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. **Proximity to shops**  
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6d. **Proximity to Primary School**  
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6e. **Proximity to Secondary School**  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) **Available primary school capacity**  
Spare capacity in some years

6f.(ii) **Available secondary school capacity**  
Limited capacity

6g.(i) **Primary education impacts - professional assessment**

6g.(ii) **Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**  
Bottisham VC is in the process of being expanded from 7FE to 10FE an additional 450 places 11-16. Future catchment forecasts indicate that there will be some limited capacity available at the school to accommodate growth. In addition, there are plans for a new secondary school to the east of Cambridge to serve that areas development needs. The school will be in part of Bottisham VC current catchment area. If pupils in this area are served by the new school that will free up further capacity to accommodate the growth proposed within the Local Plan and the sites identified in this second round.

6h. **Proximity to employment sites**  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

7. **Environmental impact**

7a. **Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**  
CWS within 501m – 1km of site

7b. **County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**

7c. **Groundwater PZ and aquifers**

7d. **Agricultural land classification**  
All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7e. Public Rights of Way</th>
<th>D – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoWs outside the site boundary</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7e.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP2 runs to the north of the site consider providing a link to this FP from the site - this would be subject to the agreement of the adjacent landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td>Conservation area to the south west, likely to have limited impact on designated heritage assets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
<td>Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification for score:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional criterion 7i. TPOs</td>
<td>No TPO within 15m of the site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parish Council support and rank

| Does Parish Council support this site? | Yes |
| Form E - Parish Council site ranking: |    |
| Form G - Parish Council’s view: | (a) add this site to the Local Plan, and keep existing preferred site(s)? |

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Parish: Dullingham CP
Site Name: Land south of Stetchworth Road, Dullingham
Site Ref: Site/09/01

Summary of Findings and Recommendations
Overall recommendation from site assessment:
Has merit

Date and time of site visit:
26/7/2016 at 11:00am

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site has some merit as it is an accessible site adjoining Dullingham village. However, as most development in this part of the village is located north of Stetchworth Road, development of the site could adversely impact upon the built form of the village. In addition, the site is not supported by the parish council.

Site Information
Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  ID: 11
Site Address: Land south of Stetchworth Road, Dullingham
Settlement: Dullingham
LP15 Allocation Ref:  Planning Perm. Ref: 
Site Description: Land south of Stetchworth Road, Dullingham
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: None known
Current Use: Agriculture  Proposed Use: Housing
Current Use info: Open space and community uses
Proposed Use info:
Site Area Net (ha): 2.81  Site Area Gross (ha): 3.75
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 50  b) Recommended

Major Criteria
1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Medium Village
1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 66.07%  Flood Zone 2: 6.43%  Flood Zone 3a: 27.51%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMifSW):
30 Year: 19.42%  100 Year: 3.67%  1,000 Year: 10.27%
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Site Name:** Land south of Stetchworth Road, Dullingham

| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No |

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 2.01km - 5km from the site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

#### 5. Site Suitability

- **5a. Proximity to contaminated land**
  - Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

#### 6. Access to services

- **6a. Proximity to public transport**
  - Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

- **6b. Proximity to medical services**
  - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

- **6c. Proximity to shops**
  - Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

- **6d. Proximity to Primary School**
  - Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

- **6e. Proximity to Secondary School**
  - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

- **6f. Available primary school capacity**
  - No spare places but room for expansion

#### 7. Environmental impact

- **7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**
  - CWS within 501m – 1km of site

#### 6g. Primary education impacts - professional assessment

- The site has the potential to add a further 70 places at the school. Using the standard pupil multiplier this would be the expected demand arising from a development of around 200 homes in the catchment area.

- **6f. Available secondary school capacity**
  - No spare places but room for expansion

#### 6g. Secondary education school capacity - professional assessment

- The school is being expanded to 10 FE - 1500 places 11-16. This is to address the forecast demand for places and makes no allowance for any further housing development. The pupils are already in the primary feeder schools for Bottisham VC. The VC will NOT expand beyond 10FE even if the site allows it.

- **6h. Proximity to employment sites**
  - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification
- All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land south of Stetchworth Road, Dullingham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7e. Public Rights of Way</th>
<th>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td>FP26 runs within the site on the north east side and connects the Stetchworth Rd to an extensive network of footpaths to the south of the site. Bridleway 13 meets the Stetchworth Rd opposite their north east corner of the site. Provide a link across the site from opposite BR13 to FP26.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii) Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td>Archaeological assets within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td>ECDC: Conservation area and listed buildings to the west - minimal impact on heritage assets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCC: Designation: Registered Park and Gardens of Dullingham House, NHLE 1000618, Early C18 pleasure grounds and deer park to the south of an early C18 country house, for which Humphry Repton produced a Red Book in 1802, the park being extended to the north in the C19. MCB1500 cropmark earthworks of the Moates/the Motts are 450m E of the proposal area. Requires pre-determination field works to enable evidence base to be supplied with any planning application.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
<td>Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification for score:</td>
<td>Development of the site would result in loss of open space but most of the natural features can be retained and included in the development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional criterion 7i. TPOs</td>
<td>No TPO within 15m of the site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td>Fifth or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council's view:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

• Land to the south of Stetchworth Road should be reconsidered as can provide affordable housing, open space and community uses, and fund other much needed local infrastructure. Suitable location and can be delivered in short time.
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Former highways depot, Brinkley Road, Dullingham
Parish: Dullingham CP
Site Ref: Site/09/02

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit: 2/8/2016 at 11:10am

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is physically separate from the main built area of the village and therefore access to village services and facilities is likely to be poor. The site is currently in employment use and, if developed, would result in a loss of employment land. Site is also below the allocation threshold, in any event. The site is therefore rejected.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B) ID: 45
Site Address: Former highways depot, Brinkley Road, Dullingham
Settlement: Dullingham
LP15 Allocation Ref: Planning Perm. Ref: 
Site Description: Former highways depot, Brinkley Road, Dullingham
Brown/Greenfield: Brownfield
Known Constraints: It would be possible for the County Council to provide land for a CLT on this plot or elsewhere in lieu of affordable housing. It may be possible to further extend the sports hub planned for Newmarket Rd.

Current Use: Employment Proposed Use: Housing
Current Use info: Proposed Use info:
Site Area Net (ha): 0.22 Site Area Gross (ha): 0.219
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 8 b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Medium Village
1b. Site Availability
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment
1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone >50% of site area in Zone 1
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00% Flood Zone 2: 0.00% Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):
### Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

**Site Name:** Former highways depot, Brinkley Road, Dullingham

**Parish:** Dullingham CP

**Site Ref:** Site/09/02

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 Year:</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
<th>100 Year:</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
<th>1,000 Year:</th>
<th>0.62%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land

Site located on contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

Former highways depot

5b. Local road impact

No objections with minor mitigation measures

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

Access off Brinkley Road

Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

#### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops

Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School

Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

No spare places but room for expansion

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

No spare places but room for expansion

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

The site has the potential to add a further 70 places at the school. Using the standard pupil multiplier this would be the expected demand arising from a development of around 200 homes in the catchment area.

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The school is being expanded to 10 FE - 1500 places 11-16. This is to address the forecast demand for places and makes no allowance for any further housing development. The pupils are already in the primary feeder schools for Bottisham VC. The VC will NOT expand beyond 10FE even if the site allows it.

6h. Proximity to employment sites

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Former highways depot, Brinkley Road, Dullingham  
**Parish:** Dullingham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/09/02

### 7e. Public Rights of Way
- E – No PRoW connection opportunities

### 7f. Conservation Area
- CA within 500m of site: D
- LB within 500m of site: D

### 7f. Listed building
- SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site: B

### 7f. Scheduled Ancient Monument
- Archaeological assets within 500m of site: D

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
- ECDC: Edge of conservation area & listed building to the south - potential to cause harm to setting of heritage assets.
- HE: 09/02: part of the site is within a conservation area and the rest affects the setting of a conservation area.
- CCC: Located to the immediate S of the Registered Park & Garden of Dullingham House NHLE 1000618. Previously advise for a condition to be placed on any planning consent for this scheme (Brinkley Road, the Depot).

### 7h. Visual Impact
- Some improvement to landscape/townscape or key views: B

### Justification for score:
Residential development on site will improve general appearance of the area but it will result in loss of employment land.

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
- TPO tree on site: C

### Parish Council support and rank
- Does Parish Council support this site? Yes
- Form E - Parish Council site ranking: Second
- Form G - Parish Council's view:

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received
Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Former highway depot, Brinkley Road should be reconsidered even though it may be a little detached from the main village envelope.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment:
- Has merit

Date and time of site visit:
- 27/06/2017 at 2:20pm

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is located close to Dullingham Station and seeks to maximise the opportunities for sustainable transport, and therefore has some merit. However, the site is located some distance from the village centre and local facilities, including the primary school. The site is located in the open countryside, and lacks defensible along the west and south of the site. Landscape impacts would therefore require careful consideration.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Station Road, Dullingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Dullingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Housing development to extend village north-westwards toward rail station, which could help facilitate the creation of a rural transport hub based around Dullingham railway station, thus facilitating a step-change in modal shift in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Submission indicates site could deliver circa. 150 dwellings, and that developable area is ‘less than 50%’ of total site area. Net area has therefore been assumed to be just under 50% of gross site area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
- Medium Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
- >50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
- Flood Zone 1: 80.42%
- Flood Zone 2: 2.45%
- Flood Zone 3a: 17.13%
- Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
- Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Date and time of site visit:
- 27/06/2017 at 2:20pm

Supersedes site submission(s)
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Land west of Station Road
Parish: Dullingham CP
Site Ref: Site/09/04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year: 13.17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
   Site does not intersect Inner Zone

4. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
   2.01km - 5km from the site

4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
   Site within 250m of contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
   Sewage work & old quarry to N & NE

5b. Local road impact
   No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
   Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
   Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops
   Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
   Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
   Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
   Spare capacity in some years

6f.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
   Forecasts suggest that this scale of development can be mitigated through the expansion of the local school

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
   Limited capacity

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
   CWS within 2.01km – 5km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

Bottisham VC is in the process of being expanded from 7FE to 10FE an additional 450 places 11-16. Future catchment forecasts indicate that there will be some limited capacity available at the school to accommodate growth. In addition, there are plans for a new secondary school to the east of Cambridge to serve that areas development needs. The school will be in part of Bottisham VC current catchment area. If pupils in this area are served by the new school that will free up further capacity to accommodate the growth proposed within the Local Plan and the sites identified in this second round.

6h. Proximity to employment sites
   Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)
## Site Name: Land west of Station Road

### Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

### Parish: Dullingham CP

### Site Ref: Site/09/04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7d. Agricultural land classification</th>
<th>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>E – No PRoW connection opportunities</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

- **ECDC** - Conservation area to the east, screened in part by existing modern housing along The Crescent. Likely to have a limited impact on designated heritage assets.

- **HE** - Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary there is the conservation area and a grade II registered park and garden close to the site. Any development therefore has the potential to impact on these designated heritage assets. The site lies to the north west of the village extending significantly into the countryside and would inevitably alter the character of the settlement at this approach to the village. In any event, it is important that any development of this site will need to preserve the registered park and garden, conservation area and their settings conserve and where opportunities arise enhance the conservation area. Should the site be allocated, these requirements should be included in the policy and supporting text of the Plan.

#### 7h. Visual Impact

- **Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive**
- **Justification for score:**

- **Additional criterion 7i. TPOs** - No TPO within 15m of the site

### Parish Council support and rank

- **Does Parish Council support this site?** No
- **Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**
- **Form G - Parish Council's view:** (c) not add this site to the Local Plan

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s) Main findings and recommendations:
The site has planning approval for residential development. The site should be allocated to retain this planning decision.

Site Information

Site Type: Site with extant planning permission ID: 463

Site Address: Land Off Lynn Road Chettisham Ely Cambridgeshire CB6 1RY

Settlement: City of Ely

LP15 Allocation Ref: Planning Perm. Ref: 16/00621/OUM

Site Description: Residential development for up to 19 houses and associated infrastructure on land adjacent to Twinwood Cottage, Lynn Road, Chettisham.

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints:

Current Use: Agriculture Proposed Use: Housing

Current Use info: Paddock / equestrian uses

Proposed Use info:

Site Area Net (ha): 0.55 Site Area Gross (ha): 0.64

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 19 b) Recommended 19

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening): Flood Zone 1: Flood Zone 2: Flood Zone 3a: Flood Zone 3b:

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

30 Year: 100 Year: 1,000 Year:
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

#### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport

6b. Proximity to medical services

6c. Proximity to shops

6d. Proximity to Primary School

6e. Proximity to Secondary School

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

6h. Proximity to employment sites

#### 7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification

7e. Public Rights of Way

7e.(i) PROW comments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification for score:

| Additional criterion 7i. TPOs |  |

---

**Parish Council support and rank**

Does Parish Council support this site?  

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:

---

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
**Site Ref:** Site/10/31

**Parish:** Ely CP

**Site Name:** Land At Barton Road Car Park

**Current Status:** Site Allocation ELY.H2

---

**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**

- Preferred site

**Date and time of site visit:**

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

- The site has extant planning permission for residential development. The site should therefore be allocated to retain this planning decision.

---

**Site Information**

**Site Type:** Site with extant planning permission

**ID:** 467

**Site Address:** Land At Barton Road Car Park Barton Road Ely Cambridgeshire

**Settlement:** City of Ely

**LP15 Allocation Ref:**

**Planning Perm. Ref:** 15/01417/F3M

**Site Description:** Residential development for 11 dwellings, with minor alterations to the existing vehicular and pedestrian access.

**Brown/Greenfield:** Brownfield

**Known Constraints:**

**Current Use:** Other (please specify)

**Proposed Use:** Housing

**Current Use info:** Car park

**Proposed Use info:**

**Site Area Net (ha):** 0.19

**Site Area Gross (ha):** 0.19

**Indicative no. of dwellings:**

- a) Submitted / estimated: 11
- b) Recommended: 11

---

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

- Flood Zone 1:
- Flood Zone 2:
- Flood Zone 3a:
- Flood Zone 3b:

2b. Surface Water flood risk

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):**

- 30 Year:
- 100 Year:
- 1,000 Year:
Current Status: Site Allocation ELY.H2  
Site Name: Land At Barton Road Car Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>5. Site Suitability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5a. Proximity to contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport

6b. Proximity to medical services

6c. Proximity to shops

6d. Proximity to Primary School

6e. Proximity to Secondary School

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

6h. Proximity to employment sites

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification

7e. Public Rights of Way

7e.(i) PROW comments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7h. Visual Impact</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Justification for score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional criterion 7i. TPOs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Current Status: Site Allocation ELY.H3  
Site Name: Former depot, Lisle Lane  
Site Ref: Site/10/32  
Parish: Ely CP

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: 

Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site has extant planning permission, and is currently under construction, to provide a retirement housing complex.

Site Information

Site Type: Site with extant planning permission  ID: 504
Site Address: Lisle Lane, Ely, Cambridgeshire, CB7 4FA
Settlement: City of Ely
LP15 Allocation Ref:  Planning Perm. Ref: 15/00538/FUM
Site Description: Former depot site, currently under construction as a retirement home complex.
Brown/Greenfield: Brownfield
Known Constraints:
Current Use: Employment  Proposed Use: Housing
Current Use info: Former agricultural machinery sales
Proposed Use info: Retirement housing
Site Area Net (ha): 0.61  Site Area Gross (ha): 0.72
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 58  b) Recommended 58

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  Main Settlement  
1b. Site Availability  Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)  
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1:  Flood Zone 2:  Flood Zone 3a:  Flood Zone 3b:  

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):
30 Year:  100 Year:  1,000 Year:  

Overall recommendation from site assessment:
Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site has extant planning permission, and is currently under construction, to provide a retirement housing complex.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation

4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites

4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Access to services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6a. Proximity to public transport

6b. Proximity to medical services

6c. Proximity to shops

6d. Proximity to Primary School

6e. Proximity to Secondary School

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

6h. Proximity to employment sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Environmental impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification

7e. Public Rights of Way

7e.(i) PROW comments
**Parish Council support and rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Form G - Parish Council’s view:

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**
Preferred site

**Date and time of site visit:**

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation with planning permission covering approximately two-thirds of the site. Therefore the principle of development has already been accepted through the planning process and should be retained.

---

**Site Information**

**Site Type:** New site submission (Form B)  
**ID:** 47

**Site Address:** Land to the north of Ely

**Settlement:** City of Ely

**LP15 Allocation Ref.:** ELY1  
**Planning Perm. Ref.:** 11/01077/ESO; 13/00785/ESO

**Site Description:** North Ely urban extension site.

**Brown/Greenfield:** Greenfield

**Known Constraints:** Please refer to the North Ely Joint Strategic Masterplan document. Site has planning permission in part - 11/01077/ESO (Highflyer Farm, Phase 1 - 800 units). Another application is pending decision - 13/00785/ESO (west of Lynn Road - 1,200 units).

**Current Use:** Agriculture  
**Proposed Use:** Urban extension

**Current Use info:**

**Proposed Use info:**

**Site Area Net (ha):** 126.00  
**Site Area Gross (ha):** 210

**Indicative no. of dwellings:**

- a) Submitted / estimated: 3000
- b) Recommended: 3000

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  
Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability  
Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

This site lies almost entirely within the Safeguarding Area and the allocation for the Ely Waste Water Treatment Works Area of Search for a new Waste Water Treatment Works (Policy W7N and Policy W6A) designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012). The overarching policies are Policy CS17 and Policy CS31 of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011). Policy CS31 places a presumption against allowing development which would be occupied by people; and which may prejudice, in this case, the planned works. Any new waste water treatment works is now likely to be north of the railway line; and consideration should be given to these policies in the interests of deliverability.

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies  
W6A; W7N

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone  
>50% of site area in Zone 1

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**
Site Name: Land to the north of Ely

Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land  Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact  No objections with minor mitigation measures

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

Access off Lynn Road
Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport  Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services  Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6c. Proximity to shops  Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School  Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School  Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity  Spare capacity in every year

6f.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

The school has been built to meet the needs of the Endurance Estates development. As this development is built out the school will fill. It cannot be assumed that capacity at this school can be used to meet the impacts of other development sites proposed in Ely

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity  Spare capacity in every year

6g.(i) Available secondary school capacity

6g.(i) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded from 1200 pupils 11-16 to 1500 pupils 11-16 on its present site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,200 new houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites  Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites  CWS within 500m of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers
**Current Status:** Site Allocation ELY.M1  
**Site Name:** Land to the north of Ely  
**Parish:** Ely CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/10/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7d. Agricultural land classification</th>
<th>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>B – Opportunities to connect to multiple nearby PRoW within the site boundary</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td>BR 25 runs within the eastern boundary of the site an FP10 runs through the east parcel of land that forms the site. Preserve these routes or divert them and provide links throughout the whole of the site for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. There will be a need for a safe crossing somewhere along the A10 in this north east corner of Ely to service the proposed development sites 10/10, 10/20 10/05, 10/13 10/07 and 10/23.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td>Archaeological assets on-site</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments | ECDC: Already allocated - same issues as before  
CCC: Proposal area has been partly evaluated in response to previous calls for evidence for Environmental Statements for development, or for the Minerals & Wast Plan allocation areas (not evaluated). Early Iron Age pits and enclosures in the SW part of the area (MBC19589 -90), a complex of enclosures and a droveway in the south and eastern area (MBC19588), while a Bronze Age socketed axes is known to the NE (MBC8691) and struck flint knapping waste is known to the S (MBC8664). The remaining block require predetermination characterisation in the same way so that a coherent mitigation strategy can be developed. NGR 555340 282390 | |
| 7h. Visual Impact | | |
| Justification for score: | | |
| Additional criterion 7i. TPOs | TPO tree on site | C |

**Parish Council support and rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council's view:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Support for scheme to be delivered in accordance with planning consent and/or principles of Ely North SPD.
- Site is located within a WWTW Safeguarding Area for allocation of a new Ely Waste Water Treatment Works.
- Development should protect and enhance the listed building (St Michaels Church) and its setting.
- No residual capacity in surface water receiving system. Necessary surface water accommodation should be put in place prior to development.

- Site promoter confirms commitment to delivery of site, with planning permission granted for 2,000 dwellings (of 3,000) total.
- Landowner confirms commitment to bring forward land as mixed-use scheme.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
Site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation, therefore principle of development established through previous Local Plan process. The allocation should be retained.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
<th>ID: 21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Nutholt Lane, Ely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>City of Ely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>ELY2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Current East Cambridgeshire District Council offices at Nutholt Lane, Ely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Currently allocated as part of a wider site under the Local Plan 2015, Policy ELY2: Retail-led/mixed-use allocation, The Grange, Nutholt Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td>Local government office (ECDC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>b) Recommended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy                    Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability                      Available for development in med term (2023-2029)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone                             >50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk              Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMsfSW):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 Year</th>
<th>100 Year</th>
<th>1,000 Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.61%</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
<td>8.68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Status: Site Allocation ELY.M2
Parish: Ely CP
Site Name: The Grange
Site Ref: Site/10/11

| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No |

3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
   Site does not intersect Inner Zone

4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
   More than 5km from site

4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
   Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact
   No objections with minor mitigation measures

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
   Nutholt Lane access for vehicles only
   Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

   The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Statement based on 43 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
   Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
   Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6c. Proximity to shops
   Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
   Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
   Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
   No spare places but room for expansion

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
   Spare capacity in every year

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
   CWS within 501m – 1km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification
   Site is not located on agricultural land

Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
   Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact
   No objections with minor mitigation measures

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
   Nutholt Lane access for vehicles only
   Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

   The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Statement based on 43 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
   Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
   Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6c. Proximity to shops
   Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
   Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
   Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
   No spare places but room for expansion

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
   Spare capacity in every year

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
   CWS within 501m – 1km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification
   Site is not located on agricultural land
**Site Name:** The Grange

**Site Ref:** Site/10/11

**Parish:** Ely CP

**Current Status:** Site Allocation ELY.M2

### 7e. Public Rights of Way

| E – No PRoW connection opportunities |

### 7e.(i) PROW comments

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 7f.(i) Conservation Area

| Site is within CA |

### 7f.(ii) Listed building

| LB on-site |

### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

| SAM within 500m of site |

### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

| Archaeological assets within 500m of site |

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

**ECDC:** Already allocated - same issues as before

**HE:** 10/11: in conservation area with listed buildings. We would refer you to the comments we made during the 2015 Local Plan process.

**CCC:** Located in the historic core of the town, immediately N of Old Gaol (MCB14045) and just less than 200m N of Ely Abbey and Cathedral (MCB8836). Stratified urban deposits expected. Requires pre-determination fieldwork to enable evidence base to be supplied with any planning application so that appropriate mitigation strategy can be developed. NGR 554110 280510.

### 7h. Visual Impact

**Justification for score:**

**Additional criterion 7i. TPOs**

| No TPO within 15m of the site |

## Parish Council support and rank

**Does Parish Council support this site?**

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Development should conserve, and where opportunities arise, enhance the setting of Ely Conservation Area and listed buildings.
- Located in Conservation Area, development should be of particularly high quality and respond to local character and distinctiveness.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Main findings and recommendations:
Site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation, therefore principle of development established through previous Local Plan process. The allocation should be retained.

Site Information

- **Site Type:** New site submission (Form B) ID: 22
- **Site Address:** Nutholt Lane
- **Settlement:** City of Ely
- **LP15 Allocation Ref:** ELY3
- **Site Description:** Paradise leisure centre, Nutholt Lane, Ely
- **Brown/Greenfield:** Brownfield
- **Known Constraints:** Currently allocated as part of a wider site under the Local Plan 2015, policy ELY3: A Vision for Paradise Area. Within Ely Conservation Area.
- **Current Use:** Leisure facility (commercial) Proposed Use: Housing
- **Current Use info:** Leisure centre and car park
- **Proposed Use info:**
- **Site Area Net (ha):** 0.85 Site Area Gross (ha): 1
- **Indicative no. of dwellings:** a) Submitted / estimated 64 b) Recommended 50

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

1b. Site Availability
Available for development in medium term (2023-2029)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone 1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3a</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3b</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Year</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 Year</td>
<td>3.35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Site Name: Paradise Leisure Centre

#### Current Status: Site Allocation ELY.M3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- More than 5km from site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

#### Minor Criteria

### 5. Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

#### 5b. Local road impact
- No objections with minor mitigation measures

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Statement based on 64 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area.

### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Spare capacity in every year

#### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

The school currently has capacity for 420 pupils. There are currently 450 on roll as 30 places are provided in a mobile classroom. Some expansion is possible on site but it would be difficult and expensive as The Lantern was designed as a modern 2FE Primary School.

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded from 1200 pupils 11-16 to 1500 pupils 11-16 on its present site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,200 new houses in the catchment area.

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 500m of site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification
- Site is not located on agricultural land

#### 7e. Public Rights of Way
- E – No PRoW connection opportunities
### Site Ref: Site/10/12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name: Paradise Leisure Centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Status: Site Allocation ELY.M3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish: Ely CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref: Site/10/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7f.(i) PROW comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>Site is within CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii) Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td>Archaeological assets on-site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

ECDC: Already allocated - same issues as before

HE: 10/12: in conservation area. We would refer you to the comments we made during the 2015 Local Plan process.

CCC: Excavations ahead of development of Waitrose store and car park (MCBs12426-30) informs that this area is to the N of the historic town core limits. Medieval occupation is closely associated with Lynn Road, with fields to rear (eg MCB15020). However, MCBs12426-7 indicate prehistoric occupation was preserved on land to the south. A planning condition would be required for any planning consent granted.  NGR554310 280620

### 7h. Visual Impact

**Justification for score:**

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

| No TPO within 15m of the site |

### Parish Council support and rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council's view:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment:

- Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:

- Site/10/16

Supersedes site submission(s)

- Site/10/16

Main findings and recommendations:

The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. The allocation should be retained as the principle of development has been accepted through the planning process.

Site Information

Site Type: Local Plan 2015 allocated site

Site Address: Station Gateway, Ely

Settlement: City of Ely

LP15 Allocation Ref: ELY7&8

Planning Perm. Ref: 

Site Description: Existing mixed-use allocation, Station Gateway

Brown/Greenfield: Brownfield

Known Constraints:

- Mixed use
- Proposed Use: Mixed use

Current Use info:

- Site Area Net (ha): 7.38
- Site Area Gross (ha): 12.3
- Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 400, b) Recommended 100

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

- Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability

- Multiple zones - see SFRA

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

- Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
  - Flood Zone 1: 50.00%
  - Flood Zone 2: 0.00%
  - Flood Zone 3a: 50.00%
  - Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk

- Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

- Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):
  - 30 Year: 9.00%
  - 100 Year: 6.00%
  - 1,000 Year: 14.00%
**Current Status:** Site Allocation ELY.M4  
**Parish:** Ely CP  
**Site Name:** Existing mixed-use allocation, Station Gateway  
**Site Ref:** Site/10/19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation | Site does not intersect Inner Zone | A  
| 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites | More than 5km from site | A  
| 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment |  |  

**Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):** No  
**Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):** No  

**Minor Criteria**  
**5. Site Suitability**  
| 5a. Proximity to contaminated land | Site located on contaminated land | E  
| 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment | Factory or works and railway land |  
| 5b. Local road impact |  |  
| 5c. Strategic Road Network impact |  |  
| 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment |  |  

**6. Access to services**  
| 6a. Proximity to public transport | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) | A  
| 6b. Proximity to medical services | Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m) | C  
| 6c. Proximity to shops | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) | A  
| 6d. Proximity to Primary School | Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m) | D  
| 6e. Proximity to Secondary School | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E  
| 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity | No spare places, no room for expansion | E  
| 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity | Spare capacity in every year | A  
| 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment | The school has the physical capacity for 420 pupils. It currently has close to 480 pupils on roll and it has two temporary classrooms providing 60 additional places. The site is under size for the present number of pupils |  
| 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment | The College could be expanded from 1200 pupils 11-16 to 1500 pupils 11-16 on its present site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,200 new houses in the catchment area. |  
| 6h. Proximity to employment sites | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E  

**7. Environmental impact**  
| 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites | CWS within 500m of site | D  
| 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment |  |  
| 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers |  |  
| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower | D  
| 7e. Public Rights of Way | C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PROW within the site boundary | C  
| 7e.(i) PROW comments | Footpath 22 runs between this site and site 17 and then crosses the railway line to link to the Rights of Way network. This link should be preserved but may require diverting to allow development to take place. |  

ECDC: Already allocated - same issues as before

CCC: No objection, as this area has been subject to extensive previous development (Tesco and former railway buildings). However, it’s location adjacent to Ely's river crossing may yield important evidence relating to the periods before the medieval northward diversion of the Great Ouse took place (12/13thC). A planning condition would apporpiately secure schemes of work in areas not subject to 20th century rail and supermarket development, or that for the open air swimming pool, now demolished (MCB17264) on the west side of the plot - i.e. remaining area of the car parks would be the focus of work. NGR 554313 279490

Parish Council support and rank

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Proposals should have no adverse impacts on the adjacent CWS and ideally enhance and provide public access.
- No residual capacity in surface water receiving system. Necessary surface water accommodation should be put in place prior to development.
- Development should pay particular regard to adjacent County Wildlife Site and ensure no adverse impact upon it. Public access must be compatible with enhancement of ecological interest of site.
- Station Gateway policy to restrictive in respect of retail – needs greater flexibility.
- Development should conserve, and where opportunities arise, enhance the Conservation Area. Located in Conservation Area, development should be high quality and respond to character and distinctiveness.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment:

Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:

09:00 09 August 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site intersects existing Local Plan allocation ELY7&8 to enable the regeneration of the Station Gateway. The site is split into two parcels by a tree belt and PROW. Redevelopment of former factory site is likely to be appropriate. The NE parcel (located outside the LP15 allocation) is unlikely to be suitable, as it is separated from the remainder of the site by a tree belt, is likely to impact upon PROW and CWS, and does not relate well to neighbouring residential developments. In conclusion, the existing Local Plan 2015 allocation should be retained and should not be amended as proposed.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)

Site Address: Westmill Foods Site, Angel Drove, Ely.

Settlement: City of Ely

LP15 Allocation Ref: ELY7&8

Planning Perm. Ref: 

Site Description: Former Westmill Foods Site, Angel Drove. Comprises previously developed brownfield land formerly occupied by significant agro-industrial buildings and following demolition site is now cleared.

Brown/Greenfield: Brownfield

Known Constraints: Part of site designated as County Wildlife Site.

Current Use: Employment

Proposed Use: Mixed use

Current Use info: Vacant employment land. Operating now wishes to dispose of site.

Proposed Use info: Mixed use proposal to include residential, commercial/employment and/or retail. No. of proposed housing units estimated based on net site area.

Site Area Net (ha): 2.18

Site Area Gross (ha): 2.91

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 78  b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability

Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%
Current Status: Superseded by ELY.M4
Site Name: Westmill Foods Site, Angel Drove
Parish: Ely CP
Site Ref: Site/10/16

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

| Percent (% of site area at risk (uFMfSW): |
| 30 Year: 6.13% | 100 Year: 4.63% | 1,000 Year: 18.19% |

Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

Minor Criteria

3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
Site does not intersect Inner Zone

4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
More than 5km from site

4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
Site located on contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land profesional assessment
Factory or works and railway land

5b. Local road impact
Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
Access off A142 existing roundabout at entrance BUT does not appear to link 4th arm of roundabout OR to the public highway at the 4th arm.
Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment based on 78 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Ely and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Ely the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6c. Proximity to shops
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
No spare places, no room for expansion

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
Spare capacity in every year

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded from 1200 pupils 11-16 to 1500 pupils 11-16 on its present site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,200 new houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

7. Environmental impact
Site Name: Westmill Foods Site, Angel Drove

Current Status: Superseded by ELY.M4
Parish: Ely CP
Site Ref: Site/10/16

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
CWS located within site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification
Site is not located on argicultural land

7e. Public Rights of Way
C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PROW within the site boundary

Footpath 41 runs across the site and provides a connection from Potters Lane on the outskirts of Ely to Angel Drove which is Byway Open to All Traffic 40. This route runs parallel to the A142 and is therefore a very important off road link and therefore needs to be preserved. This route may need diverting to allow for development to take place. Also consider upgrading the route to Bridleway to allow for use by cyclists and horse riders in addition to pedestrians.

7f.(i) Conservation Area
CA within 500m of site

7f.(ii). Listed building
LB within 500m of site

7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
SAM within 500m of site

7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

7e.(i) PROW comments
Footpath 41 runs across the site and provides a connection from Potters Lane on the outskirts of Ely to Angel Drove which is Byway Open to All Traffic 40. This route runs parallel to the A142 and is therefore a very important off road link and therefore needs to be preserved. This route may need diverting to allow for development to take place. Also consider upgrading the route to Bridleway to allow for use by cyclists and horse riders in addition to pedestrians.

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

ECDC: Conservation area to the east - views towards cathedral - some of this was addressed in the masterplan work done for the station gateway

HE: 10/16: this allocation forms part of the station gateway and should be considered holistically with the wider aspirations for improving the area and the setting of the historic core of the city.

CCC: 170m NE of cropmark enclosures (MCBs 8407,11034), 120m SW of Medieval pottery kiln and building (MCB13883) and pottery finds (MCB8475) at Potters Lane. Pre-determination field work evidence to be supplied with any planning application NGR 554000 279560

7h. Visual Impact
Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views

Justification for score:
Not a sensitive landscape. Improvement welcomed.

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
No TPO within 15m of the site

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

• Site promoter objects to rejection of wider site area as a mixed-use proposal. NB: eastern part of site, with frontage to Angel Drove, forms part of draft site allocation ELY.M4.
• Despite marketing, site has been vacant and underutilised for more than 12 years.
• Allocation should attract and secure potential developers/occupiers at the earliest opportunity.
• No reasonable prospect of site being developed for employment purposes.
• Site suitable for housing development and retail and commercial – particularly large-scale retail, which is unlikely to be met in the town centre.
• Site offers sustainable location for housing development, near rail station and town centre.
• Rear site well-related to built area.
**Current Status:** Site Allocation ELY.M5  
**Parish:** Ely CP  
**Site Name:** Existing mixed-use allocation, Octagon Business Park  
**Site Ref:** Site/10/18

### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

| Overall recommendation from site assessment: | Preferred site |
| Date and time of site visit: |  |
| Supersedes site submission(s) |  |

**Main findings and recommendations:**  
The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation with extant planning permission. The allocation should be retained as the principle of development has been accepted through the planning process.

### Site Information

**Site Type:** Local Plan 2015 allocated site  
**ID:** 231  
**Site Address:** Angel Drove, Ely  
**Settlement:** City of Ely  
**LP15 Allocation Ref:** ELY9  
**Planning Perm. Ref:** 13/00122/ESF  
**Site Description:** Existing mixed-use allocation, Octagon Business Park  
**Brown/Greenfield:** Brownfield  
**Known Constraints:** 13/00122/ESF - NB. New application pending consideration ref: 17/00428/FUM  
**Current Use:** Mixed use  
**Proposed Use:** Mixed use  
**Proposed Use info:** Mix of retail and employment development  
**Site Area Net (ha):** 8.10  
**Site Area Gross (ha):** 13.5  
**Indicative no. of dwellings:** a) Submitted / estimated  
**Polygon (ha):** 13.14  

### Major Criteria

| 1a. Settlement Hierarchy | Main Settlement |  |
| 1b. Site Availability |  |
| 1c. Minerals and Waste assessment |  |

**1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies**  
**1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations**  

| 2a. Flood zone | >50% of site area in Zone 3a (housing site) |
| Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening): |  |
| Flood Zone 1 | 25.40%  |
| Flood Zone 2 | 3.65%  |
| Flood Zone 3a | 70.95%  |
| Flood Zone 3b | 0.00%  |

| 2b. Surface Water flood risk | Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA |
| Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW): |  |
| 30 Year | 16.54% |
| 100 Year | 10.99% |
| 1,000 Year | 37.88% |
| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | Yes |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | Yes |

3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation | Site does not intersect Inner Zone |
4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites | More than 5km from site |
4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment |

**Minor Criteria**

**5. Site Suitability**

5a. Proximity to contaminated land | Site within 50m of contaminated land |
5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment |

Railway on S boundary |

5b. Local road impact |

5c. Strategic Road Network impact |

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment |

**6. Access to services**

6a. Proximity to public transport | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) |
6b. Proximity to medical services | Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m) |
6c. Proximity to shops | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) |
6d. Proximity to Primary School | Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m) |
6e. Proximity to Secondary School | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) |
6f.(i) Available primary school capacity | No spare places, no room for expansion |
6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity | Spare capacity in every year |
6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment |
6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment |

The school has the physical capacity for 420 pupils. It currently has close to 480 pupils on roll and it has two temporary classrooms providing 60 additional places. The site is under size for the present number of pupils.

6h. Proximity to employment sites | Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m) |

**7. Environmental impact**

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites | CWS within 500m of site |
7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment |

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers |

7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower |
7e. Public Rights of Way | E – No PRoW connection opportunities |
7e.(i) PROW comments
Current Status: Site Allocation ELY.M5
Site Name: Existing mixed-use allocation, Octagon Business Park
Parish: Ely CP
Site Ref: Site/10/18

ECDC: Already allocated - same issues as before

CCC: A full evaluation of the site (ECB379) was conducted in 2001 in response to an archaeological condition placed on the planning consent for E/00/0824, which revealed that the site contained no archaeological evidence of any significance. Lines of marling pits (MCB15251) and numerous land drains of different periods denote both continuing drainage need and indications of difficult agricultural conditions and heavy saturated clay-rich soils following the loss of peat after industrial drainage 'success' in the 17th and 18th centuries. We have an evaluation report in the Historic Environment Record that set out the results and appropriate entries have been incorporated into the county's Historic Environment Record. No further work required. NGR 553799 278797

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
No TPO within 15m of the site

Parish Council support and rank

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Site is located within a WWTW Safeguarding Area for allocation of a new Ely Waste Water Treatment Works.
- Development would have a negative impact on the setting of Ely Cathedral and the economic well-being of the city centre.
- Legal agreement in place with drainage board to manage surface water.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit: 13:10 15 May 2017

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site currently offers an existing aged hospital, located adjacent to modern development. A low quality public open space is located to the south and offers some opportunity for improvement. The proposal includes the redevelopment of the site to deliver improved healthcare facilities and residential development. The site is accessible, relatively unconstrained and its redevelopment will bring substantial community benefit; consequently it is considered suitable for allocation.

Site Information

Site Type: FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17
Site Address: Princess of Wales Hospital, Lynn Road, Ely CB6 1DN
Settlement: City of Ely

LP15 Allocation Ref: ID: 393
Planning Perm. Ref:

Site Description: Existing site is Princess of Wales Hospital site. Proposal includes housing development, healthcare uses, care facility and retail uses.

Brown/Greenfield: Brownfield
Known Constraints: Initial indicative layout plans suggest site could deliver approximately 77 dwellings. **Net site area estimated**

Current Use: Community facility
Current Use info: Existing hospital site
Proposed Use info: Consolidation of healthcare use, residential use, provision of care facility and retail use.

Site Area Net (ha): 3.02
Site Area Gross (ha): 4.03

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 77
b) Recommended 77

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1:</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2:</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a:</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
## Minor Criteria

### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

### 4. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 501m - 2km from the site

### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

### 5. Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located on contaminated land

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
- Former MoD & hospital site

#### 5b. Local road impact
- No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

#### 6f. Available primary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

#### 6g. Primary education impacts - professional assessment

#### 6g.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 501m – 1km of site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification
- Site is not located on agricultural land

#### 7e. Public Rights of Way
- E – No PRoW connection opportunities

#### 7e.(i) PROW comments
Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site? Yes

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view: (a) add this site to the Local Plan, and keep existing preferred site(s)?

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
**Site Ref:** Site/10/25  
**Parish:** Ely CP  
**Site Name:** Existing employment allocation, Ely Road and Rail Distribution Centre

### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Preferred site

**Date and time of site visit:**

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is an existing Local 2015 employment allocation. The allocation should be retained to enable continued employment use of the site.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Local Plan 2015 allocated site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Ely Road and Rail Distribution Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>City of Ely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref</td>
<td>ELY12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>Existing employment allocation, Ely Road and Rail Distribution Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha)</td>
<td>7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Criteria

**1a. Settlement Hierarchy**

Main Settlement

**1b. Site Availability**

**1c. Minerals and Waste assessment**

This site lies almost entirely in the Transport Safeguarding Area for the Queen Adelaide Railhead, Ely, designated by Policy T2F of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012). The overarching policy is Policy CS23 of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011). This policy places a presumption against any development in the Transport Safeguarding Area which could prejudice the existing or potential use of the protected railhead for the transport of minerals and / or waste. Consideration should be given to this policy prior to allocation in the interests of deliverability.

**1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies**

**1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations**

T2F

**2a. Flood zone**

>50% of site area in Zone 1

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

| Flood Zone 1 | 100.00% | Flood Zone 2 | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3a | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3b | 0.00% |

**2b. Surface Water flood risk**

Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

**Date and time of site visit:**

**Supersedes site submission(s):**
### Site Name:
*Existing employment allocation, Ely Road and Rail Distribution Centre*

### Current Status:
*Site Allocation ELY.E1*

### Parish:
*Ely CP*

### Site Ref:
*Site/10/25*

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- **N/a** - employment site

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- More than 5km from site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

#### Percent (% of site area at risk (uFMfSW)):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 Year</th>
<th>100 Year</th>
<th>1,000 Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.87%</td>
<td>2.18%</td>
<td>8.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):
- No

#### Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):
- No

#### 30 Year:
- 3.87%

#### 100 Year:
- 2.18%

#### 1,000 Year:
- 8.22%

### Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located on contaminated land

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

#### 5b. Local road impact

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

### Access to Services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- Limited capacity

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Spare capacity in every year

#### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- Limited capacity

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- Spare capacity in every year

### Environmental Impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS located within site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification
- Site is not located on agricultural land

#### 7e. Public Rights of Way
- C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary

### PROW comments

- No

- No
Footpath 12 provides a link from Lisle Lane in Ely to the site. It also runs along the south west and southern boundary of the site to connect with Footpaths 13 and 43. Ensure that this link is preserved.

7f.(i) Conservation Area
CA within 500m of site

7f.(ii) Listed building
LB within 1.01km – 2km of site

7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site

7f.(iv) Archaeological asset
Archaeological assets within 500.1 – 1000m of site

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
ECDC: Already allocated - same issues as before

CCC: Located on the former peaty skirtland of the fen edge, W of the R Great Ouse, this proposal area lies c. 550m to the NW of a known Bronze Age wooden causeway that would have crossed the then emerging marsh (MCB8688). Requires pre-determination fieldwork to enable evidence base to be supplied with any planning application. NGR 556210 280810

7h. Visual Impact

Justification for score:

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
No TPO within 15m of the site

Parish Council support and rank
Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council’s view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received
Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

• Proposals should have no adverse impact on the adjacent SSSI, CWS and Ely Country Park by providing adequate landscape treatment and other mitigation.
• Development proposals should contribute significant ecological enhancements.
• In addition to avoiding impacts on SSSI, CWS and Ely Country Park, major development should enhance these sites and the wider ecological network along the Ely Ouse.
• Site is located within a WWTW Safeguarding Area for allocation of a new Ely Waste Water Treatment Works.
**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**

**Preferred site**

**Date and time of site visit:**

16:00 09 August 2016

**Supersedes site submission(s)** Site/10/26

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is currently an existing business park. The site should be allocated to enable continued employment development.

---

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Lancaster Way Business Park, Ely, Cambridgeshire, CB6 3NX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>City of Ely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Existing business park at Lancaster Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td>Trade counter and uses ancillary to the business park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>17.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>29.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Recommended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

- Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability

- Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

This site lies partly within the Waste Consultation Area for the Witchford Household Recycling Centre (Policy W8BG) designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012). The overarching policy for this designation is Policy CS30 of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011). This policy seeks to safeguard waste management facilities which make a significant contribution to managing Cambridgeshire's waste; and the policy states that development will only be permitted where it is demonstrated that this will not prejudice existing or future planned waste management operations. Typically industrial uses (B2, B8) are unlikely to prejudice waste management operations, but it is suggested that consideration should be given to these policies in order to ensure deliverability.

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

- W8BG

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

- W8BG

2a. Flood zone

- >50% of site area in Zone 1

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

| Flood Zone 1 | 100.00% |
| Flood Zone 2 | 0.00% |
| Flood Zone 3a | 0.00% |
| Flood Zone 3b | 0.00% |
Site Name: Lancaster Way Business Park

Current Status: Site Allocation ELY.E2(a)
Parish: Ely CP
Site Ref: Site/10/01

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

| Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW): |
| 30 Year: 1.71% | 100 Year: 1.51% | 1,000 Year: 10.12% |

Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
N/a - employment site

4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
More than 5km from site

4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
Site located on contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
RAF Witchford

5b. Local road impact
No objections with minor mitigation measures

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
Access off A142 existing roundabout at entrance

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
No spare places, no room for expansion

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
Limited capacity

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

The site would accommodate another 15 pupils only using DfE recommended site area guidelines hence an E rather than a D classification

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area

6h. Proximity to employment sites
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers
### Current Status: Site Allocation ELY.E2(a)
#### Site Name: Lancaster Way Business Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref:</th>
<th>Site/10/01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parish:</td>
<td>Ely CP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7e.(i) PROW comments
BRs 4 and 1 Witchford run along the south and south west perimeter of sites 10/1 to 10/4. BOAT 39 connects to the A142 opposite the north east of the site. Provide links from this point across the site for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders to BRs 4 and 1.

| 7f.(i) Conservation Area | CA within 1.01km – 2km of site | B |
| 7f.(ii). Listed building | LB within 500m of site | D |
| 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument | SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site | B |
| 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset | Archaeological assets on-site | E |

#### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
ECDC: No heritage impact

CCC: Previous planning comments for piecemeal development all apply. Major Iron Age and Roman settlement area on the southern end of the isle of Ely (eg MCBs15366, 8344, 17276, 20091). Planning conditions advised for new submissions, unless construction preserves below ground archaeological resource. NGR 551560 278530

| 7h. Visual Impact | Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views | C |

#### Justification for score:
Continued use of site for employment use unlikely to cause harm.

| Additional criterion 7i. TPOs | No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

### Parish Council support and rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does Parish Council support this site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council’s view:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received
Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit: Not visited - existing allocation

Supersedes site submission(s): Site/10/26

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is an existing allocation with planning permission. Therefore the principle of development has already been accepted through the planning process and should be retained.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land south east of Lancaster Way Business Park, Ely, Cambridgeshire, CB6 3NX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>City of Ely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>ELY11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td>13/01142/RMM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Site currently in agricultural use south east of Lancaster Way Business Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Existing outline planning permission 08/00563/ESO (01.04.2011) and 15/01240/VARM (05.02.2016). Existing s106 agreement. Reserved matters permission 13/01142/RMM (26.03.2014). Option agreement in place with landowner and Grovemere Property Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>23.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated b) Recommended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability
Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access off A142 existing roundabout at entrance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small Criteria</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site would accommodate another 15 pupils only using DfE recommended site area guidelines hence an E rather than a D classification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6h. Proximity to employment sites</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7. Environmental Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impact</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater P2 and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Site Name:** Land south east of Lancaster Way Business Park

**Current Status:** Site Allocation ELY.E2(b)

**Parish:** Ely CP

**Site Ref:** Site/10/02

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7d. Agricultural land classification</th>
<th>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td>BRs 4 and 1 Witchford run along the south and south west perimeter of sites 10/1 to 10/4. BOAT 39 connects to the A142 opposite the north east of the site. Provide links from this point across the site for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders to BRs 4 and 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500.1 – 1000m of site</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td>Archaeological assets on-site</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td>ECDC: Already allocated - same issues as before</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCC: Excavations underway and planned for areas of Iron Age and Roman settlement known (eg MCB18095, MCB17823, ECB3073) within the former Witchford Airfield (MCB15156). NGR 551920 278410.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit: 16:10 09 August 2016

Supersedes site submission(s) Site/10/26

Main findings and recommendations:
Site provides extension to existing business park and should be allocated to enable continued employment development in this location. Archaeological investigation and landscape buffer at southern boundary will be required.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
<th>ID: 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Land south of Lancaster Way Business Park, Ely, Cambridgeshire, CB6 3NX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>City of Ely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>Land south of Lancaster Way Business Park, Ely, Cambridgeshire, CB6 3NX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints</td>
<td>Agreement of the landowner to promote. Adjacent to existing business park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info</td>
<td>Trade counter and uses ancillary to the business park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>11.025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated</td>
<td>b) Recommended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
- Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
- >50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
- Flood Zone 1: 100.00%
- Flood Zone 2: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
- Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
- 30 Year: 0.00%
- 100 Year: 0.00%
- 1,000 Year: 1.80%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name:</th>
<th>Land south of Lancaster Way Business Park - Phase IIIb Extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Status:</td>
<td>Site Allocation ELY.E2(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish:</td>
<td>Ely CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref:</td>
<td>Site/10/04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</th>
<th>Site located on contaminated land</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land profesional assessment</td>
<td>RAF Witchford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>No objections with minor mitigation measures</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>Access off A142 existing roundabout at entrance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area.

#### 6. Access to services

| 6a. Proximity to public transport | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) | B |
| 6b. Proximity to medical services | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |
| 6c. Proximity to shops | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |
| 6d. Proximity to Primary School | Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m) | C |
| 6e. Proximity to Secondary School | Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m) | C |
| 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity | No spare places, no room for expansion | E |
| 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity | Limited capacity | C |

#### 7. Environmental impact

| 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites | CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site | B |

| 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment | |
| 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers | |
| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower | D |
| 7e. Public Rights of Way | C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary | C |
Current Status: Site Allocation ELY.E2(c)  
Site Name: Land south of Lancaster Way Business Park - Phase IIIb Extension
Parish: Ely CP  
Site Ref: Site/10/04

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site? 

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

ECDC: No heritage impact

CCC: pipeline evidence at the eastern site margin revealed Early Roman settlement remains (MCB178230) indicating the continuation of settlement in this area. However, there is reason to suspect its discontinuity downslope S of Bedwell Hey Lane towards Grunty Fen. The results of a high quality geophysical survey supported by trenching should be included in any planning submission. Predetermination works required.

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site? 

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is an existing business park, currently allocated in the Local Plan 2015 and with a number of planning consents granted. Multiple site submissions were received covering the existing built area and adjoining land to enable expansion of the business park. Based on the findings of the site assessment, it was proposed that the boundary of draft site allocation ELY.E2 be drawn to include site submissions Site/10/01, Site/10/02, Site/10/03, Site/10/04. In response to comments received during consultation, the draft site allocation should be subdivided into smaller parcels to provide greater clarity regarding the status of sites within the business park.

Site Information

Site Type: Strategic Planning Amended Submission  ID: 357
Site Address: Lancaster Way Business Park, Ely, Cambridgeshire, CB6 3NX
Settlement: City of Ely
LP15 Allocation Ref:  Planning Perm. Ref:
Site Description: Brown/Greenfield: Mixed
Known Constraints:
Current Use: Employment  Proposed Use: Employment
Current Use info: Existing business park and adjacent undeveloped agricultural land
Proposed Use info:
Site Area Net (ha): 105.50  Site Area Gross (ha): 105.5
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated  b) Recommended

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  Main Settlement
1b. Site Availability
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment
1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations
2a. Flood zone  >50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land profesional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6h. Proximity to employment sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Site Name:** Lancaster Way Business Park

**Site Ref:** Site/10/26

**Parish:** Ely CP

**Current Status:** Superseded by ELY.E2(a-c)
**Parish Council support and rank**

Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:

---

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Site lies within a Waste Consultation Area. Typically B2, B8 employment uses are unlikely to prejudice waste management operations, but B1 may be sensitive.
- Development will retain and expand employment opportunities local to Ely and reduce the level of out-commuting.
- Site boundary should remain clear of bridleway (located west of site, which is well used and offers views of Ely Cathedral), should follow topography, and provide suitably landscaping. Site area should be reduced in size and redrawn towards Ely.
- Extension of Lancaster Way Business Park is not commensurate with its rural location.
- Site is excessive in its extent and would conflict with aspirations of the plan to protect open countryside, landscape and Cathedral views. This will have significant adverse impact on the rural setting of Witchford.
- Development of site would have severe transport implications for residents of Witchford. Direct vehicular access to A10 should be provided.
- To provide greater clarity, the draft site allocation should be split into smaller parcels reflecting the extent of the existing business park, area of Enterprise Zone, and proposed extension to south.
- Site promoter confirms deliverability of extension area.
- Site promoter welcomes draft site allocation, and confirms designation of area as National Enterprise Zone, with infrastructure progressing to serve extension land.
## Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**
- Preferred site

**Date and time of site visit:**

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation with extant planning permission. The allocation should be retained as the principle of development has been accepted through the planning process.

---

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>Local Plan 2015 allocated site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land at Downham Road, Ely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>City of Ely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>ELY10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Existing leisure allocation, land at Downham Road, Ely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Leisure facility (commercial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>b) Recommended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a. Settlement Hierarchy</th>
<th>Main Settlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b. Site Availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Minerals and Waste assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies | |
| 1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2a. Flood zone</th>
<th>&gt;50% of site area in Zone 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

| Flood Zone 1: | 100.00% |
| Flood Zone 2: | 0.00%   |
| Flood Zone 3a:| 0.00%   |
| Flood Zone 3b:| 0.00%   |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2b. Surface Water flood risk</th>
<th>Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):**

| 30 Year: | 5.49% |
| 100 Year:| 6.21% |
| 1,000 Year:| 16.88% |
**Site Name:** Existing leisure allocation, land at Downham Road, Ely

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation

- N/a - employment site

### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites

- More than 5km from site

### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

- A

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</th>
<th>Site located more than 250m from contaminated land</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

- 

#### 5b. Local road impact

- 

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

- 

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

- 

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6a. Proximity to public transport</th>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6b. Proximity to medical services</th>
<th>Less than 15 min walk (&lt;1,200m)</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6c. Proximity to shops</th>
<th>Less than 15 min walk (&lt;1,200m)</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6d. Proximity to Primary School</th>
<th>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</th>
<th>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</th>
<th>No spare places but room for expansion</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</th>
<th>Spare capacity in every year</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

The school currently has capacity for 420 pupils. There are currently 450 on roll as 30 places are provided in a mobile classroom. Some expansion is possible on site but it would be difficult and expensive as The Lantern was designed as a modern 2FE Primary School.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</th>
<th>Spare capacity in every year</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded from 1200 pupils 11-16 to 1500 pupils 11-16 on its present site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,200 new houses in the catchment area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6h. Proximity to employment sites</th>
<th>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</th>
<th>CWS within 500m of site</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7d. Agricultural land classification</th>
<th>All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7e. Public Rights of Way</th>
<th>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PROW within the site boundary</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7e.(i) PROW comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---
**Site Ref:** Site/10/20  
**Parish:** Ely CP  
**Site Name:** Existing leisure allocation, land at Downham Road, Ely  
**Current Status:** Site Allocation ELY.L1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>CA within 500.1 – 1000m of site</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500.1 – 1000m of site</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td>Archaeological assets on-site</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

- **ECDC:** Already allocated - same issues as before
- **CCC:** 14/00215/SCREEN Downham Road, Community Sports & Leisure Centre - comments from pre-determination fieldwork evidence base in ES apply. NGR 553050 281260

### 7h. Visual Impact

**Justification for score:**

### Additional criterion 7l. TPOs

- No TPO within 15m of the site

---

### Parish Council support and rank

- **Does Parish Council support this site?**
- **Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**
- **Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received

**Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:**

- Development would have a negative impact on the setting of Ely Cathedral and the economic well-being of the city centre.
- No residual capacity in surface water receiving system. Necessary surface water accommodation should be put in place prior to development.
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Parish: Ely CP
Site Ref: Site/10/03

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Has merit
Date and time of site visit: 16:30 09 August 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
Site provides an extension to the district's flagship business park and Enterprise Zone. The site is likely to be suitable for development. However, there is limited justification for the need for such additional land at this time. Further investigation is required around transport / highways impacts, Cathedral views from Witchford village and PROW south of the village, and archaeological impacts.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B) ID: 14
Site Address: Land south of Lancaster Way Business Park, Ely, Cambridgeshire, CB6 3NX
Settlement: City of Ely

LP15 Allocation Ref:  Planning Perm. Ref:
Site Description: Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints: Agreement of landowner to promote
Adjacent to existing allocation ELY11

Current Use: Agriculture Proposed Use: Employment

Current Use info: Trade counter and uses ancillary to business park
Site Area Net (ha): 14.57 Site Area Gross (ha): 24.29
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated b) Recommended

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Main Settlement
1b. Site Availability
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone >50% of site area in Zone 1
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00% Flood Zone 2: 0.00% Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
30 Year: 0.60% 100 Year: 1.38% 1,000 Year: 5.36%
## Minor Criteria

### 5. Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located on contaminated land

#### 5a(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
- RAF Witchford

#### 5b. Local road impact
- No objections with minor mitigation measures

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact
- No objections

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- Access off A142 existing roundabout at entrance

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area.

### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

#### 6f(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places, no room for expansion

#### 6f(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Limited capacity

#### 6g(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- The site would accommodate another 15 pupils only using DfE recommended site area guidelines hence an E rather than a D classification

#### 6g(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
- E

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers
- All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification
- D

#### 7e. Public Rights of Way
- C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**

Site Name: *Land south of Lancaster Way Business Park and ELY11 0 Phase Illa Extension*

Parish: **Ely CP**

Site Ref: **Site/10/03**

### 7f. (i) PROW comments

BRs 4 and 1 Witchford run along the south and south west perimeter of sites 10/1 to 10/4. BOAT 39 connects to the A142 opposite the north east of the site. Provide links from this point across the site for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders to BRs 4 and 1.

### 7f. (i) Conservation Area

CA more than 2km from site

- **A**

### 7f. (ii). Listed building

LB within 500.1 – 1000m of site

- **C**

### 7f. (iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

SAM more than 2km from site

- **A**

### 7f. (iv) Archaeological asset

Archaeological assets on-site

- **E**

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

ECDC: No heritage impact

CCC: Supposed site of Catendune, Early Saxon settlement and cemetery (M.CB2675), bulldozed in the 1950s. Also area of continued Roman field scatter artefacts (M.CB17277). Requires pre-determination field works to enable evidence base to be supplied with any planning application.

### 7h. Visual Impact

Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive

- **D**

#### Justification for score:

Difficult to determine as site not directly accessed. Suspect topography changes, sloping, therefore could have landscape impacts.

### Additional criterion 7l. TPOs

No TPO within 15m of the site

- **A**

## Parish Council support and rank

| Does Parish Council support this site? |  
| Form E - Parish Council site ranking: |  
| Form G - Parish Council’s view: |  

## FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:** 15:20 29 July 2016

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

The site is rejected on the basis that it would result in a severe intrusion into the countryside resulting in harm to the rural setting of Ely; is isolated from Ely as the site is located beyond the A10; and would likely to cause harm to key views of Ely Cathedral.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Orwell Pit Farm, Downham Road, Ely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>City of Ely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Proposed major growth at Ely on the west side of the A10 at Orwell Pit Farm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Two areas of nature conservation interest to the north of the defined site. Site could accommodate 1,700 - 2,000 dwellings. CLD to be discussed, but possible. Potential commencement 2019/20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td>Urban extension to provide housing, employment, retail, open space/recreation and community facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>69.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 2000 b) Recommended 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a. Settlement Hierarchy</th>
<th>Main Settlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b. Site Availability</td>
<td>Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Minerals and Waste assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Flood zone</td>
<td>&gt;50% of site area in Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 1:</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Surface Water flood risk</td>
<td>Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The site is rejected on the basis that it would result in a severe intrusion into the countryside resulting in harm to the rural setting of Ely; is isolated from Ely as the site is located beyond the A10; and would likely to cause harm to key views of Ely Cathedral.
Site Name: Orwell Pit Farm
Parish: Ely CP
Site Ref: Site/10/05

Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
Site does not intersect Inner Zone

4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
More than 5km from site

4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

30 Year: 7.84%
100 Year: 3.24%
1,000 Year: 6.18%

Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact
No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
Access off Dullingham Road
NO access to A10 will be permitted - Principal Route for Transport
Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment, Travel Plan and Planning Performance Agreement. This should follow CCC TA guidelines and demonstrate how the site can be made accessible on foot, by cycle and by public transport together with identifying any remaining off-site highway implications and required mitigation. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6c. Proximity to shops
Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
Spare capacity in every year

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
Spare capacity in every year

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

6h. Proximity to employment sites
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
CWS located within site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

Minor Criteria
Site Ref: Site/10/05  
Parish: Ely CP  
Site Name: Orwell Pit Farm

Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

Parish Council support and rank

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Site promoter objects to rejection of site.
- Site assessment flawed as site will provide on-site infrastructure and facilities.
- Site can be readily assimilated into the landscape and will not have significant impacts on the character and setting of Ely.
- Progress of North Ely site (ELY.M1) indicates positive market conditions in locality – radical approaches required to meet housing shortfall.
- Site has similar characteristics to ELY.M1.
- Precedent for development west of the A10 already set by Sports and Leisure Hub.
- Site has clear boundaries and would be developed in phases, therefore would not harm landscape or setting of Ely.
- Views of Cathedral would be maintained.
- Sustainable location close to Ely’s services and facilities; well-related to Ely.
- Site could provide up to 2,000 dwellings, of which 600 affordable, self-build plots, a primary school and 5ha of employment land.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit: 10:05 09 August 2016

Supersedes site submission(s):

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is rejected as it is highly constrained by rail lines at boundaries and more than 50% of site is located in Flood Zone 3a.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B) ID: 16
Site Address: Land south of Ely Road, Queen Adelaide
Settlement: Queen Adelaide

LP15 Allocation Ref: Planning Perm. Ref:
Site Description: Orwell Pit Farm, Downham Road, Ely
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: Potential railway noise. Site lies in defended flood zone 3, managed by IDB and also defended by presence of railway embankments.
Current Use: Agriculture Proposed Use: Housing

Current Use info:
Proposed Use info:

Site Area Net (ha): 1.70 Site Area Gross (ha) 2
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 35 b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Small Village
1b. Site Availability Available for dev in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment
   This site lies almost entirely in the Transport Safeguarding Area for the Queen Adelaide Railhead, Ely, designated by Policy T2F of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012). The overarching policy is Policy CS23 of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011). This policy places a presumption against any development in the Transport Safeguarding Area which could prejudice the existing or potential use of the protected railhead for the transport of minerals and / or waste. Consideration must be given to this policy in the interests of deliverability.
   1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
   1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations T2F

2a. Flood zone >50% of site area in Zone 3a (housing site)
   | Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening): |
   | Flood Zone 1: | 7.14% | Flood Zone 2: | 1.02% | Flood Zone 3a: | 91.84% | Flood Zone 3b: | 0.00% |

Date and time of site visit: 10:05 09 August 2016

Supersedes site submission(s):
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**

**Site Ref:** Site/10/06

**Parish:** Ely CP

**Site Name:** Queen Adelaide South

### Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation</td>
<td>Site does not intersect Inner Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites</td>
<td>More than 5km from site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Flood Risk

- **Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr):**
  - 30 Year: 6.86%
  - 100 Year: 47.67%
  - 1,000 Year: 23.81%

### Access to Services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- Limited capacity

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Spare capacity in every year

### Environmental Impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 500m of site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification
- All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

---

**Railway to N and S boundary. Factory or works to S.**

**Insurmountable safety issues that cannot be secured in accordance with CIL regulations.**

**Has visibility problems at access with a Level Crossing to west and a bridge to the east. No safe highways access because of proximity to the level crossing.**

This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

---

**The College could be expanded from 1200 pupils 11-16 to 1500 pupils 11-16 on its present site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,200 new houses in the catchment area.**

---

The site would allow a small scale expansion but the school currently operates a 4 forms of entry which is the Council’s maximum size for a junior school under its current policies.

---

The site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): Yes

The site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): Yes
**Site Name:** Queen Adelaide South

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Parish:** Ely CP

**Site Ref:** Site/10/06

### 7e. Public Rights of Way
- **E – No PRoW connection opportunities**

### 7e.(i) PROW comments

### 7f. Conservation Area
- **CA within 500m of site**

### 7f.(ii) Listed building
- **LB within 1.01km – 2km of site**

### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
- **SAM more than 2km from site**

### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset
- **Archaeological assets within 500.1 – 1000m of site**

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

- **ECDC:** Wider impact on setting of Ely Cathedral would need to be considered

- **CCC:** Located on the E, fen side of Ely isle. Nearest known heritage asset is a 20thC gun emplacement (MCB15077) at 620m NE of proposal area. No objection and no archaeological requirement for this area. NGR 556390 381380

### 7h. Visual Impact
- **Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views**

### Justification for score:
- **No harm**

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
- **No TPO within 15m of the site**

### Parish Council support and rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does Parish Council support this site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council’s view:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
**Site Name:** Queen Adelaide North  
**Parish:** Ely CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/10/07  

**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Rejected  
**Date and time of site visit:** 10:25 09 August 2016  
**Main findings and recommendations:** The site is rejected on the basis that more than 50% of the site area is in flood zone 3a and safe access is unlikely to be achievable.

### Site Information

- **Site Type:** New site submission (Form B)  
- **Site Address:** Land north of Ely Road, Queen Adelaide  
- **Settlement:** Queen Adelaide  
- **LP15 Allocation Ref:**  
- **Planning Perm. Ref:**  
- **Site Description:** Land north of Ely Road, Queen Adelaide  
- **Brown/Greenfield:** Greenfield  
- **Known Constraints:** Potential railway noise. The agent indicates the site lies in defended Flood Zone 3 but has never flooded due to management of surface water by IDB and also presence of the railway embankments.  
- **Current Use:** Agriculture  
- **Proposed Use:** Housing  
- **Site Area Net (ha):** 1.73  
- **Site Area Gross (ha):** 2.3  
- **Indicative no. of dwellings:** a) Submitted / estimated 35  
- **Polygons (ha):** 2.5  

### Major Criteria

1. **Settlement Hierarchy**  
   - Small Village  

2. **Site Availability**  
   - Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)  

3. **Minerals and Waste assessment**

4. **Flood zone**
   - Flood Zone 1: 2.79%  
   - Flood Zone 2: 0.80%  
   - Flood Zone 3a: 96.41%  
   - Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%  

5. **Surface Water flood risk**
   - Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA  

**Date and time of site visit:** 10:25 09 August 2016  
**Supersedes site submission(s):**
Site Name: Queen Adelaide North

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>5. Site Suitability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
<td>Site within 50m of contaminated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td>Railway on W boundary. Factory or works 74m to SW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>Insurmountable safety issues that cannot be secured in accordance with CIL regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment | Visibity issues to the west  
Constrained access  
This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Access to services</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Less than 20 min walk (&lt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Less than 20 min walk (&lt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Less than 15 min walk (&lt;1,200m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>Spare capacity in every year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>The site would allow a small scale expansion but the school currently operates a 4 forms of entry which is the Council’s maximum size for a junior school under its current policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>The College could be expanded from 1200 pupils 11-16 to 1500 pupils 11-16 on its present site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,200 new houses in the catchment area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6h. Proximity to employment sites</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Environmental impact</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td>CWS within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers | |
| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower |
| 7e. Public Rights of Way | E – No PRoW connection opportunities |
| 7e.(i) PROW comments | |
| 7f.(i) Conservation Area | CA within 500m of site | D |
| 7f.(ii). Listed building | LB within 1.01km – 2km of site | B |
| 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument | SAM more than 2km from site | A |
| 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset | Archaeological assets within 1.01km – 2km of site | B |

**7g. Heritage / archaeology comments**

ECDC: Wider impact on setting of conservation area and cathedral would need to be considered

CCC: Low archaeological potential. No objection and no archaeological requirement for this area. 556210 281690

**7h. Visual Impact**

Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views | C |

**Justification for score:**

Possible harm to views from existing dwellings, but not confirmed as unable to access site rear.

**Additional criterion 7i. TPOs**

No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

**Parish Council support and rank**

**Does Parish Council support this site?**

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council's view:**

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**  
Site Name: **Queen Adelaide Farmland**  
Parish: **Ely CP**  
Site Ref: **Site/10/08**

### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

- **Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Rejected
- **Date and time of site visit:** 10:20 09 August 2016
- **Supersedes site submission(s):**
- **Main findings and recommendations:**

  The site is rejected on the basis that need for this provision is not justified and the site is currently inaccessible.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
<th>ID:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Land north of Ely Road, Queen Adelaide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Queen Adelaide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>Farmland north of Ely Road, Queen Adelaide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints</td>
<td>The agent indicates the site lies in defended Flood Zone 3 but has never flooded due to management of surface water by the local IDB and also the presence of the railway embankments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use</td>
<td>Open space/outdoor recreation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td>Possible country park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>18.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Recommended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Criteria

**1a. Settlement Hierarchy**  
Small Village

**1b. Site Availability**  

**1c. Minerals and Waste assessment**

This site lies almost entirely within the Safeguarding Area for the Ely Waste Water Treatment Works Area of Search for a new Waste Water Treatment Works (Policy W7N and Policy W6A) designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012). The overarching policies are Policy CS17 and Policy CS31 of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011). Policy CS31 places a presumption against allowing development which would be occupied by people; and which may prejudice, in this case, the planned works. Any new waste water treatment works is now likely to be north of the railway line; and consideration should be given to these policies prior to allocation in the interests of deliverability.

**1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies**  

**1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations**  
W7N, W6A

**2a. Flood zone**  
>50% of site area in Zone 3a (employment sites)

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Queen Adelaide Farmland
Parish: Ely CP
Site Ref: Site/10/08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1:</th>
<th>39.66%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2:</th>
<th>2.04%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a:</th>
<th>58.30%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b:</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (% of site area at risk (uFMISW)):

| Flood Zone 1 | 27.61% | Flood Zone 2 | 8.31% | Flood Zone 3a | 9.18% |

Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): Yes
Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): Yes

3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
Site does not intersect Inner Zone

4a. Proximity to internationally/ nationally important wildlife sites
More than 5km from site

4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
Site within 50m of contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
Borders unknown filled ground to S.

5b. Local road impact
No objections with minor mitigation measures

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
NO highways frontage OR shown access to highway
Unable to ascertain how highways frontage will be gained
CCC RoW team should be consulted
The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

6c. Proximity to shops
Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
Limited capacity

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
Spare capacity in every year

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
The site would allow a small scale expansion but the school currently operates a 4 forms of entry which is the Council’s maximum size for a junior school under its current policies.

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
The College could be expanded from 1200 pupils 11-16 to 1500 pupils 11-16 on its present site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,200 new houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
CWS within 500m of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PROW within the site boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**

Site Name: **Greenacre Farm 1) West of Beald Drove; & East of Beald Drove**

**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Rejected**

Date and time of site visit:

09:35 09 August 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:

The site is rejected on the basis that, safe access is unlikely to be achievable; development would likely result in negative visual impacts and would be considered an intrusion into the countryside; the site is physically separate from Ely as it is located beyond the A10 boundary; and would likely result in harm to views of Ely Cathedral from Little Downham village.

**Site Information**

| Site Type: | New site submission (Form B) |
| Settlemnet: | City of Ely |
| Site Description: | Site split into two parcels by Beald Drove. East parcel proposed for housing (8.3ha). West parcel proposed for employment (6.3ha). |
| Brown/Greenfield: | Greenfield |
| Known Constraints: | County Wildlife Site designation. Community-led development can be discussed further. |
| Current Use: | Agriculture |
| Site Area Net (ha): | 8.76 |
| Site Area Gross (ha): | 14.6 |
| Indicative no. of dwellings: | a) Submitted / estimated 200 b) Recommended 0 |

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone >50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

Flood Zone 1: [ ] Flood Zone 2: [ ] Flood Zone 3a: [ ] Flood Zone 3b: [ ]

2b. Surface Water flood risk Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

30 Year: [ ] 100 Year: [ ] 1,000 Year: [ ]
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Site Name:** Greenacre Farm 1) West of Beald Drove; & East of Beald Drove

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation | Site does not intersect Inner Zone |

4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites | More than 5km from site |

4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment |

### Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land | Site located more than 250m from contaminated land |

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment |

5b. Local road impact | Insurmountable safety issues that cannot be secured in accordance with CIL regulations |

5c. Strategic Road Network impact |

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment |

Access can only be achieved via West End. This is an existing accident cluster site

Ruled out by HDM comment

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) |

6b. Proximity to medical services | Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m) |

6c. Proximity to shops | Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m) |

6d. Proximity to Primary School | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) |

6e. Proximity to Secondary School | Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m) |

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity | No spare places, no room for expansion |

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity | Limited capacity |

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment |

The school has the physical capacity for 420 pupils. It currently has close to 480 pupils on roll and it has two temporary classrooms providing 60 additional places. The site is under size for the present number of pupils

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity |

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment |

The College could be expanded from 1200 pupils 11-16 to 1500 pupils 11-16 on its present site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,200 new houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) |

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites | CWS located within site |

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment |

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers |

7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower |

7e. Public Rights of Way | C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PROw within the site boundary |

7e.(i) PROW comments |
### Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

**Site Name:** Greenacre Farm 1) West of Beald Drove; & East of Beald Drove

**Parish:** Ely CP

**Site Ref:** Site/10/09

BOAT 47 Downham and BOAT 45 Ely are situated to the north of the east parcel of land. Provide a link across the site from the existing housing to the east of the A10 near Brooke Grove to the BOATs. To ensure the safety of users crossing the A10 may require a bridge. There will be a need for a safe crossing somewhere along the A10 in this north east corner of Ely to service the proposed development sites 10/10, 10/20 10/05, 10/13 10/07 and 10/23.

#### 7f.(i) Conservation Area
- CA within 500.1 – 1000m of site
- Score: C

#### 7f.(ii) Listed building
- LB within 500.1 – 1000m of site
- Score: C

#### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
- SAM within 500.1 – 1000m of site
- Score: C

#### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset
- Archaeological assets on-site
- Score: E

### Heritage / archaeology comments

**HE:** 10/09 and 10/10: propose housing beyond the A10 border to the west of Ely which would erode the quintessential view identified in the Ely Environmental Capacity Study of 2001 from Little Downham Island. As the report states at page 19: “These views are distinctive in that the Cathedral is seen as the highest point of the town. Whilst the town surrounds the Cathedral, views to the Cathedral from this direction are often seen against the sun, so that the Cathedral is seen in silhouette and the surrounding town is in shadow and therefore less distinctive or dominant in the view.”

**CCC:** Site 10/09(i) (NGR 552610 282840) - within the proposal area are linear ditches, ring ditches and a range of other features are visible in aerial photographs of this area (MCB8647). 10/09 (ii) (NGR 552380 280880) WW2 searchlight in this area straddling sites (i) and (ii). At 700m distance to the SW of site (ii) are HER entries for Iron Age settlement remains (MCB9502) and a 17th century Brick kiln (MCB12863). Requires pre-determination fieldwork to enable evidence base to be supplied with any planning application.

#### 7h. Visual Impact
- Significant harm to landscape/townscape or key views - severe visual intrusion
- Score: E

**Justification for score:**
Wrong side of A10. Feels like a severe intrusion into countryside.

### Additional criterion 7l. TPOs
- TPO tree within 15m of the site
- Score: B

### Parish Council support and rank

**Does Parish Council support this site?**

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Rejected**

Date and time of site visit: 09:30 09 August 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is rejected on the basis that, safe access is unlikely to be achievable; development would likely result in negative visual impacts and would be considered an intrusion into the countryside; the site is physically separate from Ely as it is located beyond the A10 boundary; and development of the site could harm views of Ely Cathedral from Little Downham village.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  ID: 20

Site Address: Land east of Hurst Lane

Settlement: City of Ely

LP15 Allocation Ref:

Planning Perm. Ref:

Site Description: Land east of Hurst Lane

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints: None known

Current Use: Agriculture  Proposed Use: Leisure facility (commercial)

Current Use info:

Proposed Use info: Leisure/recreation including commercial leisure

Site Area Net (ha): 4.56  Site Area Gross (ha): 7.6

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 164  b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone  >50% of site area in Zone 1

| Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening): |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Flood Zone 1:   | 100.00%         | Flood Zone 2:   | 0.00%           | Flood Zone 3a:  | 0.00%           | Flood Zone 3b:  | 0.00%           |

2b. Surface Water flood risk  Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

| Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW): |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 30 Year:        | 8.13%           | 100 Year:       | 6.52%           | 1,000 Year:     | 22.62%          |
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Greenacre Farm (North)  
**Parish:** Ely CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/10/10

| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No |

3. **Proximity to Hazardous Installation**  
   N/a - employment site

4a. **Proximity to internationally/nationally important wildlife sites**  
   More than 5km from site

4b. **European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. <strong>Proximity to contaminated land</strong></th>
<th>Site located more than 250m from contaminated land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a.(i) <strong>Contaminated land professional assessment</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5b. <strong>Local road impact</strong></th>
<th>Insurmountable safety issues that cannot be secured in accordance with CIL regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5c. <strong>Strategic Road Network impact</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5d. <strong>Transport impacts - professional assessment</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Access can only be achieved via West End. This is an existing accident cluster site  
Ruled out by HDM comment

## 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6a. <strong>Proximity to public transport</strong></th>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6b. <strong>Proximity to medical services</strong></th>
<th>Less than 15 min walk (&lt;1,200m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6c. <strong>Proximity to shops</strong></th>
<th>Less than 15 min walk (&lt;1,200m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6d. <strong>Proximity to Primary School</strong></th>
<th>Less than 15 min walk (&lt;1,200m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6e. <strong>Proximity to Secondary School</strong></th>
<th>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6f.(i) <strong>Available primary school capacity</strong></th>
<th>No spare places but room for expansion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6g.(i) <strong>Primary education impacts - professional assessment</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The school currently has capacity for 420 pupils. There are currently 450 on roll as 30 places are provided in a mobile classroom. Some expansion is possible on site but it would be difficult and expensive as The Lantern was designed as a modern 2FE Primary School.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6f.(ii) <strong>Available secondary school capacity</strong></th>
<th>Limited capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6g.(ii) <strong>Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The College could be expanded from 1200 pupils 11-16 to 1500 pupils 11-16 on its present site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,200 new houses in the catchment area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6h. <strong>Proximity to employment sites</strong></th>
<th>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7a. <strong>Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</strong></th>
<th>CWS within 500m of site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7b. <strong>County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7c. <strong>Groundwater PZ and aquifers</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7d. <strong>Agricultural land classification</strong></th>
<th>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7e. <strong>Public Rights of Way</strong></th>
<th>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7e.(i) <strong>PROW comments</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Site Name:** Greenacre Farm (North)

There will be a need for a safe crossing somewhere along the A10 in this north east corner of Ely to service the proposed development sites 10/10, 10/20 10/05, 10/13 10/07 and 10/23.

7f.(i) Conservation Area

| CA within 500.1 – 1000m of site | C |

7f.(ii). Listed building

| LB within 500.1 – 1000m of site | C |

7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

| SAM within 500.1 – 1000m of site | C |

7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

| Archaeological assets on-site | E |

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

ECDC: Wider impact on setting of Ely Cathedral would need to be considered

HE: 10/09 and 10/10: propose housing beyond the A10 border to the west of Ely which would erode the quintessential view identified in the Ely Environmental Capacity Study of 2001 from Little Downham Island. As the report states at page 19: “These views are distinctive in that the Cathedral is seen as the highest point of the town. Whilst the town surrounds the Cathedral, views to the Cathedral from this direction are often seen against the sun, so that the Cathedral is seen in silhouette and the surrounding town is in shadow and therefore less distinctive or dominant in the view.”

CCC: Portable Antiquities Scheme database records Medieval and Post-Medieval metal work (furniture fittings, tokens, backplate etc). The proposal area lies between two known areas of Iron Age settlement to W and E (MCB15008, MCB19926). Excavations at Hurst Lane Reservoir also demonstrated earlier settlement remains (MCB17781). Requires pre-determination fieldwork to enable evidence base to be supplied with any planning application. NGR 552820 281220

7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

| Archaeological assets on-site | E |

7f.(v) Archaeological asset

| Archaeological assets on-site | E |

7f.(vi) Scheduled Ancient Monument

| SAM within 250.1 – 1000m of site | D |

7h. Visual Impact

| Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive | D |

Justification for score:

Not sensitive landscape. No important views. However would increase development outside confines of A10.

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

| No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

**Parish Council support and rank**

Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Site promoter objects to rejection of site, and to site assessment process and findings - suggests proposal was misunderstood.
- Proposed use sought was recreational/leisure i.e. playing fields/sports facilities, including some commercial facilities – such as gym/spa, garden centre. Private sports clubs.
- Net area calculation not appropriate.
- Assessment assumes access via West End. However it is intended that access would be taken from adjacent Sports and Leisure Hub.
- Recreational uses will have less visual impact than other types of development.
- Site should be reassessed.
- Comprehensive assessment of formal open space is required to ensure needs of growth are met. Site/10/10 should be reassessed in light of this assessment.
- Site should be allocated to provide an extension to Sports and Leisure Hub.
- Site would support recreation needs of Ely North development (ELY.M1).
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Rejected**

Date and time of site visit: 14:50 29 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s):

Main findings and recommendations:

The site is physically separate from the built area of Ely and is rejected principally on this basis. In addition, the site has potential to impact on distant views of the countryside from Ely, and on the setting of the Cathedral and historic city. Noise impacts from A10 could affect residential amenity.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
<th>ID:</th>
<th>48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land to the south of Ely golf club and to the east of Cambridge Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>City of Ely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Agricultural land to the south of Ely golf club and to the east of Cambridge Road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Form B indicates site could provide 230 - 267 homes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>9.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated</td>
<td>267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Recommended</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Main Settlement</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b. Site Availability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Minerals and Waste assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Flood zone</td>
<td>&gt;50% of site area in Zone 1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 1:</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 2:</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3a:</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3b:</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Surface Water flood risk</td>
<td>Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Year:</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Year:</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 Year:</td>
<td>1.85%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land to the south of Ely golf club and to the east of Cambridge Road  
**Parish:** Ely CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/10/14

| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No |

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- More than 5km from site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No |

#### Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

#### 5b. Local road impact
- No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

Access off Cambridge Road  
NO access to A10 will be permitted - Principal Route for Transport  
Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on 267 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines and demonstrate how the site can be made accessible on foot, by cycle and by public transport together with identifying any remaining off-site highway implications and required mitigation. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area.  
CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of sites 10/04 and 10/05 the cumulative impact could be significant. The two developments will require a joint master plan and joint mitigation strategy as part of the assessment to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.

#### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places, no room for expansion

#### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

The school has the physical capacity for 420 pupils. It currently has close to 480 pupils on roll and it has two temporary classrooms providing 60 additional places. The site is under size for the present number of pupils.

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Spare capacity in every year

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded from 1200 pupils 11-16 to 1500 pupils 11-16 on its present site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,200 new houses in the catchment area.

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

#### Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 500m of site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
**Site Name:** Land to the south of Ely golf club and to the east of Cambridge Road

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Parish:** Ely CP

**Site Ref:** Site/10/14

### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

### 7d. Agricultural land classification

| All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower | D |

### 7e. Public Rights of Way

| C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PROW within the site boundary | C |

### 7f. PROW comments

### 7f.(i) Conservation Area

| CA within 500.1 – 1000m of site | C |

### 7f.(ii) Listed building

| LB within 500.1 – 1000m of site | C |

### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

| SAM within 500.1 – 1000m of site | C |

### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

| Archaeological assets on-site | E |

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

HE: Conservation area and listed building to the north - likely to have a minimal impact on designated heritage assets.

ECDC: 10/14 and 10/15: we would repeat our advice in our letter of 11 August 2014 to the previous local plan process.

CCC: Rectangular cropmarked enclosure is within area (MCB8405) NGR 553230 278960. MCB16800 Neolithic flints and Medieval pottery known 200m to NE. Multi-period evidence (prehistoric-Med: MCB13727 and others) from by-pass to south. Previous advice to Local Plan consultation in 2014 for pre-determination field work evidence to be supplied with any planning application is upheld.

### 7h. Visual Impact

| Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive | D |

**Justification for score:**


### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

| No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

### Parish Council support and rank

**Does Parish Council support this site?**

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council's view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received

**Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:**

- Site promoter objects to rejection of site.
- Site can make a valuable contribution to supply of housing land.
- Site is in a sustainable location as it is in close proximity of Ely’s main urban area, with pedestrian/cycle/public transport access to its wide range of services and facilities.
- Disagrees which Site Assessment Evidence Report, which suggests site is physically separate from Ely – as site can be developed in conjunction with Site/10/15.
- Separation is as a result of Ely golf club; however this is not open countryside and is urbanised in form.
- Site has clear, defensible boundary. Proposed highways works along A142 and A10 will strengthen the boundary of the site.
- Minimal impact on distant views of Ely Cathedral, due to topography and vegetation.
- Noise from A10 can be easily mitigated through design and layout.
- Development would be a logical extension to Ely.
Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit: 14:40 29 July 2016

Main findings and recommendations:
Whilst not particularly constrained from a technical perspective, development of this site would have a significant adverse impact on the setting of the historic city of Ely.

Site Information
Site Type: New site submission (Form B) ID: 49
Site Address: Land to the south of Witchford Road, Ely
Settlement: City of Ely
LP15 Allocation Ref:
Planning Perm. Ref:
Site Description: Agricultural land to the south of Witchford Road, Ely
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: Form B indicates site could deliver 334 - 390 dwellings
Current Use: Agriculture Proposed Use: Housing
Current Use info:
Proposed Use info:
Site Area Net (ha): 10.02 Site Area Gross (ha) 16.7
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 390 b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria
1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Main Settlement
1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00% Flood Zone 2: 0.00% Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
30 Year: 8.45% 100 Year: 3.45% 1,000 Year: 6.32%

Date and time of site visit: 14:40 29 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Parish:** Ely CP  
**Site Name:** Land to the south of Witchford Road, Ely  
**Site Ref:** Site/10/15

| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No |

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- More than 5km from site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

#### 5. Site Suitability

##### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site within 250m of contaminated land

##### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

- Former hospital 208m to N.

##### 5b. Local road impact
- No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations

##### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

##### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

- Access off Cambridge Road OR Witchford Road
- NO access to A10 will be permitted - Pincipal Route for Transport
- Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

- The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on 390 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines and demonstrate how the site can be made accessible on foot, by cycle and by public transport together with identifying any remaining off-site highway implications and required mitigation. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of sites 10/04 and 10/05 the cumulative impact could be significant. The two developments will require a joint master plan and joint mitigation strategy as part of the assessment to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.

##### 6. Access to services

##### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

##### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

##### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

##### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

##### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places, no room for expansion

##### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Spare capacity in every year

##### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

- The school has the physical capacity for 420 pupils. It currently has close to 480 pupils on roll and it has two temporary classrooms providing 60 additional places. The site is under size for the present number of pupils

##### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

- The College could be expanded from 1200 pupils 11-16 to 1500 pupils 11-16 on its present site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,200 new houses in the catchment area.

##### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 501m – 1km of site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Land to the south of Witchford Road, Ely
Parish: Ely CP
Site Ref: Site/10/15

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification
All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

7e. Public Rights of Way
C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary

7f. (i) PROW comments

7f. (i) Conservation Area
CA within 500m of site

7f. (ii) Listed building
LB within 500m of site

7f. (iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
SAM within 500.1 – 1000m of site

7f. (iv) Archaeological asset
Archaeological assets within 500m of site

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

ECDC: No heritage impact

ECDC: 10/14 and 10/15: we would repeat our advice in our letter of 11 August 2014 to the previous local plan process.

CCC: Cropmarked settlement and enclosures to the immediate south (MCB12136) likely of Roman date, but with prehistoric and Early Medieval artefact associations. Anglo-Saxon cemetery and post-medieval features excavated in plot to the immediate N (MCB16830). Local Plan consultation response in 2014 for Witchford Road, land south of, was for pre-determination fieldwork evidence base needed to be supplied with any planning application and is upheld here. NGR 553000 279330

7h. Visual Impact
Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive

Justification for score:

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
No TPO within 15m of the site

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

• Site promoter objects to rejection of site.
• Site can make a valuable contribution to supply of housing land, and is suitable, available and deliverable.
• Site is in a sustainable location as it is in close proximity of Ely’s main urban area, with pedestrian/cycle/public transport access to its wide range of services and facilities.
• Strongly disagree with findings that site will have significant adverse impact of historic City of Ely – site is over 500m from Conservation Area, 0.8km from nearest listed building, with views restricted by topography and built form.
• Opportunities to establish a strong accessible green fringe to the City.
• Any landscape impacts can be addressed through design and mitigation measures.
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Cathedral Marina
Parish: Ely CP
Site Ref: Site/10/17

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected
Date and time of site visit: 15:50 29 July 2016
Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site should be rejected on the basis that suitable highway access is unlikely to be achievable, and development of the site would likely impact on the distinctive townscape.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Waterside, Ely, CB7 4 AU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>City of Ely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Parcel of land located between the River Great Ouse and the Fen Line railway line currently in use as marina and associated workshops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>The Cathedral Marina is a parcel of land located between the River Great Ouse and the Fen Line railway line to the east of the city. The site covers an area of approximately 3ha and is suitable for residential development. The site is compared to the relevant assessment methodology criteria set out by the Council. This brownfield site is located in Ely and therefore falls within the highest tier of settlements within the District (criterion 1b). There are opportunities to maintain the existing function of the marina and associated workshops alongside the future development of the site for residential use. In total, this site could deliver c.80 dwellings (based on the Council’s methodology of 75% net developable ratio for sites between 2.01ha and 10ha, and a density of 36dph), however a range of designs and layout opportunities could mean the site delivers up to 150 units. There is currently only one allocation within Ely that will deliver residential development in the area. This site, located to the north of the town, is significant in size and therefore there can be some level of uncertainty as to when and how development will come forward. The council needs to take different types of site into consideration in order to ensure the rate of housing supply delivery is maintained and accelerated given the needs of the District. The Cathedral Marina site represents a readily available and developable site that could help meet the needs of the District in the immediate future (criterion 1b). It will also help to diversify the range of development site opportunities within the District to ensure a constant supply of housing can be brought forward. The site is approximately a 10 minute walk from the town centre where there are a range of shops and services (criterion 6b/c/d/e). The nearest supermarket is less than 0.5 miles away. There are a number of bus stops located in the town centre that provide routes to a range of locations across the District (criterion 6a). Ely train station is a 10 minute walk from the site with a range of services provided by CrossCountry, East Midlands Trains, Great Northern and Greater Anglia to destinations both locally and nationally. Given the range of public transport facilities available in close proximity to the site, there are mitigating measures that can be put in place to reduce the need of the car (criterion 5b/c/d).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The site is therefore considered a highly sustainable location to bring forward for development, following the guiding principles of the NPPF and the Local Plan. The only known constraint at this stage is that parts of the site are covered by Flood zone 1, 2 and Flood Zone 3, as identified on the Environment Agency's mapping facility (criterion 2).

However it should be noted that only a small parcel of the site is located within Flood Zone 3, a sensitively designed scheme could be introduced to mitigate against the need to use this area of the site. The land is not believed to be contaminated at this stage (criterion 5a). This site represents a significant opportunity for the Council to enable a high quality, waterside development that will enhance the townscape of Ely. The site, in its current form, does not contribute to the city. Allowing new residential development to come forward on the site will help to enhance the town whilst also contributing to the housing targets currently proposed in the Preliminary Draft Local Plan.

The site is located in the Safekeeping Area for the Ely (Old) Waste Water Treatment Works (Policy W7M) designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012). The overarching policy for this designation is Policy CS31 of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011). This policy places a presumption against allowing development which would be occupied by people (residential, industrial, commercial, sport and recreation); and where new development is proposed an odour assessment report should accompany any planning application. Permission should only be granted when it has been demonstrated that the proposed development would not be adversely affected by the continued operation of the existing waste water treatment works. It is suggested that consideration should be given to these policies prior to allocation in the interests of deliverability.

This site lies almost entirely within the Safeguarding Area for the Ely (Old) Waste Water Treatment Works (Policy W7M) designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012). The overarching policy for this designation is Policy CS31 of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011). This policy places a presumption against allowing development which would be occupied by people (residential, industrial, commercial, sport and recreation); and where new development is proposed an odour assessment report should accompany any planning application. Permission should only be granted when it has been demonstrated that the proposed development would not be adversely affected by the continued operation of the existing waste water treatment works. It is suggested that consideration should be given to these policies prior to allocation in the interests of deliverability.

The site is located in the Safekeeping Area for the Ely (Old) Waste Water Treatment Works (Policy W7M) designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012). The overarching policy for this designation is Policy CS31 of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011). This policy places a presumption against allowing development which would be occupied by people (residential, industrial, commercial, sport and recreation); and where new development is proposed an odour assessment report should accompany any planning application. Permission should only be granted when it has been demonstrated that the proposed development would not be adversely affected by the continued operation of the existing waste water treatment works. It is suggested that consideration should be given to these policies prior to allocation in the interests of deliverability.

The site is therefore considered a highly sustainable location to bring forward for development, following the guiding principles of the NPPF and the Local Plan. The only known constraint at this stage is that parts of the site are covered by Flood zone 1, 2 and Flood Zone 3, as identified on the Environment Agency's mapping facility (criterion 2).

However it should be noted that only a small parcel of the site is located within Flood Zone 3, a sensitively designed scheme could be introduced to mitigate against the need to use this area of the site. The land is not believed to be contaminated at this stage (criterion 5a). This site represents a significant opportunity for the Council to enable a high quality, waterside development that will enhance the townscape of Ely. The site, in its current form, does not contribute to the city. Allowing new residential development to come forward on the site will help to enhance the town whilst also contributing to the housing targets currently proposed in the Preliminary Draft Local Plan.

The site is therefore considered a highly sustainable location to bring forward for development, following the guiding principles of the NPPF and the Local Plan. The only known constraint at this stage is that parts of the site are covered by Flood zone 1, 2 and Flood Zone 3, as identified on the Environment Agency's mapping facility (criterion 2).

However it should be noted that only a small parcel of the site is located within Flood Zone 3, a sensitively designed scheme could be introduced to mitigate against the need to use this area of the site. The land is not believed to be contaminated at this stage (criterion 5a). This site represents a significant opportunity for the Council to enable a high quality, waterside development that will enhance the townscape of Ely. The site, in its current form, does not contribute to the city. Allowing new residential development to come forward on the site will help to enhance the town whilst also contributing to the housing targets currently proposed in the Preliminary Draft Local Plan.

The site is therefore considered a highly sustainable location to bring forward for development, following the guiding principles of the NPPF and the Local Plan. The only known constraint at this stage is that parts of the site are covered by Flood zone 1, 2 and Flood Zone 3, as identified on the Environment Agency's mapping facility (criterion 2).

However it should be noted that only a small parcel of the site is located within Flood Zone 3, a sensitively designed scheme could be introduced to mitigate against the need to use this area of the site. The land is not believed to be contaminated at this stage (criterion 5a). This site represents a significant opportunity for the Council to enable a high quality, waterside development that will enhance the townscape of Ely. The site, in its current form, does not contribute to the city. Allowing new residential development to come forward on the site will help to enhance the town whilst also contributing to the housing targets currently proposed in the Preliminary Draft Local Plan.

The site is therefore considered a highly sustainable location to bring forward for development, following the guiding principles of the NPPF and the Local Plan. The only known constraint at this stage is that parts of the site are covered by Flood zone 1, 2 and Flood Zone 3, as identified on the Environment Agency's mapping facility (criterion 2).

However it should be noted that only a small parcel of the site is located within Flood Zone 3, a sensitively designed scheme could be introduced to mitigate against the need to use this area of the site. The land is not believed to be contaminated at this stage (criterion 5a). This site represents a significant opportunity for the Council to enable a high quality, waterside development that will enhance the townscape of Ely. The site, in its current form, does not contribute to the city. Allowing new residential development to come forward on the site will help to enhance the town whilst also contributing to the housing targets currently proposed in the Preliminary Draft Local Plan.

The site is therefore considered a highly sustainable location to bring forward for development, following the guiding principles of the NPPF and the Local Plan. The only known constraint at this stage is that parts of the site are covered by Flood zone 1, 2 and Flood Zone 3, as identified on the Environment Agency's mapping facility (criterion 2).

However it should be noted that only a small parcel of the site is located within Flood Zone 3, a sensitively designed scheme could be introduced to mitigate against the need to use this area of the site. The land is not believed to be contaminated at this stage (criterion 5a). This site represents a significant opportunity for the Council to enable a high quality, waterside development that will enhance the townscape of Ely. The site, in its current form, does not contribute to the city. Allowing new residential development to come forward on the site will help to enhance the town whilst also contributing to the housing targets currently proposed in the Preliminary Draft Local Plan.
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
<td>Site within 50m of contaminated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td>Factory or works on W boundary. Sewage works 46m to NW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>No objections with minor mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>NO highways frontage OR shown access to public highway therefore it must be assumed access will be via private bridge. Highways Authority will not be able adopt this structure. The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment based on 150 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Ely and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Ely the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Less than 15 min walk (&lt;1,200m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Less than 20 min walk (&lt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Less than 20 min walk (&lt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>Spare capacity in every year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6h. Proximity to employment sites</td>
<td>Less than 20 min walk (&lt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td>CWS located within site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>Site is not located on argicultural land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td>Footpath 36 runs along the northern boundary of the site. Footpath 22 runs along the the south west boundary of the site and between this site and Site 19 and crosses the railway line to link to the Rights of Way network. This link may require diverting to allow development to take place but should be preserved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f. Conservation Area</td>
<td>Site is within CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f. Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f. Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f. Archaeological asset</td>
<td>Archaeological assets on-site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Heritage / archaeology comments**

ECDC: Several listed buildings and within the conservation area - views across to the Cathedral will be key

HE: 10/17: in conservation area.

CCC: This area, locally known as Babylon, has been used for boat building for hundreds of years. A cast iron crane is still in use, but most of earlier industrial activity has been cleared for modern use (MCB16601). Medieval pottery wasters from the late Medieval Babylon pottery kilns found here (MBCB2609). Any development will need to be sympathetically designed to prevent settings of, and views into and out of the scheduled remains of the Castle site at Cherry Hill c. 200m west of the proposal area (NHLE 1006915). NGR 555530 280040 Archaeological recommendations will need to respond specifically to types of construction impact.

**Additional criterion 7i. TPOs**

TPO tree on site | C

**Parish Council support and rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council’s view:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Parish:** Ely CP  
**Site Name:** Existing mixed-use allocation, Waitrose car park area  
**Site Ref:** Site/10/21

### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:**

**Supersedes site submission(s)**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. The site is located within the built area of Ely and is within the development envelope. However it is no longer considered likely that the site will be delivered in the plan period and should therefore be rejected.

### Site Information

**Site Type:** Local Plan 2015 allocated site

**Site Address:** Waitrose, Brays Lane, Ely

**Settlement:** City of Ely

**LP15 Allocation Ref:** ELY4

**Planning Perm. Ref:**

**Site Description:** Existing mixed-use allocation, Waitrose car park area

**Brown/Greenfield:** Brownfield

**Known Constraints:**

**Current Use:** Retail

**Proposed Use info:**

**Indicative no. of dwellings:**

| a) Submitted / estimated | 20 |
| b) Recommended | 0 |

### Major Criteria

1. **Settlement Hierarchy**

   **Main Settlement**

2. **Site Availability**

3. **Minerals and Waste assessment**

4. **Flood zone**

   **Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

   | Flood Zone 1 | 100.00% |
   | Flood Zone 2 | 0.00%   |
   | Flood Zone 3a | 0.00% |
   | Flood Zone 3b | 0.00% |

5. **Surface Water flood risk**

   Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

   **Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFtMSW):**

   | 30 Year | 0.00% |
   | 100 Year | 0.00% | 1,000 Year | 9.59% |
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**  
**Site Name:**  **Existing mixed-use allocation, Waitrose car park area**  
**Parish:**  **Ely CP**  
**Site Ref:**  **Site/10/21**

| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No |

3. **Proximity to Hazardous Installation**  
Site does not intersect Inner Zone

4a. **Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites**  
More than 5km from site

4b. **European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Site Suitability</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a. <strong>Proximity to contaminated land</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 5b. **Local road impact** |
| 5c. **Strategic Road Network impact** |
| 5d. **Transport impacts - professional assessment** |

5. **Site Suitability**

| 5a. **Proximity to contaminated land** |
| 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment |

| 5b. **Local road impact** |
| 5c. **Strategic Road Network impact** |
| 5d. **Transport impacts - professional assessment** |

| 6. **Access to services** |
| 6a. **Proximity to public transport** | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) |
| 6b. **Proximity to medical services** | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) |
| 6c. **Proximity to shops** | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) |
| 6d. **Proximity to Primary School** | Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m) |
| 6e. **Proximity to Secondary School** | Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m) |
| 6f.(i) **Available primary school capacity** | No spare places but room for expansion |
| 6f.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment |
| 6g.(i) **Primary education impacts - professional assessment** |
| 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment |

6. **Access to services**

| 6a. **Proximity to public transport** | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) |
| 6b. **Proximity to medical services** | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) |
| 6c. **Proximity to shops** | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) |
| 6d. **Proximity to Primary School** | Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m) |
| 6e. **Proximity to Secondary School** | Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m) |
| 6f.(i) **Available primary school capacity** | No spare places but room for expansion |
| 6f.(ii) **Available secondary school capacity** | Spare capacity in every year |
| 6g.(i) **Primary education impacts - professional assessment** |
| 6g.(ii) **Primary education impacts - professional assessment** |

| 6h. **Proximity to employment sites** | Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m) |

| 7. **Environmental impact** |
| 7a. **Proximity to County Wildlife Sites** | CWS within 500m of site |
| 7b. **County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment** |

| 7c. **Groundwater PZ and aquifers** |
| 7d. **Agricultural land classification** | Site is not located on agricultural land |
| 7e. **Public Rights of Way** | C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary |
| 7e.(i) **PROW comments** |

| 7. **Environmental impact** |
| 7a. **Proximity to County Wildlife Sites** | CWS within 500m of site |
| 7b. **County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment** |

| 7c. **Groundwater PZ and aquifers** |
| 7d. **Agricultural land classification** | Site is not located on agricultural land |
| 7e. **Public Rights of Way** | C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary |
| 7e.(i) **PROW comments** |
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Existing mixed-use allocation, Waitrose car park area  
**Parish:** Ely CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/10/21

### Footpath 32 runs from Nutholt Lane to the north of the site. Provide a footpath link across the site from this footpath to Bray's Lane

#### 7f.(i) Conservation Area
- Site is within CA

#### 7f.(ii). Listed building
- LB within 500m of site

#### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
- SAM within 500m of site

#### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset
- Archaeological assets on-site

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

- ECDC: Already allocated - same issues as before
- CCC: Land excavated in 1991 (ECB2454. Waitrose Brays Lane). No further requirement NGR 554370 280490

### 7h. Visual Impact

Justification for score:

### Additional criterion 7l. TPOs
- No TPO within 15m of the site

### Parish Council support and rank

- Does Parish Council support this site?
- Form E - Parish Council site ranking:
- Form G - Parish Council's view:

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Existing mixed-use allocation, land north of Nutholt Lane
Parish: Ely CP
Site Ref: Site/10/22

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected
Date and time of site visit:
Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. The site is located within the built area of Ely and is within the development envelope. However it is no longer considered likely that the site will be delivered in the plan period and should therefore be rejected.

Site Information

| Site Type: | Local Plan 2015 allocated site |
| Site Address: | Land north of Nutholt Lane, Ely |
| Settlement: | City of Ely |
| LP15 Allocation Ref: | ELY5 |
| Planning Perm. Ref: | |
| Site Description: | Existing mixed-use allocation, land north of Nutholt Lane |
| Brown/Greenfield: | Brownfield |
| Known Constraints: | |
| Current Use: | Community facility |
| Proposed Use: | Mixed use |
| Current Use info: | Police and ambulance stations |
| Proposed Use info: | |
| Site Area Net (ha): | 0.34 |
| Site Area Gross (ha): | 0.34 |
| Indicative no. of dwellings: | a) Submitted / estimated 12 b) Recommended 0 |

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
1b. Site Availability
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
| Flood Zone 1: | 100.00% |
| Flood Zone 2: | 0.00% |
| Flood Zone 3a: | 0.00% |
| Flood Zone 3b: | 0.00% |

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
| 30 Year: | 8.53% |
| 100 Year: | 17.76% |
| 1,000 Year: | 11.45% |
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Parish:** Ely CP  
**Site Name:** Existing mixed-use allocation, land north of Nutholt Lane  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation**  
Site does not intersect Inner Zone

**4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites**  
More than 5km from site

**4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment**

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

**5a. Proximity to contaminated land**  
Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

**5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment**

**5b. Local road impact**

**5c. Strategic Road Network impact**

**5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**  
This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

#### 6. Access to services

**6a. Proximity to public transport**  
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

**6b. Proximity to medical services**  
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

**6c. Proximity to shops**  
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

**6d. Proximity to Primary School**  
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

**6e. Proximity to Secondary School**  
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

**6f.(i) Available primary school capacity**  
No spare places but room for expansion

**6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity**  
Spare capacity in every year

**6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**  
The school currently has capacity for 420 pupils. There are currently 450 on roll as 30 places are provided in a mobile classroom. Some expansion is possible on site but it would be difficult and expensive as The Lantern was designed as a modern 2FE Primary School.

**6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**  
The College could be expanded from 1200 pupils 11-16 to 1500 pupils 11-16 on its present site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,200 new houses in the catchment area.

**6h. Proximity to employment sites**  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 7. Environmental impact

**7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**  
CWS within 500m of site

**7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**

**7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers**

**7d. Agricultural land classification**  
Site is not located on agricultural land

**7e. Public Rights of Way**  
E – No PRoW connection opportunities

**7e.(i) PROW comments**
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**  
Site Name: **Existing mixed-use allocation, land north of Nutholt Lane**

Parish: **Ely CP**  
Site Ref: **Site/10/22**

### 7f. Conservation Area
- Site is within CA: E

### 7f. (ii) Listed building
- LB within 500m of site: D

### 7f. (iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
- SAM within 500m of site: D

### 7f. (iv) Archaeological asset
- Archaeological assets within 500m of site: D

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

- ECDC: Already allocated - same issues as before
- CCC: Lynn Road street frontage is known area of Medieval occupation (MCB15020) - as seen in excavations for planning ref E/99/0788. Stratified urban deposits are anticipated, for which an appropriate mitigation strategy should be presented in any planning submission. This can only be developed in response to fieldwork evidence, for which a pre-determination phase of work is required. NGR 554130 280580

### 7h. Visual Impact

#### Justification for score:

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
- No TPO within 15m of the site: A

### Parish Council support and rank

#### Does Parish Council support this site?

#### Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

#### Form G - Parish Council’s view:

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Parish:** Ely CP  
**Site Name:** The Gardens, Lynn Road Ely  
**Site Ref:** Site/10/23

### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Rejected  
**Date and time of site visit:**  
**Supersedes site submission(s):**  

**Main findings and recommendations:**  
Current site monitoring data indicates that development of the site is now complete. The site is therefore rejected.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>Site with extant planning permission</th>
<th>ID: 241</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>The Gardens, Lynn Road Ely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>City of Ely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td>12/00867/FUM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>The Gardens, Lynn Road Ely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td>Garden land / agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 19</td>
<td>b) Recommended 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

| Main Settlement |  | A |

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

| >50% of site area in Zone 1 | A |

#### Flood Zone (% of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening)):

| Flood Zone 1: | 100.00% | Flood Zone 2: | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3a: | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3b: | 0.00% |

2b. Surface Water flood risk

| Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA |  |

#### Surface Water flood risk (% of site area at risk (uFMfSW)):

<p>| 30 Year: | 1.74% | 100 Year: | 1.95% | 1,000 Year: | 7.11% |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation</td>
<td>Site does not intersect Inner Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites</td>
<td>More than 5km from site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

#### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport  
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services  
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6c. Proximity to shops  
Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School  
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School  
Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity  
Spare capacity in every year

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity  
Spare capacity in every year

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The school has been built to meet the needs of the Endurance Estates development. As this development is built out the school will fill. It cannot be assumed that capacity at this school can be used to meet the impacts of other development sites proposed in Ely.

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity  
Spare capacity in every year

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded from 1200 pupils 11-16 to 1500 pupils 11-16 on its present site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,200 new houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites  
CWS within 501m – 1km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification  
All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

7e. Public Rights of Way  
E – No PRoW connection opportunities

7f.(i) PROW comments

---

Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation  
Site Name: The Gardens, Lynn Road Ely  
Parish: Ely CP  
Site Ref: Site/10/23
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation  
Site Name: The Gardens, Lynn Road Ely  
Parish: Ely CP  
Site Ref: Site/10/23

7f.(i) Conservation Area  
CA within 500.1 – 1000m of site  
C

7f.(ii). Listed building  
LB within 1.01km – 2km of site  
B

7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument  
SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site  
B

7f.(iv) Archaeological asset  
Archaeological assets on-site  
E

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

CCC: Built. Evaluated for 12/00867/FUM (ECB3973), low flint scatter.

7h. Visual Impact

Justification for score:

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs  
No TPO within 15m of the site  
A

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council’s view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Rejected

**Main findings and recommendations:**
The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. The SFRA update indicates that more than 50% of the site area is located in Flood Zone 3a. The site is therefore not considered suitable for allocation.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>Local Plan 2015 allocated site</th>
<th>ID:</th>
<th>204</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Putney Hill Road, Prickwillow, Ely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Prickwillow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref.</td>
<td>PRK1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Existing housing allocation, land adjacent to Putney Hill Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 15</td>
<td>b) Recommended 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
   - Small Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
   - >50% of site area in Zone 3a (housing site)

   | Flood Zone 1: | Flood Zone 2: | Flood Zone 3a: | Flood Zone 3b: |
   | 0.00%        | 0.00%        | 100.00%       | 0.00%         |

2b. Surface Water flood risk
   - Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))

   | 30 Year: | 100 Year: | 1,000 Year: |
   | 0.00%    | 0.00%     | 0.00%       |
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</th>
<th>Site located more than 250m from contaminated land</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5b. Local road impact</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6a. Proximity to public transport</th>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>Spare capacity in every year</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6h. Proximity to employment sites</th>
<th>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</th>
<th>CWS within 500m of site</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7d. Agricultural land classification</th>
<th>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 7e. Public Rights of Way | E – No PRoW connection opportunities | E  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7e.(i) PROW comments</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Site Name:** Existing housing allocation, land adjacent to Putney Hill Road  
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Parish:** Ely CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/10/24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>CA more than 2km from site</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td>Archaeological assets within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7g. Heritage / archaeology comments**

ECDC: Already allocated - same issues as before

CCC: Bronze Age flint knife (MCB8753) 120mW and Roman skillet (MCB8758) 400m SW of proposal area. Prickwillow’s winding road follows the roddonised meander of ancient course of the Great Ouse prehistoric river. Bronze Age, Roman, Medieval and Post-Medieval metal finds are known along this course and in its wider floodplain and fen from casual metal detection. 17th century and later wind pumps and 19th century steam pumps are known and a tourist attraction at Prickwillow. An archaeological condition is recommended to be placed on any planning consent granted for development on this plot. NGR 559360 282170

**7h. Visual Impact**

**Justification for score:**

**Additional criteria 7i. TPOs**

| No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

**Parish Council support and rank**

Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:** 13:30 15 May 2017

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is isolated from the main settlement of Ely. Vehicular access is poor and is severed by a level crossing. Development of the site may result in harm to the SSSI. The site is an existing developed site in use as an engineering works and is of poor aesthetic value. It would be preferable to clear the site and return it to a more natural state to complement the natural park, thereby improving the recreational and ecological value of the adjacent wetlands.

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb'17</th>
<th>ID: 392</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Kiln Lane, Ely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>City of Ely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>The site is located at the eastern end of Kiln Lane, Ely, adjacent to the existing development envelope for the city. The land is currently used for employment uses, although it is not allocated or protected for such uses in either the adopted or draft Local Plan. The site is located in a prime position in close proximity to the city centre and adjacent to the River Great Ouse.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Submission indicates site has capacity for approximately 26 dwellings, reflecting constraints. <strong>Net site area estimated</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td>Small-scale B2 and B8 uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td>Housing-led mixed use allocation, with some employment uses and/or leisure, in particularly supporting a marina or docking facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 26</td>
<td>b) Recommended 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

1. Settlement Hierarchy
   - Main Settlement

2. Site Availability
   - Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

3. Minerals and Waste assessment
   - Site affected by M+W Policies
   - Site affected by M+W Allocations

4. Flood zone
   - >50% of site area in Zone 1

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**
**Site Name:** Land at Kiln Lane

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-10.57%</td>
<td>10.57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):     | No |

**Minor Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Site Suitability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay pits and road haulage site to N &amp; E boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**6. Access to services**

| 6a. Proximity to public transport                                                 | C      |
| 6b. Proximity to medical services                                                 | D      |
| 6c. Proximity to shops                                                            | C      |
| 6d. Proximity to Primary School                                                   | C      |
| 6e. Proximity to Secondary School                                                 | E      |
| 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity                                          | D      |
| 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment                         |        |
| The additional levels of housing allocated can be accommodated in the new schools being provided. However, it may be necessary to provide more places in these new primary schools than originally planned. |        |
| 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity                                       | D      |
| 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment                      |        |
| The additional sites in Ely and Little Downham add a further 0.75FE (113 places) of secondary age children to the additional numbers previously identified. The opening of a new school in Littleport combined with the potential for further expansion on the Ely College site would provide appropriate mitigation |        |

| 6h. Proximity to employment sites                                                 | A      |

**7. Environmental impact**

| 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites                                           | E      |
| 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment                              |        |
| 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers                                                  |        |
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land at Kiln Lane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7d. Agricultural land classification</th>
<th>Site is not located on agricultural land</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td>Access to this site is via Kiln Lane which is also FP70 and FP12. This route would need to be included in the site plans. FP14 runs through the north west corner of the site and this link would need to be maintained.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td>Conservation Area to the north/northeast, potential to impact views out of the designated heritage asset. However already in employment use so impact likely to be minimal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual impact</td>
<td>Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification for score:</td>
<td>Exisitng building has poor aesthetic value. Development of the site would therefore likely be neutral or deliver improvement. However, demolition of built features and return to a more nauralised state may be preferable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional criterion 7l. TPOs</td>
<td>No TPO within 15m of the site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council’s view:</td>
<td>(c) not add this site to the Local Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit: 09:30 15 May 2017

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is adjacent to Witchford village, the Lancaster Way Business Park (the district’s flagship employment area and enterprise zone) and City of Ely. The submission proposes major strategic scale growth and would provide a significant contribution to the district’s housing supply. Development of such a scale would require significant investment in infrastructure, such as provision of a new primary school, expansion of Witchford Village College, and junction capacity improvements at the A142 / A10.

Due to the scale of the site, development could harm Witchford’s village character. Development of the site may result in the physical coalescence of Witchford and the Lancaster Way Business Park, and erode the open space between Witchford and Ely. This could adversely impact Witchford’s distinct identity as a physically separate settlement.

Site Information

Site Type: FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17

Site Address: Witchford Road, Witchford, Ely

Settlement: City of Ely

LP15 Allocation Ref: Planning Perm. Ref:

Site Description: The site comprises agricultural land and is located to the north-east of Witchford, bound by the A142, to the north, Witchford Road and the Lancaster Way Business Park to the south-east. The site is bisected by Witchford Road. Site has potential to create links with adjacent draft site allocation WFD.H3. Proposed for housing development, including circa 7ha of public open space, a primary school, ancillary retail and employment.

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints: Submission indicates site could deliver 720-840 dwellings. Whilst the site area adjoins Witchford village, most of the site area is within the parish of Ely.

**Net site area estimated**

Current Use: Agriculture

Proposed Use: Housing

Proposed Use info: Housing development with public open space, a primary school, ancillary retail and employment.

Site Area Net (ha): 21.24

Site Area Gross (ha): 35.4

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 840

b) Recommended 0
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Parish:** Ely CP  
**Site Name:** Site to the North East of Witchford  
**Site Ref:** Site/10/29

### Major Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a. Settlement Hierarchy</td>
<td>Main Settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. Site Availability</td>
<td>Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Minerals and Waste assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Flood zone</td>
<td>&gt;50% of site area in Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flood Zone 1: 88.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Surface Water flood risk</td>
<td>Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 Year: 1.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation</td>
<td>Site does not intersect Inner Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites</td>
<td>2.01km - 5km from the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
<td>Site located on contaminated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eastern part of site is on former RAF Witchford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The A142/A10 roundabout is likely to be an issue for this development; NO access to A142 will be permitted - Principal Route for Transport Access should be off Witchford Road / Main Street Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

**Site Name:** Site to the North East of Witchford

**Parish:** Ely CP

**Site Ref:** Site/10/29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expanded significantly on a new site to provide the places required.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is potential to expand Witchford Village College on its current site. However, this latest call for site would result in much higher levels of development within the catchment area of the College if they were all included in the Local Plan. The level of development would generate another 595 secondary aged children or 4FE. This is in addition to the additional pupils identified from the sites included in the consultation draft local plan. At this level of development suitable mitigation could not be provided at Witchford VC. It would be the Council's intention on adoption of the Local Plan to undertake a strategic review of secondary school provision across the District and the review would include the option of a further new secondary school (and site) in order to provide suitable mitigation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 6h. Proximity to employment sites | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) |

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification

All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower

#### 7e. Public Rights of Way

C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PROW within the site boundary

#### 7f.(i) Conservation Area

CA within 1.01km – 2km of site

#### 7f.(ii) Listed building

LB within 500m of site

#### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

SAM more than 2km from site

#### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

#### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

ECDC - Listed building at No.14, potential to considerably alter the setting of the listed building and the character of the village in this location.

HE - There are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary. The site wraps around a grade II house. The proposed site extends significantly towards Ely and would inevitably alter the character of the settlement at this approach to the village. There is a longer distant view of Ely Cathedral to the north of Witchford (see Ely Environmental Capacity Study) which would need to be considered. Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts. If taken forward for allocation, appropriate development criteria would need to be set.

#### 7h. Visual impact

Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive

**Justification for score:**

Risk that development may be detrimental to the enjoyment and quality of the PROW, which at present feels like a natural, green space.

**Additional criterion 7i. TPOs**

TPO tree within 15m of the site

**Parish Council support and rank**

Does Parish Council support this site? Yes

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

- (c) not add this site to the Local Plan

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received**
Site Ref: Site/10/29
Parish: Ely CP
Site Name: Site to the North East of Witchford

Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Preferred site

**Date and time of site visit:**

**Supersedes site submission(s)**: Site/11/10; Site/11/2

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is accessible and located close to village services, and is considered suitable for development. The site combines submissions Site/11/10 and Site/11/21 and includes an existing undeveloped Local Plan allocation.

---

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>Strategic Planning Amended Submission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land south of Mildenhall Road, East of Collin's Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Fordham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Site supersedes Site/11/10 and Site/11/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 20 b) Recommended 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a. Settlement Hierarchy</th>
<th>Large Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b. Site Availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Minerals and Waste assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Flood zone</td>
<td>&gt;50% of site area in Zone 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

| Flood Zone 1: | 100.00% |
| Flood Zone 2: | 0.00% |
| Flood Zone 3a: | 0.00% |
| Flood Zone 3b: | 0.00% |

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):**

| 30 Year | 0.00% |
| 100 Year | 0.86% |
| 1,000 Year | 2.69% |

**2b. Surface Water flood risk**

Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))
### Minor Criteria

**5. Site Suitability**

5a. Proximity to contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport

6b. Proximity to medical services

6c. Proximity to shops

6d. Proximity to Primary School

6e. Proximity to Secondary School

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

6h. Proximity to employment sites

### 7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification

7e. Public Rights of Way

7e.(i) PROW comments
**Parish Council support and rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council's view:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- **No objection, but if mineral is extracted, it should be put to sustainable use.**
- **Object to this site, due to impact on Grade I listed St Peter’s Church, opposite the site. If site continues, policy must have wording about high quality design and the need to conserve / enhance setting of the conservation area and listed church.**
- **(Promoter) support allocation. However, access should also be permitted off Collin’s Hill. Also, if new suggested site adjoining to south is supported, alternative access to FRD.H1 might be appropriate.**
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment:
Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:
15:30 09 Aug 2016

Supersedes site submission(s):

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is accessible and located close to village services, and should therefore be allocated in combination with Site/11/21.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type: New site submission (Form B)</th>
<th>ID: 52</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address: Land east of Collin's Hill, Fordham, Cambridgeshire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement: Fordham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description: Paddock east of Collin's Hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints: Form B indicates site could provide 15 - 20 dwellings and 0 - 20% CLD. Site lies adjacent to the Development Envelope of Fordham. The site has previously been considered in the Local plan 2015 process. Potential/visual and archaeological impacts requiring mitigation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use: Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info: Paddocks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use: Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha): 1.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha): 1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 20 b) Recommended 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Large Village

1b. Site Availability
Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment
This site lies within the Mineral Safeguarding Area for Sand and Gravel, designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Core Strategy and shown on Proposals Map C (2011). The overarching policy is CS26 Mineral Safeguarding Areas which sets out criteria which must be met in order for development to be permitted. However, in this instance the proposed site is in close proximity to existing development and the mineral resource is an isolated area. It is unlikely to be an economic resource therefore no objections would be raised in this context to this site being allocated.

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
CS26

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
| Flood Zone 1: 100.00% | Flood Zone 2: 0.00% | Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% | Flood Zone 3b: 0.00% |
**Current Status:** Superseded by FRD.H1

**Site Name:** *Land east of Collin's Hill*

**Parish:** Fordham CP

**Site Ref:** Site/11/10

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</th>
<th>Site located on contaminated land</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land profesional assessment</td>
<td>part of site on old pit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>No objections with Moderate mitigation measures</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>Access to site via Collins Hill due to proximity of junction on Chruch Street Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6a. Proximity to public transport</th>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>Spare capacity in some years</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The school is being expanded in size from 1FE to 2FE (210 places to 420 places) This is in part to meet an existing need but also in anticipation of a certain level of further housing development in the village

| 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity | Limited capacity | C |
| 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment | | |

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

| 6h. Proximity to employment sites | Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m) | D |

#### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</th>
<th>CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Name: Land east of Collin’s Hill

Current Status: Superseded by FRD.H1
Parish: Fordham CP

Site Ref: Site/11/10

| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower | C |
| 7e. Public Rights of Way | C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary | C |
| 7f.(i) PROW comments | Provide an off road link between Mildenhall Rd and Collins Hill with site 11/21 |  |
| 7f.(ii) Conservation Area | CA within 500m of site | D |
| 7f.(iii) Listed building | LB within 500m of site | D |
| 7f.(iv) Scheduled Ancient Monument | SAM more than 2km from site | A |
| 7f.(v) Archaeological asset | Archaeological assets within 500m of site | D |

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

CCC: Immediately E of medieval church of Saint Peter and Saint Mary Magdalene (MCB9146), likely to be an area of historic village core. Advise pre-determination works to provide evidence on character and significance of anticipated village remains. Note, Saxon remains were found at Fordham Primary School 100m to NW (MCB14610). NGR 563470 270 730

7h. Visual Impact | Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive | D |

Justification for score:
Site forms part (start of) open countryside, with good views to countryside.

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs | No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site? Yes

Form E - Parish Council site ranking: Fifth or more

Form G - Parish Council’s view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site includes an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation and adjacent land. The site is accessible and close to village services, and should therefore be allocated.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>Local Plan 2015 allocated site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land east of 24 Mildenhall Road, Fordham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Fordham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>FRD1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Existing housing allocation, land east of 24 Mildenhall Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Recommended</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Large Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment
This site lies within the Mineral Safeguarding Area for Sand and Gravel, designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Core Strategy and shown on Proposals Map C (2011). The overarching policy is CS26 Mineral Safeguarding Areas which sets out criteria which must be met in order for development to be permitted. However, in this instance the proposed site is in close proximity to existing development. It is unlikely to be an economic resource therefore no objections would be raised in this context to this site being allocated.

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
CS26

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):
**Site Name:** Existing housing allocation, land east of 24 Mildenhall Road  
**Current Status:** Superseded by FRD.H1  
**Parish:** Fordham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/11/21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 Year:</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
<th>100 Year:</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
<th>1,000 Year:</th>
<th>0.03%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Site located in area benefiting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation  
Site does not intersect Inner Zone  

4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites  
501m - 2km from the site  

4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

**Minor Criteria**

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land  
Site within 50m of contaminated land  

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment  
old pits immediately adjacent to E and W

5b. Local road impact  
No objections with Moderate mitigation measures  

5c. Strategic Road Network impact  

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment  
No access to the A142 will be permitted  
Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry  

This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport  
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)  

6b. Proximity to medical services  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)  

6c. Proximity to shops  
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)  

6d. Proximity to Primary School  
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)  

6e. Proximity to Secondary School  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)  

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity  
Spare capacity in some years  

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity  
Limited capacity  

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment  
The school is being expanded in size from 1FE to 2FE (210 places to 420 places) This is in part to meet an existing need but also in anticipation of a certain level of further housing development in the village

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment  
The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites  
Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)  

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites  
CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site  

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment  

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers  

7d. Agricultural land classification  
All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower  

7e. Public Rights of Way  
C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary
Current Status: Superseded by FRD.H1
Site Name: Existing housing allocation, land east of 24 Mildenhall Road
Parish: Fordham CP
Site Ref: Site/11/21

7e.(i) PROW comments
Provide an off road link between Mildenhall Rd and Collins Hill with site 11/10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>CA within 500m of site</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii) Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td>Archaeological assets on-site</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
ECDC: Already allocated - same issues as before
CCC: 190m E of medieval church of Saint Peter and Saint Mary Magdalene (MCB9146), likely to be at edge of historic village core. No objection, but recommend a planning condition for any planning application. NGR 563550 270730

7h. Visual Impact
Justification for score:

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
No TPO within 15m of the site A

Parish Council support and rank
Does Parish Council support this site?
Form E - Parish Council site ranking:
Form G - Parish Council's view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received
Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Preferred site

**Date and time of site visit:** 16:20 on 09 Aug 2016

**Main findings and recommendations:**
The site is favoured by the parish council and would provide a logical extension to neighbouring development at Rules Garden. The site should therefore be allocated.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site Type</strong></th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Address</strong></td>
<td>Land rear of Rules Garden, CB7 5LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement</strong></td>
<td>Fordham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LP15 Allocation Ref:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning Perm. Ref:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Description:</strong></td>
<td>Land rear of Rules Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brown/Greenfield:</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Known Constraints:</strong></td>
<td>None known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Use:</strong></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Use:</strong></td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Site Area

| **Site Area Net (ha):** | 0.68 |
| **Site Area Gross (ha):** | 0.8 |

#### Indicative no. of dwellings

| **a) Submitted / estimated** | 15 |
| **b) Recommended** | 15 |

### Major Criteria

#### 1a. Settlement Hierarchy

| **Large Village** |

#### 1b. Site Availability

| Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22) |

#### 1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

- **1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies**
- **1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations**

#### 2a. Flood zone

| >50% of site area in Zone 1 |

#### Flood Zone (% of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening))

| **Flood Zone 1:** | 100.00% |
| **Flood Zone 2:** | 0.00% |
| **Flood Zone 3a:** | 0.00% |
| **Flood Zone 3b:** | 0.00% |

#### 2b. Surface Water flood risk

| Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr)) |

#### Percent (% of site area at risk (uFMSW))

| **30 Year:** | 0.00% |
| **100 Year:** | 0.00% |
| **1,000 Year:** | 0.00% |
**Site Name:** Rules Garden

**Parish:** Fordham CP

**Site Ref:** Site/11/04

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

- **5a. Proximity to contaminated land**  
  Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

- **5b. Local road impact**  
  Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

- **5c. Strategic Road Network impact**  
  
- **5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**  
  Rule Gardens is not adopted highway  
  No vehicle access on to Carter Street except for pedestrians and cyclists  
  The development site should come forward with 11/03 or 11/03+ 11/13 the Highways Authority would seek one junction for all three sites  
  Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

  This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

#### 6. Access to services

- **6a. Proximity to public transport**  
  Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

- **6b. Proximity to medical services**  
  Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

- **6c. Proximity to shops**  
  Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

- **6d. Proximity to Primary School**  
  Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

- **6e. Proximity to Secondary School**  
  Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

- **6f.(i) Available primary school capacity**  
  Spare capacity in some years

- **6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity**  
  Limited capacity

- **6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**  
  The school is being expanded in size from 1FE to 2FE (210 places to 420 places) This is in part to meet an existing need but also in anticipation of a certain level of further housing development in the village

- **6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**  
  The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

- **6h. Proximity to employment sites**  
  Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 7. Environmental impact

- **7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**  
  CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

- **7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**  
  
- **7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers**  
  
- **7d. Agricultural land classification**  
  All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower
Site Name: Rules Garden

Parish: Fordham CP

Site Ref: Site/11/04

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

- (Promoter) allocation supported
- Policy and supporting text should refer to need to conserve / enhance nearby listed building (Cromwell House)
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s) Site/11/02

Main findings and recommendations:
The site has extant planning permission and should be allocated to retain this planning decision. The current planning consent includes measures to retain the existing business on-site. This amended submission excludes the existing business from the site allocation area.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>Site with extant planning permission</th>
<th>ID: 505</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land at 5 Station Road, Fordham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref: 16/01551/OUM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 27 b) Recommended 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Large Village

1b. Site Availability Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: Flood Zone 2: Flood Zone 3a: Flood Zone 3b:

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):
30 Year: 100 Year: 1,000 Year:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5b. Local road impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

#### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6b. Proximity to medical services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6c. Proximity to shops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6d. Proximity to Primary School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6e. Proximity to Secondary School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6h. Proximity to employment sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7. Environmental Impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7d. Agricultural land classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7e. Public Rights of Way

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7e.(i) PROW comments
**Site Ref:** Site/11/28  
**Parish:** Fordham CP  
**Site Name:** Land at Station Road  

**Current Status:** Site Allocation FRD.H3

| 7f.(i) Conservation Area |  |
| 7f.(ii). Listed building |  |
| 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument |  |
| 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset |  |

**7g. Heritage / archaeology comments**

| 7h. Visual Impact |  |

**Justification for score:**

| Additional criterion 7i. TPOs |  |

**Parish Council support and rank**

- Does Parish Council support this site?  
- Form E - Parish Council site ranking:  
- Form G - Parish Council's view:

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment:

Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:

15:50 on 09 Aug 2016

Supersedes site submission(s):

Main findings and recommendations:

Since publication of the Further Draft Local Plan, the site has been granted planning permission for residential development. The site should therefore be allocated to retain this planning decision.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land at 5 Station Road, Fordham, Ely, Cambridgeshire, CB7 5LW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Fordham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td>16/01551/OUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Employment land and vacant land at Station Road. Site has resolution to grant planning permission for residential development for up to 27 dwellings (incl up to 5 self-build dwellings), garages, open space, new accesses onto Station Road, internal roads and associated works. Retention of existing B1 building and remodel access and parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td>Form B also indicates ‘mixed-use’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 27 b) Recommended 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Large Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1b. Site Availability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&gt;50% of site area in Zone 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1: 100.00%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2: 0.00%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

-
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact

No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

Access to site via Station Road

No access to Newmarket Road for vehicles but Pedestrian and cycles ok

Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Statement, based on 50 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. These proposals total 1400 units in Fordham, therefore the development will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the development proposals. Individually these sites may not incur severe impact within Fordham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, however CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Fordham the cumulative impact could be significant, especially on A142 junctions and the A142/A14 junction.

#### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops

Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School

Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

Spare capacity in some years

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

Limited capacity

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

The school is being expanded in size from 1FE to 2FE (210 places to 420 places) This is in part to meet an existing need but also in anticipation of a certain level of further housing development in the village

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites

Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

#### 7. Environmental Impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7b.</td>
<td>County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c.</td>
<td>Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d.</td>
<td>Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e.</td>
<td>Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PROW within the site boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i)</td>
<td>PROW comments</td>
<td>Provide a connection from the east of the site on the Newmarket Rd to Station Rd in the north also from this site to sites 11/08 and 11/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii)</td>
<td>Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii)</td>
<td>Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv)</td>
<td>Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv)</td>
<td>Archaeological asset</td>
<td>Archaeological assets within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g.</td>
<td>Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td>CCC: Gardens and park at Fordham Abbey 380m E. Multi period finds 150m to E. An archaeological condition is recommended to be placed on any planning consent granted for development on this plot. NGR 562540 270190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h.</td>
<td>Visual Impact</td>
<td>Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification for score:</td>
<td>Some reasonable views across site to open countryside.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional criterion 7i.</td>
<td>TPOs</td>
<td>No TPO within 15m of the site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

| Does Parish Council support this site? | No |
| Form E - Parish Council site ranking: | Fifth or more |
| Form G - Parish Council’s view: | |

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Site 11/02 – (promoter) site should be added, because it now has a resolution to grant planning permission (subject to s106) for 27 dwellings.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s) Site/11/13

Main findings and recommendations:

The site is an amended proposal of a larger scheme previously assessed under reference Site/11/13. The site assessment concluded the site 'has merit', but other suitable sites were available in the village. This smaller site offers a logical extension to the built area, has few constraints and offers a suitable location for a modest scale development. Reducing the site area addresses concerns relating to the overall scale of growth in Fordham. Development should be low density and building styles should reflect the character of adjacent development.

Site Information

Site Type: Strategic Planning Amended Submission

Site Address: Land off Steward's Field

Settlement: Fordham

LP15 Allocation Ref:

Planning Perm. Ref:

Site Description: The site supersedes part of Site/11/13, which the landowner amended through their representations to the FDLP.

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints:

Current Use: Agriculture

Proposed Use: Housing

Current Use info:

Proposed Use info:

Site Area Net (ha): 0.43

Site Area Gross (ha): 0.5

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 20

b) Recommended 12

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

Large Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

Flood Zone 1: 
Flood Zone 2: 
Flood Zone 3a: 
Flood Zone 3b: 

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
**Site Ref:** Site/11/27  
**Site Name:** Land off Steward’s Field  
**Parish:** Fordham CP  
**Current Status:** Site Allocation FRD.H4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 Year:</th>
<th>100 Year:</th>
<th>1,000 Year:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):**
- **Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):**

### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation

### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites

### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

- **5a. Proximity to contaminated land**
  - **5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment**

- **5b. Local road impact**

- **5c. Strategic Road Network impact**

- **5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**

#### 6. Access to services

- **6a. Proximity to public transport**

- **6b. Proximity to medical services**

- **6c. Proximity to shops**

- **6d. Proximity to Primary School**

- **6e. Proximity to Secondary School**

- **6f.(i) Available primary school capacity**

- **6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**

- **6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity**

- **6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**

- **6h. Proximity to employment sites**

#### 7. Environmental impact

- **7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**

- **7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**

- **7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers**

- **7d. Agricultural land classification**

- **7e. Public Rights of Way**

- **7e.(i) PROW comments**
**Current Status:** Site Allocation FRD.H4  
**Parish:** Fordham CP  
**Site Name:** Land off Steward's Field  
**Site Ref:** Site/11/27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7g. Heritage / archaeology comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7h. Visual Impact</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Justification for score:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional criterion 7i. TPOs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

**Does Parish Council support this site?**

| Form E - Parish Council site ranking: |  |
| Form G - Parish Council’s view: |  |

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received**

**Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:**
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Has merit

Date and time of site visit: 16:30 on 09 Aug 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:

The site has some merit, but was not supported by the Parish Council. During consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan, the landowner indicated the site boundary should be amended - see Site/11/27.

Site Information

- **Site Type:** New site submission (Form B)
- **Site Address:** Land fronting Soham Road and also accessed off Stewards Field
- **Settlement:** Fordham
- **LP15 Allocation Ref:**
- **Planning Perm. Ref:**
- **Site Description:** Land fronting Soham Road and also accessed off Stewards Field
- **Brown/Greenfield:** Greenfield
- **Known Constraints:** A smaller scheme off Stewards Field has also been promoted previously shown hatched blue and a hedge exists along the northern boundary making it effectively a separate parcel.
- **Current Use:** Agriculture
- **Proposed Use:** Housing
- **Site Area Net (ha):** 3.77
- **Site Area Gross (ha):** 5.03
- **Indicative no. of dwellings:** a) Submitted / estimated 136 b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Large Village

1b. Site Availability Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone >50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening): 
- Flood Zone 1: 100.00%
- Flood Zone 2: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Year:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 Year:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Name: Land fronting Soham Road and also accessed off Stewards Field

Current Status: Superseded by FRD.H4

Parish: Fordham CP

Site Ref: Site/11/13

3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
   Site does not intersect Inner Zone

4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
   2.01km - 5km from the site

4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
   Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact
   No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
   Access to site via Soham Road
   The Highways Authority would like to see this development come forward with ///03 & 11/04 with single access
   Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

   A Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan would need to accompany the development proposals for this site. This would need
   to follow the guidance from CCC TA guidelines; particularly the need to demonstrate that the site can provide adequate mitigation
   measures and assess and improve connectivity within Fordham. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport
   policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. These proposals total 1400 untils in
   Fordham, therefore the development will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the development
   proposals. Individually these sites may not incur severe impact within Fordham and the surrounding road network provided
   adequate mitigation is delivered, however CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Fordham the
   cumulative impact could be significant, especially on A142 junctions and the A142/A14 junction.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
   Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
   Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops
   Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
   Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
   Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
   Spare capacity in some years

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
   Limited capacity

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
   The school is being expanded in size from 1FE to 2FE (210 places to 420 places) This is in part to meet an existing need but also in
   anticipation of a certain level of further housing development in the village

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
   The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield
   multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites
   Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

7. Environmental Impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
   CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- **(Promoter)** this rejected site could be reduced to 0.5ha, accessed off Stewards Field, and allocated for 20 dwellings.
- **(Promoter)** site should be reassessed – especially error relating to access (which can be provided off Grove Park, contrary to evidence reports published by council).
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment:

Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:

16:00 09 Aug 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:

The relocation of the garden centre could result in this large, close-to-village centre site becoming vacant, and therefore potentially derelict. The site could provide a suitable location for a mixed-use (likely housing-led) scheme, and should be allocated on this basis. Other uses, such as employment and/or retail should be provided to retain jobs in this location.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Scotsdale Garden Centre, Market Street, Fordham, CB7 5LQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Fordham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Land at and adjoining Scotsdale Garden Centre, Fordham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Form B indicates site could deliver 250 - 275 dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>7.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 275 b) Recommended 150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

Large Village

1b. Site Availability

Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

- |

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

- |

2a. Flood zone

>50% of site area in Zone 1

| Flood Zone 1: | 100.00% | Flood Zone 2: | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3a: | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3b: | 0.00% |

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

| 30 Year: | 0.00% | 100 Year: | 0.00% | 1,000 Year: | 1.08% |
### Site Ref: Site/11/09

**Site Name:** Land at and adjoining Scotsdale Garden Centre, Fordham  
**Parish:** Fordham CP  
**Current Status:** Site Allocation FRD.M1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Minor Criteria

**5. Site Suitability**

5a. Proximity to contaminated land | Site within 50m of contaminated land | D |

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment  
old factory site on S boundary

5b. Local road impact | No objections with Moderate mitigation measures | B |

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment  
Access to site via Market Street  
Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

A Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan would need to accompany the development proposals for this site. This would need to follow the guidance from CCC TA guidelines; particularly the need to demonstrate that the site can provide adequate mitigation measures and assess and improve connectivity within Fordham. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. These proposals total 1400 untils in Fordham, therefore the development will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the development proposals. Individually these sites may not incur severe impact within Fordham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, however CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Fordham the cumulative impact could be significant, especially on A142 junctions and the A142/A14 junction.

#### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) | A |

6b. Proximity to medical services | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |

6c. Proximity to shops | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) | A |

6d. Proximity to Primary School | Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m) | C |

6e. Proximity to Secondary School | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity | Spare capacity in some years | B |

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment  
The school is being expanded in size from 1FE to 2FE (210 places to 420 places) This is in part to meet an existing need but also in anticipation of a certain level of further housing development in the village

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity | Limited capacity | C |

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment  
The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites | Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m) | C |

#### 7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites | CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site | B |

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
**Site Name:** Land at and adjoining Scotsdale Garden Centre, Fordham

**Parish:** Fordham CP

**Current Status:** Site Allocation FRD.M1

### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 7d. Agricultural land classification

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 7e. Public Rights of Way

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 7f.(i) PROW comments

Provide an off road connection for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders between the B1102 and Station Road

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 7f.(ii) Conservation Area

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

**ECDC:** No heritage impact

**CCC:** Within former gardens of Shrubland House (MCB19367). MCB13841 Lithic implement found in central part of proposal area. Numerous excavation areas along Fordham by-pass directly W (350m) of the area revealed prehistoric occupation and burial evidence (e.g. MCBs MCB16949, MCB15001, MCB15000, MCB16950). Requires pre-determination fieldwork to enable evidence base to be supplied with any planning application. NGR562400 270530

### 7h. Visual Impact

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Justification for score:**

Has some potential to create improvements.

### Additional criterion 7l. TPOs

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

**Does Parish Council support this site?** No

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:** Fifth or more

**Form G - Parish Council's view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Proposed allocations have the potential to have an adverse effect on European protected sites and SSSI, through increased recreational pressure. Policy for both sites needs a requirement for HRA and a requirement for a net gain in biodiversity.
- FRD.M1 – (promoter) support allocation. However, -150 target should be indicative, not maximum. -Policy should confirm that the garden centre will remain on site (albeit consolidated to approx 4 hectares), with rest (approx 9ha) for housing-led development.
- Policy too specific / restrictive in terms of access – this detail should be determined at masterplanning and planning application stage.
- Employment provision should be flexible (not B class)
- Other detailed policy wording amendments also suggested
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**  
Preferred site

**Date and time of site visit:**  
15:00 09 Aug 2016

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

Since publication of the Further Draft Local Plan, the site has been granted planning permission for residential development. The site should be allocated to retain this planning decision.

---

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Land east of Mildenhall Road, Fordham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Fordham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>FRD3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td>16/01662/OUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Since publication of the Further Draft Local Plan, the site has been granted planning permission for residential development for 74 houses inc. 5 plots for self build, parking, vehicular accesses and public open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Agent indicates that the agricultural tenant will require one year's notice to vacate the site. The agent also indicates that ecology and drainage reports have been obtained for this site and both confirm there are no constraints for residential development. The owner is prepared to offer to the parish council a large area of the site to be used as public open space for community use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>80-100 housing units. Also public open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>6.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Recommended 79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  
Large Village  

1b. Site Availability  
Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)  

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

This site lies within the Mineral Safeguarding Area for Sand and Gravel, designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Core Strategy and shown on Proposals Map C (2011). The overarching policy is CS26 Mineral Safeguarding Areas which sets out criteria which must be met in order for development to be permitted. However, in this instance the proposed site is in close proximity to existing development and the mineral resource is an isolated area. It is unlikely to be an economic resource therefore no objections would be raised in this context to this site being allocated.

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies  
CS26

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations
### Current Status: Site Allocation FRD.M2
**Parish:** Fordham CP  
**Site Name:** Land east of 67 Mildenhall Road  
**Site Ref:** Site/11/05

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land  
- Site within 50m of contaminated land  

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment  
- Pit 47m to E. Works 57m to S

5b. Local road impact  
- No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment  
- Access to site via Chippenham Road would be acceptable  
- The vehicle access should be staggered off / at Thirwall Drive  
- Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

A Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan would need to accompany the development proposals for this site. This would need to follow the guidance from CCC TA guidelines; particularly the need to demonstrate that the site can provide adequate mitigation measures and assess and improve connectivity within Fordham. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. These proposals total 1400 untis in Fordham, therefore the development will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the development proposals. Individually these sites may not incur severe impact within Fordham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, however CCC is concerned that by combinging the impact of all identified sites in Fordham the cumulative impact could be significant, especially on A142 junctions and the A142/A14 junction.

#### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport  
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services  
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops  
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School  
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School  
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity  
- Spare capacity in some years

6f.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment  
- The school is being expanded in size from 1FE to 2FE (210 places to 420 places) This is in part to meet an existing need but also in anticipation of a certain level of further housing development in the village

6f.(i) Available secondary school capacity  
- Limited capacity

6g.(i) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
**Site Name:** Land east of 67 Mildenhall Road  
**Site Ref:** Site/11/05

**Parish:** Fordham CP  
**Current Status:** Site Allocation FRD.M2

---

### The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

### Environment Impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site
- **Value:** B

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification
- All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower
- **Value:** C

#### 7e. Public Rights of Way
- E – No PRoW connection opportunities
- **Value:** E

#### 7f.(i) Conservation Area
- CA within 500m of site
- **Value:** D

#### 7f.(ii). Listed building
- LB within 500m of site
- **Value:** D

#### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
- SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site
- **Value:** B

#### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset
- Archaeological assets within 500m of site
- **Value:** D

#### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

- ECDC: Already allocated - same issues as before
- CCC: Recommended pre-determination works to be supplied with any planning application for Mildenhall Road, land between 67-115 Local Plan 2012 consultation. Advice upheld here. Iron Age, Roman and Medieval metal detection finds 650-600m N and NW of plot; Iron Age inhumations MCB9112 150m to W. Cropmarked sites of settlement enclosures known 700-750m to NW and N. NGR 563840 270950

#### 7h. Visual Impact
- Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive
- **Value:** D

**Justification for score:**
- Good views across site to open countryside beyond.

### Additional criterion 7l. TPOs
- No TPO within 15m of the site
- **Value:** A

---

**Parish Council support and rank**

- Does Parish Council support this site? Yes
- Form E - Parish Council site ranking: Third
- Form G - Parish Council's view:

---

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Object: traffic / access make this site unsuitable.
- Proposed allocations have the potential to have an adverse effect on European protected sites and SSSI, through increased recreational pressure.
- No objection, but if mineral is extracted, it should be put to sustainable use.
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**
- Preferred site

**Date and time of site visit:**

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is an existing employment Local Plan 2015 allocation and should be retained to enable continued employment development.

---

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>Local Plan 2015 allocated site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID:</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land north of Turners Site, Newmarket Road, Fordham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Fordham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>FRD7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Existing employment allocation, land north of Turners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
- Large Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
- >50% of site area in Zone 1

**Flood Zone (%):**

| Flood Zone 1 | 100.00% |
| Flood Zone 2 | 0.00%   |
| Flood Zone 3a| 0.00%   |
| Flood Zone 3b| 0.00%   |

2b. Surface Water flood risk
- Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):**

| 30 Year | 0.00% |
| 100 Year| 0.15% |
| 1,000 Year| 0.70% |
### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites</th>
<th>Within 500m of site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

| No objections with Moderate mitigation measures | B |

#### Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

#### Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No

#### Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

### 5. Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

| Road Haulage Depot on S boundary | - |

#### 5b. Local road impact

| No objections with Moderate mitigation measures | B |

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

| - | - |

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

Access to site via Station Road

Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

| Access to site via Station Road | - |

| Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry | - |

| This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required | - |

### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport

| Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m) | C |

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services

| Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |

#### 6c. Proximity to shops

| Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School

| Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School

| Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

| Spare capacity in some years | B |

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

| Limited capacity | C |

**6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**

The school is being expanded in size from 1FE to 2FE (210 places to 420 places). This is in part to meet an existing need but also in anticipation of a certain level of further housing development in the village.

**6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity**

| Limited capacity | C |

**6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

| CWS within 501m – 1km of site | C |

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

| - | - |

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

| All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower | D |

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification

| E – No PRoW connection opportunities | E |

#### 7e. Public Rights of Way

| E – No PRoW connection opportunities | E |

#### 7e.(i) PROW comments

| - | - |
Current Status: Site Allocation FRD.E1(a)  
Site Name: Existing employment allocation, land north of Turners  
Parish: Fordham CP  
Site Ref: Site/11/16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>CA within 1.01km – 2km of site</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 500.1 – 1000m of site</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td>Archaeological assets on-site</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7f. Heritage / archaeology comments

ECDC: Already allocated - same issues as before

CCC: Bronze Age barrows with inhumations and burials were dug beneath car and lorry parks at the SE corner of the plot in 2012 (ECB3854). More exist in the barrow cemetery in the immediate environs of the site (eg MCB 10817-8). The proposal area is 900m to the NW of SCHEDULED MONUMENT Roman villa south of Snailwell Fen (NHLE 1006868). No objection, but Requires pre-determination fieldwork to enable evidence base to be supplied with any planning application. NGR 562720 268930.

7h. Visual impact

Justification for score:

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs  
No TPO within 15m of the site  
A

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

• Support need for HRA
• No objection, but if mineral is extracted, it should be put to sustainable use.
• The Transport Safeguarding Area and the Waste Consultation Area for the European Metal Recycling Railhead, Snailwell, designated by T2D of the M&W Local Plan is not identified / wrong respectively on the Policies Map – it should be added / corrected respectively. Policy Fordham6 should also refer to these designations.
• FRD.E1(A-G) – these should all be for B1, B2 and B8.
• FRD.E1 (D) - Object to the need for a concept plan
• Support reference to heritage and archaeology in the policy, but specific mention should be made of the scheduled ancient monument and listed buildings which are very nearby.
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**
- Preferred site

**Date and time of site visit:**

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is an existing, developed parcel of employment land within the Fordham Employment Cluster. The site should be allocated for employment use to enable continued employment development of the site and to provide a logical boundary to the business park.

---

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>Existing business park</th>
<th>ID:</th>
<th>354</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Turners Soham Ltd, Fordham Rd, Fordham, Newmarket CB8 7NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Existing developed employment site within Fordham Employment Cluster - logistics/haulage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>15.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated</td>
<td>b) Recommended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

- >50% of site area in Zone 1

| Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening): |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Flood Zone 1: | 100.00% | Flood Zone 2: | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3a: | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3b: | 0.00% |

2b. Surface Water flood risk

- Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

| Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW): |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 30 Year: | 0.57% | 100 Year: | 1.27% | 1,000 Year: | 5.82% |
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6h. Proximity to employment sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- **Support need for HRA**
- **No objection, but if mineral is extracted, it should be put to sustainable use.**
- **The Transport Safeguarding Area and the Waste Consultation Area for the European Metal Recycling Railhead, Snailwell, designated by T2D of the M&W Local Plan is not identified / wrong respectively on the Policies Map – it should be added / corrected respectively. Policy Fordham6 should also refer to these designations.**
- **FRD.E1(A-G) – these should all be for B1, B2 and B8.**
- **FRD.E1 (D) - Object to the need for a concept plan**
- **Support reference to heritage and archaeology in the policy, but specific mention should be made of the scheduled ancient monument and listed buildings which are very nearby.**
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is an existing employment Local Plan 2015 allocation and should be retained to enable continued employment development.

Site Information

Site Type: Local Plan 2015 allocated site
Site Address: Land south of Landwade Road, Fordham
Settlement: Fordham
LP15 Allocation Ref: FRD8
Site Description: Existing employment allocation, land south of Landwade Road, Fordham
Brown/Greenfield: Mixed

Current Use: Employment
Proposed Use: Employment

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated

Site Area Net (ha): 8.70
Site Area Gross (ha): 14.5

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Large Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

This site has a very small area which falls in the Mineral Safeguarding Area for Sand and Gravel, designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Core Strategy and shown on Proposals Map C (2011). However, in this instance it does not represent an economic resource therefore no objections would be raised in this context to this site being allocated. This site also lies partly in the Transport Safeguarding Area for the European Metal Recycling Railhead, Snailwell, designated by Policy T2D of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012). The overarching policy is Policy CS23 of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011). This policy places a presumption against any development in the Transport Safeguarding Area which could prejudice the existing or potential use of the protected railhead for the transport of minerals and/or waste. This site also falls partly within the Waste Consultation Area for the European Metal Recycling site at Fordham Road, Snailwell (Policy W8T) designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012). The overarching policy for this designation is Policy CS30 of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011). This policy seeks to safeguard waste management facilities which make a significant contribution to managing Cambridgeshire's waste; and the policy states that development will only be permitted where it is demonstrated that this will not prejudice existing or future planned waste management operations. Typically industrial uses (B2, B8) are unlikely to prejudice waste management operations, but it is suggested that consideration
Current Status: Site Allocation FRD.E1(c)  
Parish: Fordham CP  
Site Name: Existing employment allocation, land south of Landwade Road  
Site Ref: Site/11/20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies</th>
<th>CS26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations</td>
<td>T2D; W8T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2a. Flood zone  
Percent (%) of site area at risk:  
- Flood Zone 1: 98.97%  
- Flood Zone 2: 0.27%  
- Flood Zone 3a: 0.75%  
- Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%  

2b. Surface Water flood risk  
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation  
N/a - employment site

4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites  
501m - 2km from the site

4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land  
Site located on contaminated land  
E

5a.(i) Contaminated land profesional assessment  
Road Haulage Depots to W

5b. Local road impact  
Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations  
D

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment  
No access to the A142 will be permitted  
Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

A Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan would need to accompany the development proposals for this site. This would need to follow the guidance from CCC TA guidelines; particularly the need to demonstrate that the site can provide adequate mitigation measures and assess and improve connectivity within Fordham. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. The development will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the development proposals. Individually these sites may not incur severe impact within Fordham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, however CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Fordham the cumulative impact could be significant, especially on A142 junctions and the A142/A14 junction.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport  
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)  
A

6b. Proximity to medical services  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)  
E

6c. Proximity to shops  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)  
E

6d. Proximity to Primary School  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)  
E

6e. Proximity to Secondary School  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)  
E

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity  
Spare capacity in some years  
B

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment  
The school is being expanded in size from 1FE to 2FE (210 places to 420 places) This is in part to meet an existing need but also in anticipation of a certain level of further housing development in the village

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):  
- Flood Zone 1: 98.97%  
- Flood Zone 2: 0.27%  
- Flood Zone 3a: 0.75%  
- Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No |

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):  
- 30 Year: 1.30%  
- 100 Year: 1.37%  
- 1,000 Year: 5.80%
Current Status: Site Allocation FRD.E1(c)  
Site Name: Existing employment allocation, land south of Landwade Road  
Parish: Fordham CP  
Site Ref: Site/11/20

### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

Limited capacity

### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

### 6h. Proximity to employment sites

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

CWS within 500m of site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification

All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

#### 7e. Public Rights of Way

E – No PRoW connection opportunities

#### 7e.(i) PROW comments

#### 7f.(i) Conservation Area

CA within 500.1 – 1000m of site

#### 7f.(ii). Listed building

LB within 500m of site

#### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

SAM within 500m of site

#### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

Archaeological assets within 500m of site

#### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

ECDC: Already allocated - same issues as before

CCC: Prehistoric settlement (Bronze - Iron Age) in the majority of this plot was excavated in 1996 ahead of the current industrial building (ECB1736, MCB16109). Archaeological evidence was found to be less concentrated in the southern part of that excavation area. No objection, but recommend a planning condition for any planning application. NGR 563260 268030

#### 7h. Visual Impact

#### Justification for score:

#### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

No TPO within 15m of the site

### Parish Council support and rank

**Does Parish Council support this site?**

- [ ] Yes
- [X] No

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii)</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii)</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6h.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Form G - Parish Council's view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Support need for HRA
- No objection, but if mineral is extracted, it should be put to sustainable use.
- The Transport Safeguarding Area and the Waste Consultation Area for the European Metal Recycling Railhead, Snailwell, designated by T2D of the M&W Local Plan is not identified / wrong respectively on the Policies Map – it should be added / corrected respectively. Policy Fordham6 should also refer to these designations.
- FRD.E1(A-G) – these should all be for B1, B2 and B8.
- FRD.E1 (D) - Object to the need for a concept plan
- Support reference to heritage and archaeology in the policy, but specific mention should be made of the scheduled...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Status: Site Allocation FRD.E1(c)</th>
<th>Parish: Fordham CP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Name: Existing employment allocation, land south of Landwade Road</td>
<td>Site Ref: Site/11/20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ancient monument and listed buildings which are very nearby.
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**
- Preferred site

**Date and time of site visit:**

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is an existing employment Local Plan 2015 allocation and should be retained to enable continued employment development.

---

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>Local Plan 2015 allocated site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land at Horse Racing Forensic Laboratories, Fordham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Fordham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>FRD6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Existing employment allocation, land at Horse Racing Forensic Laboratories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
- Large Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

This site lies partly within the Mineral Safeguarding Area for Sand and Gravel, designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Core Strategy and shown on Proposals Map C (2011). The overarching policy is CS26 Mineral Safeguarding Areas which sets out criteria which must be met in order for development to be permitted. However, in this instance the proposed site has largely already been developed, and thus the mineral is unlikely to be an economic resource therefore no objections would be raised in this context to this site being allocated.

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
- CS26

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
- >50% of site area in Zone 1

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**
- Flood Zone 1: 57.56%
- Flood Zone 2: 2.99%
- Flood Zone 3a: 9.54%
- Flood Zone 3b: 29.91%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
- Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):**
-
**Site Name:** Existing employment allocation, land at Horse Racing Forensic Laboratories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 Year:</th>
<th>0.11%</th>
<th>100 Year:</th>
<th>0.31%</th>
<th>1,000 Year:</th>
<th>3.26%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):** No
- **Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):** No

**3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation**
- N/a - employment site

**4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites**
- Within 500m of site

**4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment**

**Minor Criteria**

**5. Site Suitability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</th>
<th>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site within 50m of contaminated land</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment**
  - Road Haulage Depot on site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5b. Local road impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No objections with minor mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **5c. Strategic Road Network impact**

**5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**

- **Existing access will A142**
  - No new access to the A142 will be permitted
  - Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry
  - A Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan would need to accompany the development proposals for this site. This would need to follow the guidance from CCC TA guidelines; particularly the need to demonstrate that the site can provide adequate mitigation measures and assess and improve connectivity within Fordham. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. The development will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the development proposals. Individually these sites may not incur severe impact within Fordham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, however CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Fordham the cumulative impact could be significant, especially on A142 junctions and the A142/A14 junction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6a. Proximity to public transport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6b. Proximity to medical services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6c. Proximity to shops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6d. Proximity to Primary School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spare capacity in some years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The school is being expanded in size from 1FE to 2FE (210 places to 420 places) This is in part to meet an existing need but also in anticipation of a certain level of further housing development in the village</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6h. Proximity to employment sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7. Environmental impact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CWS within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**
### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

- No PZ and aquifers

### 7d. Agricultural land classification

- All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower: D

### 7e. Public Rights of Way

- E – No PRoW connection opportunities: E

### 7f. (i) PROW comments

### 7f. (ii) Conservation Area

- CA within 1.01km – 2km of site: B

### 7f. (iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

- SAM within 500m of site: D

### 7f. (iv) Archaeological asset

- Archaeological assets within 500m of site: D

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

ECDC: Already allocated - same issues as before

CCC: Proposal area located 150m N of SCHEDULED MONUMENT Roman villa south of Snailwell Fen (NHLE 1006868) and 100m E of non-designated prehistoric barrow cemetery (eg MCB 10817-8). Iron Age to Roman enclosures are known as cropmarks and find spots from 150m to the E (eg MCB20063 and 9358). Response to EIA scoping consultations in 2007 and 2008 recommended pre-determination fieldwork results to be incorporated into E5 to enable evidence base to be supplied with any planning application and to ensure that any Masterplan builds in an appropriate buffer to preserve the setting of the designated site area to the south. NGR 563440 268500.

### 7h. Visual Impact

- Justification for score:

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

- No TPO within 15m of the site: A

---

### Parish Council support and rank

- Does Parish Council support this site?

- Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

- Form G - Parish Council’s view:

---

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Support need for HRA
- No objection, but if mineral is extracted, it should be put to sustainable use.
- The Transport Safeguarding Area and the Waste Consultation Area for the European Metal Recycling Railhead, Snailwell, designated by T2D of the M&W Local Plan is not identified / wrong respectively on the Policies Map – it should be added / corrected respectively. Policy Fordham6 should also refer to these designations.
- FRD.E1(A-G) – these should all be for B1, B2 and B8.
- FRD.E1 (D) - Object to the need for a concept plan
- Support reference to heritage and archaeology in the policy, but specific mention should be made of the scheduled ancient monument and listed buildings which are very nearby.
**Site Name:** Existing employment allocation, land north of Snailwell Road

**Current Status:** Site Allocation FRD.E1(e)

**Parish:** Fordham CP

**Site Ref:** Site/11/18

### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**

- Preferred site

**Date and time of site visit:**

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is an existing employment Local Plan 2015 allocation and should be retained to enable continued employment development.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>Local Plan 2015 allocated site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land north of Snailwell Road, Fordham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Fordham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>FRD5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Existing employment allocation, land north of Snailwell Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Criteria

**1a. Settlement Hierarchy**

- Large Village

**1b. Site Availability**

**1c. Minerals and Waste assessment**

This site lies partly within the Mineral Safeguarding Area for Sand and Gravel, designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Core Strategy and shown on Proposals Map C (2011). The overarching policy is CS26 Mineral Safeguarding Areas which sets out criteria which must be met in order for development to be permitted. However, in this instance there is very little mineral within the sites, and it is in proximity to existing development. Thus the mineral is unlikely to be an economic resource therefore no objections would be raised in this context to this site being allocated. This site lies partly in the Transport Safeguarding Area for the European Metal Recycling Railhead, Snailwell, designated by Policy T2D of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012). The overarching policy is Policy CS23 of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011). This policy seeks to safeguard waste management facilities which make a significant contribution to managing Cambridgeshire’s waste; and the policy states that development will only be permitted where it is...
demonstrated that this will not prejudice existing or future planned waste management operations. Typically industrial uses (B2, B8) are unlikely to prejudice waste management operations, but it is suggested that consideration should be given to both of these policies prior to allocation in the interests of deliverability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies</th>
<th>CS26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations</td>
<td>W8T, T2D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2a. Flood zone | >50% of site area in Zone 1 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 1: 99.46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2b. Surface Water flood risk | Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 Year: 0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation

N/a - employment site

4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites

Within 500m of site

4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land

Site within 50m of contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

Road Haulage Depots to W

5b. Local road impact

No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

No access to the A142 will be permitted

Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

A Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan would need to accompany the development proposals for this site. This would need to follow the guidance from CCC TA guidelines; particularly the need to demonstrate that the site can provide adequate mitigation measures and assess and improve connectivity within Fordham. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. The development will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the development proposals. Individually these sites may not incur severe impact within Fordham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, however CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Fordham the cumulative impact could be significant, especially on A142 junctions and the A142/A14 junction.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

Spare capacity in some years

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
The school is being expanded in size from 1FE to 2FE (210 places to 420 places). This is in part to meet an existing need but also in anticipation of a certain level of further housing development in the village.

### 6. Available secondary school capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available secondary school capacity</th>
<th>Limited capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

### 6h. Proximity to employment sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proximity to employment sites</th>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</th>
<th>CWS within 500m of site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groundwater PZ and aquifers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agricultural land classification</th>
<th>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7e. Public Rights of Way

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Rights of Way</th>
<th>E – No PRoW connection opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7f.(i) PROW comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation Area</th>
<th>CA within 500.1 – 1000m of site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7f.(ii). Listed building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Listed building</th>
<th>LB within 500m of site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheduled Ancient Monument</th>
<th>SAM within 500m of site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archaeological asset</th>
<th>Archaeological assets on-site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

ECDC: Already allocated - same issues as before

CCC: Immediately adjacent (to the north) of SCHEDULED MONUMENT Roman villa south of Snailwell Fen (NHLE 1006868). Requires pre-determination fieldwork to enable evidence base to be supplied with any planning application and to ensure that any Masterplan builds in an appropriate buffer to preserve the setting of the designated site area to the east. NGR 563400 268260

### 7h. Visual Impact

#### 7i. TPOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TPOs</th>
<th>No TPO within 15m of the site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Justification for score:

#### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

**Parish Council support and rank**

**Does Parish Council support this site?**

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received**
**Current Status:** Site Allocation FRD.E1(e)  
**Parish:** Fordham CP  
**Site Name:** Existing employment allocation, land north of Snailwell Road  
**Site Ref:** Site/11/18

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Support need for HRA
- No objection, but if mineral is extracted, it should be put to sustainable use.
- The Transport Safeguarding Area and the Waste Consultation Area for the European Metal Recycling Railhead, Snailwell, designated by T2D of the M&W Local Plan is not identified / wrong respectively on the Policies Map – it should be added / corrected respectively. Policy Fordham6 should also refer to these designations.
- FRD.E1(A-G) – these should all be for B1, B2 and B8.
- FRD.E1 (D) - Object to the need for a concept plan
- Support reference to heritage and archaeology in the policy, but specific mention should be made of the scheduled ancient monument and listed buildings which are very nearby.
Current Status: Site Allocation FRD.E1(f)
Site Name: Existing employment allocation, land south of Snailwell Road
Parish: Fordham CP
Site Ref: Site/11/17

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is an existing employment Local Plan 2015 allocation and should be retained to enable continued employment development.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>Local Plan 2015 allocated site</th>
<th>ID: 227</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land south of Snailwell Road, Fordham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>FRD4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Existing employment allocation, land south of Snailwell Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Recommended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy | Large Village |
1b. Site Availability | |
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment | This site lies partly within the Mineral Safeguarding Area for Sand and Gravel, designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Core Strategy and shown on Proposals Map C (2011). The overarching policy is CS26 Mineral Safeguarding Areas which sets out criteria which must be met in order for development to be permitted. However, in this instance there is very little mineral within the sites, and it is in proximity to existing development. Thus the mineral is unlikely to be an economic resource therefore no objections would be raised in this context to this site being allocated. This site lies partly in the Transport Safeguarding Area for the European Metal Recycling Railhead, Snailwell, designated by Policy T2D of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012). The overarching policy is Policy CS23 of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011). This policy places a presumption against any development in the Transport Safeguarding Area which could prejudice the existing or potential use of the protected railhead for the transport of minerals and / or waste. This site lies largely within the Waste Consultation Area for the European Metal Recycling site at Fordham Road, Snailwell (Policy W8T) designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012). The overarching policy for this designation is Policy CS30 of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011). This policy seeks to safeguard waste management facilities which make a significant contribution to managing Cambridgeshire's waste; and the policy states that development will only be permitted where it is...
demonstrated that this will not prejudice existing or future planned waste management operations. Typically industrial uses (B2, B8) are unlikely to prejudice waste management operations, but it is suggested that consideration should be given to both of these policies in the interests of deliverability.

---

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

- **5a. Proximity to contaminated land**
  - Site within 50m of contaminated land

- **5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment**
  - Road Haulage Depot on W boundary

- **5b. Local road impact**
  - No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

- **5c. Strategic Road Network impact**

- **5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**
  - No access to the A142 will be permitted
  - Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

A Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan would need to accompany the development proposals for this site. This would need to follow the guidance from CCC TA guidelines; particularly the need to demonstrate that the site can provide adequate mitigation measures and assess and improve connectivity within Fordham. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. The development will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the development proposals. Individually these sites may not incur severe impact within Fordham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, however CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Fordham the cumulative impact could be significant, especially on A142 junctions and the A142/A14 junction.

---

### 6. Access to services

- **6a. Proximity to public transport**
  - Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

- **6b. Proximity to medical services**
  - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

- **6c. Proximity to shops**
  - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

- **6d. Proximity to Primary School**
  - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

- **6e. Proximity to Secondary School**
  - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

- **6f.(i) Available primary school capacity**
  - Spare capacity in some years

- **6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**
The school is being expanded in size from 1FE to 2FE (210 places to 420 places). This is in part to meet an existing need but also in anticipation of a certain level of further housing development in the village.

### 6f. Available secondary school capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Required capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6g. Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>CWS within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

- **7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**
  - CWS within 500m of site: D

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

- **7d. Agricultural land classification**
  - All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower: D

#### 7e. Public Rights of Way

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>No PRoW connection opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7f. PROW comments

- **7f.(i) Conservation Area**
  - CA within 500.1 – 1000m of site: C

- **7f.(ii) Listed building**
  - LB within 500m of site: D

- **7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument**
  - SAM within 500m of site: D

- **7f.(iv) Archaeological asset**
  - Archaeological assets on-site: E

#### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

- **ECDC:** Already allocated - same issues as before

- **CCC:** Metal detection Roman finds (incl Hod Hill type bow brooch) found within the plot. Immediately adjacent (to the west) of SCHEDULED MONUMENT: Roman villa south of Snailwell Fen (NHLE 1006868). Requires pre-determination fieldwork to enable evidence base to be supplied with any planning application and to ensure that any Masterplan builds in an appropriate buffer to preserve the setting of the designated site area to the east. NGR 563400 268260

### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

- **6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**
  - The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Required capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6f.(iii) Available secondary school capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Required capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Required status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7d. Agricultural land classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Required status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7e. Public Rights of Way

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>No PRoW connection opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f.(i) Conservation Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Required status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>CA within 500.1 – 1000m of site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f.(ii) Listed building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Required status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Required status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>SAM within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Required status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Archaeological assets on-site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

- **ECDC:** Already allocated - same issues as before

- **CCC:** Metal detection Roman finds (incl Hod Hill type bow brooch) found within the plot. Immediately adjacent (to the west) of SCHEDULED MONUMENT: Roman villa south of Snailwell Fen (NHLE 1006868). Requires pre-determination fieldwork to enable evidence base to be supplied with any planning application and to ensure that any Masterplan builds in an appropriate buffer to preserve the setting of the designated site area to the east. NGR 563400 268260

### 7h. Visual Impact

- **7h. Visual Impact**
  - Justification for score:

### Additional criterion 7l. TPOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Required status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>No TPO within 15m of the site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parish Council support and rank

- **Does Parish Council support this site?**
  - Form E - Parish Council site ranking:
  - Form G - Parish Council's view:

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received
### Current Status: Site Allocation FRD.E1(f)

**Parish:** Fordham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/11/17

**Site Name:** Existing employment allocation, land south of Snailwell Road

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Support need for HRA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No objection, but if mineral is extracted, it should be put to sustainable use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Transport Safeguarding Area and the Waste Consultation Area for the European Metal Recycling Railhead, Snailwell, designated by T2D of the M&amp;W Local Plan is not identified / wrong respectively on the Policies Map – it should be added / corrected respectively. Policy Fordham6 should also refer to these designations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• FRD.E1(A-G) – these should all be for B1, B2 and B8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• FRD.E1 (D) - Object to the need for a concept plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support reference to heritage and archaeology in the policy, but specific mention should be made of the scheduled ancient monument and listed buildings which are very nearby.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Preferred site

**Date and time of site visit:**

**Supersedes site submission(s)**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is an existing, developed parcel of employment land within the Fordham Employment Cluster. The site should be allocated for employment use to enable continued employment development of the site and to provide a logical boundary to the business park.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Existing business park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Fordham Rd, Snailwell, Fordham, Newmarket CB8 7NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Fordham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref</td>
<td>ID: 355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>Existing developed employment site within Fordham Employment Cluster providing a range of employment uses including offices, logistics and a recycling centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha)</td>
<td>11.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha)</td>
<td>19.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a. Settlement Hierarchy</th>
<th>Large Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b. Site Availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Minerals and Waste assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Flood zone</td>
<td>&gt;50% of site area in Zone 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

- **Flood Zone 1:** 96.35%
- **Flood Zone 2:** 0.15%
- **Flood Zone 3a:** 0.15%
- **Flood Zone 3b:** 3.35%

**2b. Surface Water flood risk**

Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):**

- **30 Year:** 0.37%
- **100 Year:** 1.14%
- **1,000 Year:** 6.91%
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- [ ]

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact
- [ ]

5c. Strategic Road Network impact
- [ ]

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- [ ]

#### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
- [ ]

6b. Proximity to medical services
- [ ]

6c. Proximity to shops
- [ ]

6d. Proximity to Primary School
- [ ]

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- [ ]

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- [ ]

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- [ ]

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

6h. Proximity to employment sites
- [ ]

#### 7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- [ ]

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers
- [ ]

7d. Agricultural land classification
- [ ]

7e. Public Rights of Way
- [ ]

7e.(i) PROW comments
- [ ]
**Site Name:** Employment land at and adjoining Lynx Business Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii) Listed building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

Does Parish Council support this site? Yes

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Support need for HRA
- No objection, but if mineral is extracted, it should be put to sustainable use.
- The Transport Safeguarding Area and the Waste Consultation Area for the European Metal Recycling Railhead, Snailwell, designated by T2D of the M&W Local Plan is not identified / wrong respectively on the Policies Map – it should be added / corrected respectively. Policy Fordham6 should also refer to these designations.
- FRD.E1(A-G) – these should all be for B1, B2 and B8.
- FRD.E1 (D) - Object to the need for a concept plan
- Support reference to heritage and archaeology in the policy, but specific mention should be made of the scheduled ancient monument and listed buildings which are very nearby.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment:  
Rejected

Date and time of site visit:
15:50 on 09 Aug 2016

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is physically separate from the built area of the village, and development of the site would likely result in unacceptable visual impacts. Other more suitable sites are available closer to the village centre. The site was not favoured by the parish council. The site should therefore be rejected.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  
ID: 23

Site Address: Land south of Fordham Road, Fordham, Ely, Cambridgeshire

Settlement: Fordham

LP15 Allocation Ref:  
Planning Perm. Ref:  

Site Description: Agriculture/horticulture land south of Fordham Road, Fordham, Ely, Cambridgeshire

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints: No known planning constraints, available, located near village amenities and transport links.

Current Use: Agriculture  
Proposed Use: Housing

Current Use info:

Proposed Use info:

Site Area Net (ha): 5.03  
Site Area Gross (ha): 6.71

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 60  
b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Large Village

1b. Site Availability
Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year: 0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**
Site Name: **Land south of Fordham Road, Fordham**

**Minor Criteria**

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land  
Site within 250m of contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

Factory 230m to E

5b. Local road impact  
No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

Access to site via Station Road
Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Statement, based on 60 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. These proposals total 1400 untis in Fordham, therefore the development will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the development proposals. Individually these sites may not incur severe impact within Fordham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, however CCC is concerned that by combing the impact of all identified sites in Fordham the cumulative impact could be significant, especially on A142 junctions and the A142/A14 junction.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport  
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops  
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School  
Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity  
Spare capacity in some years

6f.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The school is being expanded in size from 1FE to 2FE (210 places to 420 places) This is in part to meet an existing need but also in anticipation of a certain level of further housing development in the village

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity  
Limited capacity

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites  
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites  
CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
**Site Name:** Land south of Fordham Road, Fordham

**Parish:** Fordham CP

**Site Ref:** Site/11/01

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7d. Agricultural land classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7e. Public Rights of Way

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7e.(i) PROW comments

FP 19 runs alongside the western boundary of the site - provide a connection from the southern end of the site to the footpath then links into the wider highway network

### 7f. Conservation Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA within 500.1 – 1000m of site</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f.(ii) Listed building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LB within 500.1 – 1000m of site</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological assets within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

ECDC: No heritage impact

CCC: MCB19367 - Gardens of Shrubland House, Fordham to the immediate N, MCB14463 - Gardens and park at Fordham Abbey 380m E; MCB14609 Flint scatter 350m SW. An archaeological condition is recommended to be placed on any planning consent granted for development on this plot. NGR 565380 270050

### 7h. Visual Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Justification for score:

No major view issues

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No TPO within 15m of the site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parish Council support and rank

**Does Parish Council support this site?** No

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:** Fifth or more

**Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Site 11/01 – (promoter) site should be reassessed – recent permissions nearby demonstrate this site also suitable for up to 60 dwellings.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Has merit

Date and time of site visit: 16:30 09 Aug 2016

Supersedes site submission(s): The site should not be allocated as there are suitable sites available in closer proximity to village facilities and services. The proposal is for 100% community-led development and therefore has some merit.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
<th>ID: 25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Land rear of 2-5 Soham Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>Land rear of 2-5 Soham Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints</td>
<td>Site is owned by 7 members of the same family. We are looking at affordable homes, 1, 2 and 3 bedroom homes to support the young in the village, as all our children have moved out of the village as cannot afford houses here.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info</td>
<td>Paddocks/ploughed field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha): 1.81</td>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha): 2.411926</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 60</td>
<td>b) Recommended 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Large Village
1b. Site Availability Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment
1c.1 Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.2 Site affected by M+W Allocations
2a. Flood zone >50% of site area in Zone 1
2b. Surface Water flood risk Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone 1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3a</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3b</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):

-
**Site Name:** Land off Soham Road  
**Parish:** Fordham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/11/03

### Current Status
Rejected - not a site allocation

### Site Details
- **Site Ref:** Site/11/03
- **Parish:** Fordham CP
- **Site Name:** Land off Soham Road

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 2.01km - 5km from the site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

#### 5. Site Suitability

##### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

##### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

##### 5b. Local road impact
- No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

##### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

##### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- Access to site via Soham Road
- The development site should come forward with 11/04 + 11/13 the Highways Authority would seek one junction for all three sites
- Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry
- The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Statement, based on 60 units identified.
- This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. These proposals total 1400 units in Fordham, therefore the development will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the development proposals. Individually these sites may not incur severe impact within Fordham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, however CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Fordham the cumulative impact could be significant, especially on A142 junctions and the A142/A14 junction.

#### 6. Access to services

##### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

##### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

##### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- Spare capacity in some years

##### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Limited capacity

##### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- The school is being expanded in size from 1FE to 2FE (210 places to 420 places) This is in part to meet an existing need but also in anticipation of a certain level of further housing development in the village

##### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

#### 7. Environmental Impact

##### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

##### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**

Site Name: *Land off Soham Road*

Parish: **Fordham CP**

Site Ref: **Site/11/03**

### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 7d. Agricultural land classification

All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

| | D |

### 7e. Public Rights of Way

C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PROW within the site boundary

| | C |

### 7f. PROW comments

Provide an off road connection for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders between Carter St and Murfitts Lane in the north of the site through site 11/04 and 11/13 to FP7 which connects to the site 11/13 in the south east corner

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 7f.(i) Conservation Area

CA within 500.1 – 1000m of site

| | C |

### 7f.(ii). Listed building

LB within 500m of site

| | D |

### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

SAM more than 2km from site

| | A |

### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

Archaeological assets within 500m of site

| | D |

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

ECDC: Listed buildings to the north - consideration would need to be given to their setting

CCC: Recommended pre-determination works to be supplied with any planning application for Local Plan allocation Soham Road, land r/o 2-5 in 2012. Advice upheld here NGR 562250 271120

### 7h. Visual Impact

Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive

| | D |

**Justification for score:**

Important agricultural land creating setting for village.

### Additional criterion 7l. TPOs

No TPO within 15m of the site

| | A |

### Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site? Yes

Form E - Parish Council site ranking: Second

Form G - Parish Council's view:

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Site should be reassessed (detailed reasons given), for 45-60 dwellings
## Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:** 14:55 09 August

**Older site submission(s)**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is located beyond the logical boundary to the village created by Chippenham Road. Other suitable sites are available closer to the village centre. The site should therefore be rejected.

## Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Land west of Leechmere Farm, 198 Mildenhall Road, Fordham, Ely, Cambs, CB7 5NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Fordham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>Land south of Mildenhall Road / East of Chippenham Road, Fordham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints</td>
<td>Agent indicates that the site is well related to the settlement, being adjacent to the village boundary. The site was formerly in a part a sand and gravel pit. Access to the pit was on to Mildenhall Road via an existing dropped kerb. The site also has frontage to Chippenham Rd providing further access options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha)</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha)</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a. Settlement Hierarchy</td>
<td>Large Village - B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. Site Availability</td>
<td>Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22) - A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Minerals and Waste assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Flood zone</td>
<td>&gt;50% of site area in Zone 1 - A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 1: 100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 2: 0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Surface Water flood risk</td>
<td>Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The site is located beyond the logical boundary to the village created by Chippenham Road. Other suitable sites are available closer to the village centre. The site should therefore be rejected.
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**
Site Name: *Land south of Mildenhall Road / East of Chippenham Road, Fordham*
Parish: **Fordham CP**
Site Ref: **Site/11/06**

---

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

- **5a. Proximity to contaminated land**
  - Site located on contaminated land: **E**
  - Contaminated land professional assessment: **old quarry or pit**

- **5b. Local road impact**
  - No objections with Moderate mitigation measures: **B**

- **5c. Strategic Road Network impact**
  - Access to site via Middlenhall Road:
    - Has highway frontage: **B**
    - Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

- **5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**
  - The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Statement, based on 50 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. These proposals total 1400 units in Fordham, therefore the development will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the development proposals. Individually these sites may not incur severe impact within Fordham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, however CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Fordham the cumulative impact could be significant, especially on A142 junctions and the A142/A14 junction.

#### 6. Access to services

- **6a. Proximity to public transport**
  - Less than 5 min walk (<400m): **A**

- **6b. Proximity to medical services**
  - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m): **E**

- **6c. Proximity to shops**
  - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m): **E**

- **6d. Proximity to Primary School**
  - Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m): **C**

- **6e. Proximity to Secondary School**
  - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m): **E**

- **6f.(i) Available primary school capacity**
  - Spare capacity in some years: **B**

- **6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**
  - The school is being expanded in size from 1FE to 2FE (210 places to 420 places) This is in part to meet an existing need but also in anticipation of a certain level of further housing development in the village.

- **6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity**
  - Limited capacity: **C**

- **6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**
  - The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

- **6h. Proximity to employment sites**
  - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m): **E**

#### 7. Environmental impact

- **7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**
  - CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site: **B**
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land south of Mildenhall Road / East of Chippenham Road, Fordham  
**Parish:** Fordham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/11/06

### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7d. Agricultural land classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7d. Agricultural land classification</th>
<th>All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7e. Public Rights of Way

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7e. Public Rights of Way</th>
<th>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f. PROW comments

Provide an off road link between connection between Mildenhall Rd and Chippenham Rd

### 7f.(i) Conservation Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>CA within 1.01km – 2km of site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f.(ii) Listed building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(ii) Listed building</th>
<th>LB within 1.01km – 2km of site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</th>
<th>SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</th>
<th>Archaeological assets within 500.1 – 1000m of site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

**ECDC: No heritage impact**

**CCC:** Surface finds of prehistoric lithics (MCB12158) and barrows (Bronze Age burial mounds) known c. 650m to SE and SW of plot. An archaeological condition is recommended to be placed on any planning consent granted for development on this plot.  
*NGR564600 270920*

### 7h. Visual Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7h. Visual Impact</th>
<th>Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification for score:**

No particular impact because site screened from roads.

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional criterion 7i. TPOs</th>
<th>No TPO within 15m of the site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parish Council support and rank

**Does Parish Council support this site?** Yes

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:** Fourth

**Form G - Parish Council's view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit: 15:10 09 Aug 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site should be rejected due to high impact on landscape and because the proposal would result in the loss of employment land.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  ID: 29
Site Address: Mildenhall Lane, Fordham
Settlement: Fordham
LP15 Allocation Ref:  Planning Perm. Ref:
Site Description: Land south of Mildenhall Lane
Brown/Greenfield: Mixed
Known Constraints:
Current Use: Mixed use
Proposed Use info: Partly agricultural, partly haulage yard
Proposed Use:
Site Area Net (ha): 3.30
Site Area Gross (ha): 4.4
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 120  b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  Large Village  B

1b. Site Availability  Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)  A

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

This site lies within the Mineral Safeguarding Area for Sand and Gravel, designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Core Strategy and shown on Proposals Map C (2011). The overarching policy is CS26 Mineral Safeguarding Areas which sets out criteria which must be met in order for development to be permitted. However, in this instance the proposed site is in close proximity to existing development and the mineral resource is an isolated area. It is unlikely to be an economic resource therefore no objections would be raised in this context to this site being allocated.

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies  CS26

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

>50% of site area in Zone 1  A

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMSIW): -
### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 501m - 2km from the site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

#### 5. Site Suitability

##### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located on contaminated land

##### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
- Works on site

##### 5b. Local road impact
- No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

##### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

##### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- Access to site via Carter Street
- Potential Inver-vehicle Visibility Issues
- 40mph road speed limit
- Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

A Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan would need to accompany the development proposals for this site. This would need to follow the guidance from CCC TA guidelines; particularly the need to demonstrate that the site can provide adequate mitigation measures and assess and improve connectivity within Fordham. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. These proposals total 1400 untils in Fordham, therefore the development will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the development proposals. Individually these sites may not incur severe impact within Fordham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, however CCC is concerned that by combing the impact of all identified sites in Fordham the cumulative impact could be significant, especially on A142 junctions and the A142/A14 junction.

#### 6. Access to services

##### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

##### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

##### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- Spare capacity in some years

##### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Limited capacity

##### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

The school is being expanded in size from 1FE to 2FE (210 places to 420 places) This is in part to meet an existing need but also in anticipation of a certain level of further housing development in the village

##### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

#### 7. Environmental impact
**Site Name:** Land south of Mildenhall Lane

**Parish:** Fordham CP

**Site Ref:** Site/11/07

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

### Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td>CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater P2 and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>E – No PRoW connection opportunities</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td>Archaeological assets within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECDC: No heritage impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC: Roman settlement remains and prehistoric finds and a barrow lie to the SW, S and SE, while immediately E, Roman and medieval finds were recovered when metal detecting in a garden (MCB 13536-7). Requires pre-determination fieldwork to enable evidence base to be supplied with any planning application. NGR 563970 270700.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
<td>Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification for score:</td>
<td>Good views from road across site to open countryside.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional criterion 7i. TPOs</td>
<td>TPO tree on site</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parish Council support and rank

- **Does Parish Council support this site?** No
- **Form E - Parish Council site ranking:** Fifth or more
- **Form G - Parish Council's view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
**Site Ref:** Site/11/08  
**Parish:** Fordham CP  
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land adjoining 19 Station Road, Fordham,

### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:** 15:40 on 09 Aug 2016

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**  
The site is below the minimum size threshold (site capacity fewer than 10 units) and therefore should be rejected.

---

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land adjoining 19 Station Road, Fordham, Ely, Cambridgeshire, CB7 5LW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Fordham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP5 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Garden land adjoining 19 Station Road, Fordham,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>No known constraints. Site below size threshold - cannot accommodate sufficient dwellings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 3 b) Recommended 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a. Settlement Hierarchy</th>
<th>Large Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b. Site Availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Minerals and Waste assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies | |
| 1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2a. Flood zone</th>
<th>&gt;50% of site area in Zone 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 1:</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2b. Surface Water flood risk</th>
<th>Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent (%) of site area at risk (ufMISW):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Year:</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Date and time of site visit:** 15:40 on 09 Aug 2016

**Indicative no. of dwellings:** a) Submitted / estimated 3 b) Recommended 0

---

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Rejected

---

**Main findings and recommendations:**  
The site is below the minimum size threshold (site capacity fewer than 10 units) and therefore should be rejected.

---

**Date and time of site visit:** 15:40 on 09 Aug 2016

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**  
The site is below the minimum size threshold (site capacity fewer than 10 units) and therefore should be rejected.

---

**Date and time of site visit:** 15:40 on 09 Aug 2016

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**  
The site is below the minimum size threshold (site capacity fewer than 10 units) and therefore should be rejected.
# Site Ref: Site/11/08

**Site Name:** Land adjoining 19 Station Road, Fordham,  
Parish: Fordham CP

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- **Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):** No

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- **Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):** No

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone
- 501m - 2km from the site

#### 5. Site Suitability

##### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site within 250m of contaminated land

##### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
- Factory or 223m to NE

##### 5b. Local road impact
- No objections with minor mitigation measures

##### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

##### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- Access to site via Station Road
- Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

#### 6. Access to services

##### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

##### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

##### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- Limited capacity

##### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Limited capacity

##### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- The school is being expanded in size from 1FE to 2FE (210 places to 420 places)

##### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site.

#### 7. Environmental impact

##### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

##### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

##### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

##### 7d. Agricultural land classification
- All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

##### 7e. Public Rights of Way
- C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PROW within the site boundary

##### 7f.(i) PROW comments
**Site Name:** Land adjoining 19 Station Road, Fordham, Fordham CP

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Parish Council support and rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

| Fifth or more |

**Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

| |

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

| 7f.(i) Conservation Area | CA within 500.1 – 1000m of site | C |
| 7f.(ii) Listed building | LB within 500.1 – 1000m of site | C |
| 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument | SAM more than 2km from site | A |
| 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset | Archaeological assets within 500m of site | D |

**7g. Heritage / archaeology comments**

ECDC: No heritage impact

CCC: Advised a planning condition for this proposal area when consulted for Local Plan allocation proposed in 2012 for Station Road, land at 5

**7h. Visual Impact**

Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive | D |

**Justification for score:**

Alone, this site would harm views of countryside.

**Additional criterion 7i. TPOs**

No TPO within 15m of the site | A
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Station Road, Fordham

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected
Date and time of site visit: 15:55 on 09 Aug 2016

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is rejected as the proposal forms part of the open countryside and is not well related to the existing settlement.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  ID: 53
Site Address: Station Road, Fordham
Settlement: Fordham
LP15 Allocation Ref: Planning Perm. Ref: 
Site Description: Agricultural land at Station Road, Fordham
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Current Use: Agriculture  Proposed Use: Housing

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 100  b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Large Village
1b. Site Availability Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone >50% of site area in Zone 1

Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):
30 Year: 0.00%  100 Year: 0.00%  1,000 Year: 6.15%
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Station Road, Fordham  
**Parish:** Fordham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/11/11

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</strong></td>
<td>Site within 250m of contaminated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</strong></td>
<td>Old factory site 166m to E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5b. Local road impact</strong></td>
<td>No objections with minor mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Access to site via Station Road  
Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

A Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan would need to accompany the development proposals for this site. This would need to follow the guidance from CCC TA guidelines; particularly the need to demonstrate that the site can provide adequate mitigation measures and assess and improve connectivity within Fordham. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. These proposals total 1400 untills in Fordham, therefore the development will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the development proposals. Individually these sites may not incur severe impact within Fordham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, however CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Fordham the cumulative impact could be significant, especially on A142 junctions and the A142/A14 junction.

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6a. Proximity to public transport</strong></td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6b. Proximity to medical services</strong></td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6c. Proximity to shops</strong></td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6d. Proximity to Primary School</strong></td>
<td>Less than 15 min walk (&lt;1,200m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</strong></td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</strong></td>
<td>Spare capacity in some years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</strong></td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6h. Proximity to employment sites</strong></td>
<td>Less than 15 min walk (&lt;1,200m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</strong></td>
<td>CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

This text is from a document detailing the criteria and assessments for a proposed site, with specific emphasis on site suitability, access to services, and environmental impact. The document includes a table format for easy reference.
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Station Road, Fordham
Parish: Fordham CP
Site Ref: Site/11/11

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers
7d. Agricultural land classification
7e. Public Rights of Way
7f.(i) PROW comments
7f.(ii) Conservation Area
7f.(iii) Listed building
7f.(iv) Scheduled Ancient Monument
7f.(v) Archaeological asset
7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
7h. Visual Impact
7i. TPOs

ECDC: No heritage impact
CCC: Within former gardens of Shrubland House (MCB19367). MCB13841 Lithic implement found in central part of proposal area. Numerous excavation areas along Fordham by-pass directly W (350m) of the area revealed prehistoric occupation and burial evidence (eg MCBs MCB16949, MCB15001, MCB15000, MCB16950. Requires pre-determination fieldwork to enable evidence base to be supplied with any planning application. NGR 562330 270260.

No real views on site due to tree belt along Station Road.

Parish Council support and rank
Does Parish Council support this site? No
Form E - Parish Council site ranking: Fifth or more
Form G - Parish Council's view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received
Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:**
16:30 on 09 Aug 2016

**Supersedes site submission(s)**

**Main findings and recommendations:**
The site should be rejected on the basis that development of the site would be an intrusion into the countryside and could cause harm to the setting of the village.

---

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
<th>ID: 54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Station Road, Fordham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>Agricultural land at Station Road, Fordham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha)</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 400</td>
<td>b) Recommended 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Large Village

1b. Site Availability
Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N)</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies | |
| 1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations | |

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Flood Zone</strong></th>
<th><strong>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone 1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3a</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3b</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 Year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**

Site Name: **Station Road, Fordham**

| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No |

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 501m - 2km from the site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

#### 5. Site Suitability

##### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site within 250m of contaminated land

##### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
- Old factory site 166m to E

##### 5b. Local road impact
- No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

##### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

##### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

NO CLEAR INTERNAL SITE BOUNDARY COMMENTS & SCORE BASED ON ASSUMED LAYOUT

Access to site via Market Street

Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

A Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan would need to accompany the development proposals for this site. This would need to follow the guidance from CCC TA guidelines; particularly the need to demonstrate that the site can provide adequate mitigation measures and assess and improve connectivity within Fordham. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. These proposals total 1400 untils in Fordham, therefore the development will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the development proposals. Individually these sites may not incur severe impact within Fordham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, however CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Fordham the cumulative impact could be significant, especially on A142 junctions and the A142/A14 junction.

#### 6. Access to services

##### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

##### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- Spare capacity in some years

##### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

The school is being expanded in size from 1FE to 2FE (210 places to 420 places) This is in part to meet an existing need but also in anticipation of a certain level of further housing development in the village

##### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Limited capacity

##### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

##### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

#### 7. Environmental impact

##### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

##### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

...
### Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

**Site Name:** Station Road, Fordham

**Site Ref:** Site/11/12

#### Parish Council support and rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td>Fifth or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council's view:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td>Provide an off road connection for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders between the B1102 and Station Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 500.1 – 1000m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td>Archaeological assets on-site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECDC: No heritage impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC: Within former gardens of Shrubland House (MCB19367). MCB13841 Lithic implement found in central part of proposal area. Numerous excavation areas along Fordham by-pass directly W (350m) of the area revealed prehistoric occupation and burial evidence (eg MCBs MCB16949, MCB15001, MCB15000, MCB16950. Requires pre-determination fieldwork to enable evidence base to be supplied with any planning application. NGR 562330 270260.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
<td>Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7i. TPOs</td>
<td>TPO tree on site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification for score:**

Clearly part of open countryside, with development causing harm to village setting.
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:** 16:15 on 09 Aug 2016

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**
The site should be rejected on the basis that adequate site access is unlikely to be achievable. The site is not well related to the existing built form / townscape.

---

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
<th>ID: 278</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land off Grove Park, Carter Street, Fordham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Agricultural land off Grove Park, Fordham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>The site will also include areas set aside as green infrastructure that will provide natural play areas for both adults and children based on Discovery Play principles. These areas will also provide an opportunity to significantly increase local biodiversity, which is an integral part of the Discovery Play Concept. We will also set aside an additional area of 0.3 hectares for some form of community use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 200 b) Recommended 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

| Large Village |

1b. Site Availability

| Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22) |

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

| |

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

| |

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

| |

2a. Flood zone

| >50% of site area in Zone 1 |

| Flood Zone 1: 91.17% Flood Zone 2: 2.40% Flood Zone 3a: 6.44% Flood Zone 3b: 0.00% |

2b. Surface Water flood risk

| Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yrs)) |
**Site Name:** Land off Grove Park, Fordham

**Parish:** Fordham CP

**Site Ref:** Site/11/14

---

**Site Ref:** Site/11/14

**Site Name:** Land off Grove Park, Fordham

**Parish:** Fordham CP

**Site Name:** Land off Grove Park, Fordham

**Parish:** Fordham CP

**Site Name:** Land off Grove Park, Fordham

**Parish:** Fordham CP

---

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMSW):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>30 Year</th>
<th>100 Year</th>
<th>1,000 Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation

- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites

- 501m - 2km from the site

### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

---

**Minor Criteria**

### 5. Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land

- Site within 250m of contaminated land

---

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

- Old road haulage depot site 108m to S.

---

#### 5b. Local road impact

- Insurmountable safety issues that cannot be secured in accordance with CIL regulations

---

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

---

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

- Does not have a frontage with adopted public highway therefore no access is possible with adopted highway

---

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>6a. Proximity to public transport</th>
<th>6b. Proximity to medical services</th>
<th>6c. Proximity to shops</th>
<th>6d. Proximity to Primary School</th>
<th>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</th>
<th>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</th>
<th>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</th>
<th>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</th>
<th>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>Spare capacity in some years</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
<td>The school is being expanded in size from 1FE to 2FE (210 places to 420 places) This is in part to meet an existing need but also in anticipation of a certain level of further housing development in the village</td>
<td>The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</th>
<th>6h. Proximity to employment sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

---

- Site does not intersect Inner Zone
- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): Yes
- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): Yes
- 501m - 2km from the site
- Old road haulage depot site 108m to S.
- Insurmountable safety issues that cannot be secured in accordance with CIL regulations
- Does not have a frontage with adopted public highway therefore no access is possible with adopted highway
- The school is being expanded in size from 1FE to 2FE (210 places to 420 places) This is in part to meet an existing need but also in anticipation of a certain level of further housing development in the village
- The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.
- CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)
| 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment |  |
| 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers |  |
| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower |
| 7e. Public Rights of Way | C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary |
| 7f. (i) PROW comments | FP 4 runs from the B1102 across the site and provides an off road link to Fordham Moor Road. The FP will probably need diverting to a more appropriate alignment to allow for development and consider upgrading to cycle track or bridleway to allow for use by cyclists/horse riders in addition to pedestrians. |
| 7f. (ii) Conservation Area | CA within 500m of site |
| 7f. (iii) Listed building | LB within 500m of site |
| 7f. (iv) Scheduled Ancient Monument | SAM more than 2km from site |
| 7f. (v) Archaeological asset | Archaeological assets within 500m of site |
| 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments | ECDC: Listed buildings to the west and south - probably limited impact on heritage |
| 7h. Visual Impact | Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive |
| Justification for score | Some impact, though not an overly public area. |

**Parish Council support and rank**

| Does Parish Council support this site? | No |
| Form E - Parish Council site ranking: | Fifth or more |

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Existing housing allocation, land between 37 and 55 Mildenhall Road

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected
Date and time of site visit:
Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is an existing Local Plan allocation. However, its capacity is below the threshold (of 10 units) and should therefore be rejected.

Site Information

Site Type: Local Plan 2015 allocated site
Site Address: Land between 37 and 55 Mildenhall Road, Fordham
Settlement: Fordham
LP15 Allocation Ref: FRD2
Planning Perm. Ref:
Site Description: Existing housing allocation, land between 37 and 55 Mildenhall Road
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints:
Current Use: Agriculture
Proposed Use: Housing
Proposed Use info:
Site Area Net (ha): 0.30
Site Area Gross (ha): 0.3
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 11 b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Large Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment
This site lies within the Mineral Safeguarding Area for Sand and Gravel, designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Core Strategy and shown on Proposals Map C (2011). The overarching policy is CS26 Mineral Safeguarding Areas which sets out criteria which must be met in order for development to be permitted. However, in this instance the proposed site is in close proximity to existing development. It is unlikely to be an economic resource therefore no objections would be raised in this context to this site being allocated.

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies CS26
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%  

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):  

ID: 213 LP15 Allocation Ref: FRD2
Site Address: Land between 37 and 55 Mildenhall Road, Fordham
Site Description: Existing housing allocation, land between 37 and 55 Mildenhall Road
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints:
Current Use: Agriculture
Proposed Use: Housing
Proposed Use info:
Site Area Net (ha): 0.30
Site Area Gross (ha): 0.3
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 11 b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Large Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment
This site lies within the Mineral Safeguarding Area for Sand and Gravel, designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Core Strategy and shown on Proposals Map C (2011). The overarching policy is CS26 Mineral Safeguarding Areas which sets out criteria which must be met in order for development to be permitted. However, in this instance the proposed site is in close proximity to existing development. It is unlikely to be an economic resource therefore no objections would be raised in this context to this site being allocated.

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies CS26
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%  

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):
**Site Name:** Existing housing allocation, land between 37 and 55 Mildenhall Road  
**Parish:** Fordham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/11/15

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No |

### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 501m - 2km from the site

### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site within 50m of contaminated land

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
- Pit 41m to SW, 71m to N.

5b. Local road impact
- No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- Access to site via Station Road
- Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry
- This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

#### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- Spare capacity in some years

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Limited capacity

#### 6g. Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- The school is being expanded in size from 1FE to 2FE (210 places to 420 places) This is in part to meet an existing need but also in anticipation of a certain level of further housing development in the village

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification
- All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower

7e. Public Rights of Way
- E – No PRoW connection opportunities

#### 7e.(i) PROW comments
**Site Name:** Existing housing allocation, land between 37 and 55 Mildenhall Road

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Parish:** Fordham CP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>CA within 500m of site</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii) Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td>Archaeological assets within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ECDC:** Already allocated - same issues as before

**CCC:** Iron Age inhumations found to immediate N of plot (MCB9112). Relatively small plot, but heightened sensitivity owing to burials to N and Bronze Age find 80m to S (MCB9351). Requires pre-determination fieldwork to enable evidence base to be supplied with any planning application. NGR 563640 270825

**Parish Council support and rank**

Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Land to the East of Isleham Road
Parish: Fordham CP
Site Ref: Site/11/25

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit: 12:00 12 May 2017

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site does not relate well to the built form of the village. It is located in the open countryside and would likely be visually intrusive, resulting in adverse harm to the landscape.

Site Information

Site Type: FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17
Site Address: Isleham Road, Fordham
Settlement: Fordham
LP15 Allocation Ref: ID: 394
Planning Perm. Ref: Site Area Net (ha): 6.10
Site Area Gross (ha): 10.2

Site Description: Site currently in agricultural use, proposed for housing development.
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: Submission indicates site could deliver approximately 150 dwellings, on a net developable area of 6.10ha (60% of total site area).

Current Use: Agriculture
Proposed Use: Housing

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 150
b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Large Village
B

1b. Site Availability
Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)
A

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1
A

Flood Zone 1: 100.00% Flood Zone 2: 0.00% Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yri))
A

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):
30 Year: 0.00% 100 Year: 0.00% 1,000 Year: 1.05%
## Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
### Site Name: Land to the East of Isleham Road

### Parish: Fordham CP
### Site Ref: Site/11/25

| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No |

#### Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site within 250m of contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
- Pit 180m to S. Graveyard on boundary

5b. Local road impact
- No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry. Access on to B1102 must make provision for cycleway visibility

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- Spare capacity in every year

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- The CCC forward funded the expansion of the primary school in expectation of future housing development. The impact of the addition of these further two sites could be accommodated in the recently expanded primary school.

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- The combined effect of the call for additional sites is to require a further 3.3FE of additional secondary school places (500 places) Coupled with the impacts of sites identified in the earlier round the total number of places required cannot be delivered at Soham VC which already operates at (FE (1350 places) on its current site. Coupled with higher levels of growth elsewhere it would be the County Council’s intention to conduct a district wide review of secondary school provision on adoption of the new local plan. A strategic review would need to include the need for a further new secondary school (and site) within East Cambs as a potential option

6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification
- All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**  
**Site Name:** *Land to the East of Isleham Road*  
**Parish:** Fordham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/11/25

### 7e. Public Rights of Way
C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary

#### 7e.(i) PROW comments
Provide a new Public Right of Way across the site to provide a safe off road link between Mildenhall Rd and Isleham Rd.

### 7f. (i) Conservation Area
CA within 500m of site

### 7f. (ii) Listed building
LB within 500m of site

### 7f. (iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site

### 7f. (iv) Archaeological asset

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
ECDC - Listed building immediately opposite on Isleham Road and to the south. Site would wrap around the back of an existing gap in the street frontage and would be at odds with the built form of the area. Dependant on access points, potential to impact the setting of the listed buildings.

HE - Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary there is a grade II listed farmhouse opposite the site on the Isleham Road. Any development therefore has the potential to impact on this designated heritage asset. The site lies to the north of the village extending significantly into the countryside and would inevitably alter the character of the settlement at this approach to the village. In any event, it is important that any development of this site will need to preserve the listed building and its setting. Should the site be allocated, this requirement should be included in the policy and supporting text of the Plan.

### 7h. Visual Impact
Significant harm to landscape/townscape or key views - severe visual intrusion

#### Justification for score:
Significant harm to landscape and agricultural setting of Fordham.

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
No TPO within 15m of the site

#### Parish Council support and rank

- **Does Parish Council support this site?** No

- **Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

- **Form G - Parish Council’s view:** (c) not add this site to the Local Plan

#### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Rejected**

Date and time of site visit: 11:30 12 May 2017

Supersedes site submission(s):

Main findings and recommendations:

The site is currently in use as allotments; development would result in the loss of this community facility. The proposal does include the provision of allotments elsewhere, in the village, but this may be less preferable than retaining the allotments in situ (and does not compensate for the effort and resource gardeners have committed to their existing plots). Other suitable sites are available elsewhere in the village.

Site Information

Site Type: **FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17**

Site Address: Allotment Gardens, Collin’s Hill, Fordham

Settlement: Fordham

LP15 Allocation Ref: 395

Planning Perm. Ref: 395

Site Description: The site is currently in use as allotments. The proposal is for housing development of the site, with reprovision of allotments on land elsewhere in Fordham on land within the same ownership. The site adjoins additional land within the Diocese of Ely’s ownership which forms part of draft site allocation FRD.H1. This proposal seeks to extend the allocation southward.

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints: Submission indicates site could deliver 20-30 dwellings

Current Use info: Allotment gardens

Proposed Use info: Housing development, with the reprovision of allotments elsewhere in Fordham.

Site Area Net (ha): 3.00

Site Area Gross (ha): 4

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 30

b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

Large Village

1b. Site Availability

Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

>50% of site area in Zone 1

Flood Zone 1: 100.00% Flood Zone 2: 0.00% Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))

Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Rejected**
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**
Site Name: **Allotment Gardens, Collin's Hill**
Parish: **Fordham CP**
Site Ref: **Site/11/26**

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site within 50m of contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
- Old pit/quarry on N boundary

5b. Local road impact
- No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

#### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- Spare capacity in every year

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
The CCC forward funded the expansion of the primary school in expectation of future housing development. The impact of the addition of these further two sites could be accommodated in the recently expanded primary school.

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
The combined effect of the call for additional sites is to require a further 3.3FE of additional secondary school places (500 places) coupled with the impacts of sites identified in the earlier round the total number of places required cannot be delivered at Soham VC which already operates at (FE 1350 places) on its current site. Coupled with higher levels of growth elsewhere it would be the County Council's intention to conduct a district wide review of secondary school provision on adoption of the new local plan. A strategic review would need to include the need for a further new secondary school (and site) within East Cambs as a potential option

6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

#### 7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers
**Site Name:** Allotment Gardens, Collin’s Hill

**Parish:** Fordham CP

**Site Ref:** Site/11/26

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7d. Agricultural land classification</th>
<th>All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>E – No PRoW connection opportunities</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f. (i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f. (i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f. (ii) Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f. (iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f. (iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECDC - Conservation area and several listed buildings to the northwest, potential to have considerable impact on the wider setting, particularly in relation to the church.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE - Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary there is the grade I parish church of St Peter and the conservation area close to the site. Any development therefore has the potential to impact on these designated heritage assets. The site lies to the east of the village and would inevitably alter the setting of the Church to the south east which currently is open fields and allotments. Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts. As with the allocated site to the north of this potential site, we would prefer that this site is not brought forward for development. If however, the site continues to be brought forward through the Plan, we suggest that specific mention is made of the conservation area and listed buildings and the need to conserve and where opportunities arise enhance the conservation area, listed buildings and their settings in the Policy. Development would need to be of high quality design.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
<td>Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification for score:</td>
<td>Likely neutral. Subject to church (listed building). No real harm to town or landscape.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parish Council support and rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council’s view:</td>
<td>(c) not add this site to the Local Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Justification for score:

**Likely neutral. Subject to church (listed building). No real harm to town or landscape.**
## Summary of Findings and Recommendations

| Overall recommendation from site assessment: | Preferred site |
| Date and time of site visit: | 13:20 08 May 2017 |
| Supersedes site submission(s): | |

### Main findings and recommendations:

The site is supported by the Parish Council as a site for community-led development. The site is located close to village services. Vehicular access will require improvement, and the western and northern boundary will require a landscape buffer to mitigate landscape impacts.

### Site Information

| Site Type: | FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17 |
| Site Address: | West End, Haddenham |
| Settlement: | Haddenham |
| LP15 Allocation Ref: | ID: 397 |
| Site Description: | The site is currently used for agricultural and farming purposes. It is accessed via West End and Hardwicke Fields through a gated field entrance off an unmetalled track. The eastern boundary of the site abuts a 45 unit Mobile Homes Retirement Park built in the 1980s. The site is bound predominantly by large hedgerows and mature trees along the northern and southern boundaries. |
| Brown/Greenfield: | Greenfield |
| Known Constraints: | Submission indicates site could deliver 54 dwellings, supporting community-led development through the transfer of 16 affordable homes (30%) to Haddenham Community Land Trust, to be managed for the benefit of the local community in perpetuity. **Net site area estimated** |
| Current Use: | Agriculture |
| Proposed Use info: | Proposal includes community-led development. |
| Site Area Net (ha): | 2.40 |
| Site Area Gross (ha): | 3.2 |
| Indicative no. of dwellings: | 54 |
| Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening): | |

### Major Criteria

| 1a. Settlement Hierarchy | Large Village |
| 1b. Site Availability | Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22) |
| 1c. Minerals and Waste assessment | |
| 1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies | |
| 1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations | |
| 2a. Flood zone | >50% of site area in Zone 1 |

**Overall site assessment:** Preferred site

**Overall site recommendation:** Preferred site

**Overall site recommendation:** Preferred site

**Site visit date and time:** 13:20 08 May 2017

**Net site area:** 2.40 ha

**Site Area:** 3.2 ha

**Indicative dwellings:** 54

**Percent (%) of site area at risk:**

**Site Address:** West End, Haddenham

**Current Use:** Agriculture

**Proposed Use:** Housing

**Current Use info:** Proposal includes community-led development.

**Site Area Net (ha):** 2.40

**Site Area Gross (ha):** 3.2

**Indicative no. of dwellings:** 54

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land  
- Site within 100m of contaminated land

5a.(l) Contaminated land professional assessment  
- Oil sand quarry 81m to East

5b. Local road impact  
- Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment  
- Does not appear to have access to highways frontage OR shown access to highway Potential problems to access the highway Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

#### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport  
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services  
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6c. Proximity to shops  
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School  
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School  
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(l) Available primary school capacity  
- No spare places but room for expansion

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity  
- No spare places but room for expansion

6g.(l) Primary education impacts - professional assessment  
- The primary school is capable of being expanded to mitigate the impact of the development proposed in Haddenham including the additional sites in this document.

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment  
- There is potential to expand Witchford Village College on its current site. However, this latest call for site would result in much higher levels of development within the catchment area of the College if they were all included in the Local Plan. The level of development would generate another 595 secondary aged children or 4FE. This is in addition to the additional pupils identified from the sites included in the consultation draft local plan. At this level of development suitable mitigation could not be provided at Witchford VC. It would be the Council's intention on adoption of the Local Plan to undertake a strategic review of secondary school provision across the District and the review would include the option of a further new secondary school (and site) in order to provide suitable mitigation.

6h. Proximity to employment sites  
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

#### 7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites  
- CWS within 501m – 1km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
### Site Ref: Site/12/16

**Current Status:** Site Allocation HAD.H1  
**Site Name:** Land off West End  
**Parish:** Haddenham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/12/16

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Feature</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification

- All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower: C

#### 7e. Public Rights of Way

- E – No PRoW connection opportunities: E

#### 7f. PROW comments

- **(i) Conservation Area**: CA within 500m of site: D
- **(ii) Listed building**: LB within 500m of site: D
- **(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument**: SAM more than 2km from site: A
- **(iv) Archaeological asset**: SAM more than 2km from site: A

#### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

Conservation area immediately opposite and to the east. Likely to have a limited impact on designated heritage assets.

#### 7h. Visual Impact

- Significant harm to landscape/townscape or key views - severe visual intrusion: E

**Justification for score:**

Development of site would be visually intrusive to open countryside. Existing mobile homes site is in an elevated position and chalets are oriented to enjoy wide, distant views. Development could harm transitional isle character.

#### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

- No TPO within 15m of the site: A

### Parish Council support and rank

- **Does Parish Council support this site?** Yes

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council’s view:** (a) add this site to the Local Plan, and keep existing preferred site(s)?

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and should be retained.

---

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>Local Plan 2015 allocated site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land at New Road, Haddenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Haddenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>HAD2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Existing housing allocation, land at New Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Recommended 24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

Large Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1:</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2:</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a:</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 Year:</th>
<th>100 Year:</th>
<th>1,000 Year:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land

- Site within 100m of contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

- Old quarry 86m to SW

5b. Local road impact

- No objections with minor mitigation measures

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

- Has Highways frontage

| Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry |

| This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required |

#### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport

- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services

- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6c. Proximity to shops

- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School

- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School

- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

- No spare places but room for expansion

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

- Limited capacity

6g.(i) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

- The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area

#### 7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

- CWS within 500m of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification

- All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

7e. Public Rights of Way

- B – Opportunities to connect to multiple nearby PRoW within the site boundary
**Site Name:** Existing housing allocation, land at New Road  
**Current Status:** Site Allocation HAD.H2  
**Parish:** Haddenham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/12/12

### 7e.(i) PROW comments

This site is bounded by Site/12/08 and Footpath 3 in north and New Road in

### 7f.(i) Conservation Area

CA within 500m of site

### 7f.(ii). Listed building

LB within 500m of site

### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

SAM more than 2km from site

### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

Archaeological assets within 500m of site

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

ECDC: Already allocated - same issues as before

CCC: Previous LDF advice given in 2011& 12 was to apply a planning condition to any planning consent warded for development in this area owing to proximity to sensitive archaeological evidence (eg MCBs 10370-1, 16166 and 7059-71, and new IA/Ro evidence to the south (MCB20847). NGR 546850 275210

### 7h. Visual impact

Justification for score:

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

No TPO within 15m of the site

---

### Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:

---

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Site adjoins the Conservation Area. Development of the site will need to conserve and where opportunities arise enhance the conservation area and its setting – this requirement should be included in the policy, and should reflect the statutory requirements.
- Site promoter requests boundary is amended to included further land to the east, to enable the development of 180 dwellings – see Site/12/17.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit: 15:50 25 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site has good access from Chewells Lane (subject to footpath widening and junction improvement) and is largely free of constraints, and therefore is suitable for allocation for housing development. The site is understood to be currently in use as a plant nursery, albeit fairly low in scale and intensity.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  ID: 35
Site Address: Chewells Lane, Haddenham
Settlement: Haddenham

LP15 Allocation Ref: | Planning Perm. Ref: |
Site Description: Plant nursery site east of Chewells Lane, Haddenham
Brown/Greenfield: Brownfield

Known Constraints: Largely free of constraints. New access can be provided from Chewells Lane.

Current Use: Other (please specify)  Proposed Use: Housing

Current Use info: Plant nursery / garden centre

Proposed Use info:

Site Area Net (ha): 1.28  Site Area Gross (ha): 1.5

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 40  b) Recommended 40

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy: Large Village

1b. Site Availability: Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone: >50% of site area in Zone 1

| Flood Zone 1: | 100.00% | Flood Zone 2: | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3a: | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3b: | 0.00% |

2b. Surface Water flood risk: Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

| Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMSW): |
| 30 Year: | 0.00% | 100 Year: | 0.00% | 1,000 Year: | 1.81% |
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Proximity to Contaminated Land</th>
<th>Site within 100m of contaminated land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unknown filled ground 98m to N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5b. Local road impact</th>
<th>No objections with Moderate mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access off Chewells Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Highways improvements needed e.g. footway widening &amp; junction improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6a. Proximity to public transport</th>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6b. Proximity to medical services</th>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6c. Proximity to shops</th>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6d. Proximity to Primary School</th>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</th>
<th>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6f(i) Available primary school capacity</th>
<th>No spare places but room for expansion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6g(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The school is currently operating above its physical capacity of 270 places. There is potential for expansion by another 120 places on the site which would be sufficient to provide for development in excess of 300 units in the catchment area using the Council’s standard child yield multipliers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6f(ii) Available secondary school capacity</th>
<th>Limited capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6g(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6h. Proximity to employment sites</th>
<th>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</th>
<th>CWS within 500m of site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7d. Agricultural land classification</th>
<th>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7e. Public Rights of Way</th>
<th>B – Opportunities to connect to multiple nearby PRoW within the site boundary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Current Status: Site Allocation HAD.H3
Site Name: Land to the east of Chewells Lane, Haddenham
Site Ref: Site/12/06
Parish: Haddenham CP

7h. PROW comments
Footpath 2 and Bridleway 1 meet and connect to the north west corner of the plot on Chewells Lane. This plot connects to Site/12/08 which in turn connects to Site/12/12 and then New Road. Provide a link across these sites for pedestrians and cyclists.

7f.(i) Conservation Area
CA within 500m of site
D

7f.(ii) Listed building
LB within 500m of site
D

7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
SAM more than 2km from site
A

7f.(iv) Archaeological asset
Archaeological assets within 500m of site
D

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
ECDC: Conservation area to the south, east and west
HE: 12/06: affecting setting of a conservation area.
CCC: 130m NE of Saxon burial ground found in car park of 3 King’s pub, 170m W of park and garden (MCB16166) of Medieval Hinton Hall that overlies Roman and Saxon remains (MCB7059-61). Requires pre-determination fieldwork to enable evidence base to be supplied with any planning application. NGR546694 275594

7h. Visual Impact
Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views
C

Justification for score:
Unlikely to cause significant harm.

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
TPO tree within 15m of the site
B

Parish Council support and rank
Does Parish Council support this site? Yes
Form E - Parish Council site ranking: Fourth
Form G - Parish Council's view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received
Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
- Site promoter supports allocation of site, but requests that policy wording is amended to make it clear that the proposed dwelling figure (40 units) is indicative only.
- Site will deliver public benefits, including new public open spaces, play areas and improved access to public rights of way.
- Site is unconstrained and can be delivered within five years.
Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Preferred site**

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s):

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and should be retained.

### Site Information

**Site Type:** Local Plan 2015 allocated site  
**ID:** 219  
**Site Address:** Land at Haddenham Business Park, Station Road  
**Settlement:** Haddenham  
**LP15 Allocation Ref:** HAD3  
**Planning Perm. Ref:**  
**Site Description:** Existing employment allocation, land at Haddenham Business Park, Station Road  
**Brown/Greenfield:** Greenfield  
**Known Constraints:**  
**Current Use:** Agriculture  
**Proposed Use:** Employment  
**Current Use info:**  
**Proposed Use info:**  
**Site Area Net (ha):** 0.68  
**Site Area Gross (ha):** 0.8  
**Indicative no. of dwellings:** a) Submitted / estimated  
**b) Recommended**

### Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  
Large Village  

1b. Site Availability  

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment  

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies  

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations  

2a. Flood zone  
>50% of site area in Zone 1  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone 1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3a</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3b</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk  
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 30 Year:                         | 0.00%  
| 100 Year:                        | 0.00%  
| 1,000 Year:                      | 1.88%  

---

Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Preferred site**

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s):  

Main findings and recommendations:  
The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and should be retained.
### Current Status: Site Allocation HAD.E1

**Site Name:** Existing employment allocation, land at Haddenham Business Park, Station Road

| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No |
| 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation | N/a - employment site |
| 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites | 2.01km - 5km from the site |
| 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment | |

#### Minor Criteria

**5. Site Suitability**

| 5a. Proximity to contaminated land | Site within 100m of contaminated land |
| 5a.(i) Contaminated land profesional assessment | |
| Factory /works to S. Old landfill to 94m to E. |
| 5b. Local road impact | No objections with Moderate mitigation measures |
| 5c. Strategic Road Network impact | |
| 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment | Access off Sutton Road |
| Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry |
| This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required. |

**6. Access to services**

| 6a. Proximity to public transport | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) |
| 6b. Proximity to medical services | Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m) |
| 6c. Proximity to shops | Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m) |
| 6d. Proximity to Primary School | Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m) |
| 6e. Proximity to Secondary School | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) |
| 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity | No spare places but room for expansion |
| 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment | The school is currently operating above its physical capacity of 270 places. There is potential for expansion by another 120 places on the site which would be sufficient to provide for development in excess of 300 units in the catchment area using the Council’s standard child yield multipliers |
| 6g.(ii) Available secondary school capacity | Limited capacity |
| 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment | The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area |
| 6h. Proximity to employment sites | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) |

**7. Environmental impact**

| 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites | CWS within 500m of site |
| 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment | |
| 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers | |
| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower |
| 7e. Public Rights of Way | D – Opportunities to connect to nearby PROiWs outside the site boundary |
| 7e.(i) PROW comments | |
Footpath 11 runs to the south west of the site. Consider providing a connection with this Footpath which will require the agreement of the adjacent landowner.

7f.(i) Conservation Area | CA within 500m of site | D
7f.(ii). Listed building | LB within 500m of site | D
7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument | SAM more than 2km from site | A
7f.(iv) Archaeological asset | Archaeological assets within 500.1 – 1000m of site | C

ECDC: Already allocated - same issues as before

CCC: No archaeological potential. No objection and no requirement. 546630 276390

7h. Visual Impact

Justification for score:

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs | No TPO within 15m of the site | A

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

#### Overall recommendation from site assessment:
- **Rejected**

#### Date and time of site visit:
- 16:20 25 July 2016

#### Supersedes site submission(s):

#### Main findings and recommendations:
The proposal to change the use of the site from employment to housing is rejected on the basis that the site is physically separate from the main area of the village, therefore access to village services would likely be poor; the proposal would result in the loss of employment land; and access is likely to be a constraint.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Land north of Hinton Hedges Road, Haddenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Haddenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>Land north of Hinton Hedges Road, Haddenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints</td>
<td>Formerly used for quarry activities. Commercial property (tyre reconditioning) is located in centre of the site. A small lake associated with brick making activities lies north of the land. May require geotechnical/contaminated land assessment as well as consideration of ecological constraints. Agent indicates CLD not considered to date (but indicates approx 20% CLD).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td>Vacant land and occupied commercial premises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Recommended 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Criteria

#### 1a. Settlement Hierarchy
- Large Village

#### 1b. Site Availability
- Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

#### 1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

#### 1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

#### 1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

#### 2a. Flood zone
- >50% of site area in Zone 1

#### Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
- Flood Zone 1: 100.00% |
- Flood Zone 2: 0.00% |
- Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% |
- Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

#### 2b. Surface Water flood risk
- Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

#### Date and time of site visit:
- 16:20 25 July 2016

#### Supersedes site submission(s):
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land  
- Site located on contaminated land [E]

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
- Filled ground, pit or quarry

5b. Local road impact
- Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations [D]

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- Access must be off station Road NOT off Hinton Hedges Road  
- Can only be accessed via site 12/07
  
  This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

#### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m) [A]

6b. Proximity to medical services
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m) [B]

6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m) [B]

6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m) [C]

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) [E]

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion [D]

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Limited capacity [C]

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- The school is currently operating above its physical capacity of 270 places. There is potential for expansion by another 120 places on the site which would be sufficient to provide for development in excess of 300 units in the catchment area using the Council's standard child yield multipliers

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area

6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m) [A]

#### 7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 500m of site [D]

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers
| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower | D |
| 7e. Public Rights of Way | E – No PRoW connection opportunities | E |
| 7e.(i) PROW comments | |
| 7f.(i) Conservation Area | CA within 500m of site | D |
| 7f.(ii) Listed building | LB within 500m of site | D |
| 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument | SAM more than 2km from site | A |
| 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset | Archaeological assets within 500m of site | D |
| 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments | |
| ECDC: Conservation area to the southwest - limited impact on heritage | |
| CCC: Former Brick & Tile works site with quarries and rail (MCB20040). Responded with 'No Comment' to 2011 LDF/Local Plan consultation for Anson Packaging, land adjacent. No objection and no archaeological requirements NGR 546740 276230 | |
| 7h. Visual Impact | Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views | C |
| Justification for score: | |
| No clear views. | |
| Additional criterion 7i. TPOs | TPO tree on site | C |
| Parish Council support and rank | |
| Does Parish Council support this site? | No | |
| Form E - Parish Council site ranking: | Fifth or more | |
| Form G - Parish Council's view: | |

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit: 14:30 25 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is rejected as safe site access is unlikely to be achievable. Aldreth village offers limited services, and the site is not supported by the Parish Council.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B) ID: 31
Site Address: Rear of High Street, east of School Lane
Settlement: Aldreth
LP15 Allocation Ref: Planning Perm. Ref:
Site Description: Farmyard site rear of High St, east of School Lane
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: Potential for new access from School Lane. Site includes traditional agricultural buildings with potential for conversion.
Current Use: Agriculture Proposed Use: Housing
Current Use info:
Proposed Use info:
Site Area Net (ha): 1.28 Site Area Gross (ha): 1.5
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 30 b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Small Village
1b. Site Availability Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment
1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone >50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
- Flood Zone 1: 100.00% Flood Zone 2: 0.00% Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
- 30 Year: 0.06% 100 Year: 0.17% 1,000 Year: 5.81%
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** De-Freville Farmyard  
**Parish:** Haddenham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/12/02

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>5. Site Suitability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</strong></td>
<td>Site located on contaminated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>old farm buildings on site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5b. Local road impact</strong></td>
<td>Insurmountable safety issues that cannot be secured in accordance with CIL regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment** | NO access via High Street  
School Lane is un-adopted  
Visibilty problems and very restricted frontage with the highway  
Can not achieve required highways frontage and visibility splays  
This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Access to services</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6a. Proximity to public transport</strong></td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6b. Proximity to medical services</strong></td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6c. Proximity to shops</strong></td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6d. Proximity to Primary School</strong></td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</strong></td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</strong></td>
<td>No spare places but room for expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</strong></td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school is currently operating above its physical capacity of 270 places. There is potential for expansion by another 120 places on the site which would be sufficient to provide for development in excess of 300 units in the catchment area using the Council's standard child yield multipliers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6h. Proximity to employment sites</strong></td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Environmental impact</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</strong></td>
<td>CWS within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7d. Agricultural land classification</strong></td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Parish Council support and rank**

**Does Parish Council support this site?**
No

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**
Fifth or more

**Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

---

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Rejected**

Date and time of site visit: 14:25 25 July

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is rejected on the basis that Aldreth offers very limited services and facilities; the site is located beyond the current ‘gateway’ to the village and would therefore affect the character of the village; and, development of the site could harm views to the countryside.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
<th>ID: 32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land south of Aldreth Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Aldreth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Land south of Aldreth Road in agricultural use (arable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 10  b) Recommended 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy | Small Village |
1b. Site Availability | Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22) |
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment |

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies |
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations |

2a. Flood zone | >50% of site area in Zone 1 |

| Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening): |
| Flood Zone 1: 100.00% | Flood Zone 2: 0.00% | Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% | Flood Zone 3b: 0.00% |

2b. Surface Water flood risk | Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA |

| Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW): |
| 30 Year: 0.00% | 100 Year: 0.00% | 1,000 Year: 7.55% |
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located in area benefiting from defences (Y/N): No
- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
- Site located in area benefiting from defences (Y/N): No

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
- Site located in area benefiting from defences (Y/N): No

5b. Local road impact
- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
- Site located in area benefiting from defences (Y/N): No

5c. Strategic Road Network impact
- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
- Site located in area benefiting from defences (Y/N): No

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
- Site located in area benefiting from defences (Y/N): No

Access off Aldreth Road
Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry
This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

#### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
- Site located in area benefiting from defences (Y/N): No

6b. Proximity to medical services
- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
- Site located in area benefiting from defences (Y/N): No

6c. Proximity to shops
- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
- Site located in area benefiting from defences (Y/N): No

6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
- Site located in area benefiting from defences (Y/N): No

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
- Site located in area benefiting from defences (Y/N): No

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
- Site located in area benefiting from defences (Y/N): No

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
- Site located in area benefiting from defences (Y/N): No

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
- Site located in area benefiting from defences (Y/N): No

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
- Site located in area benefiting from defences (Y/N): No

#### 7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
- Site located in area benefiting from defences (Y/N): No

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
- Site located in area benefiting from defences (Y/N): No

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers
- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
- Site located in area benefiting from defences (Y/N): No

7d. Agricultural land classification
- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
- Site located in area benefiting from defences (Y/N): No

7e. Public Rights of Way
- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
- Site located in area benefiting from defences (Y/N): No

7e.(i) PROW comments
- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
- Site located in area benefiting from defences (Y/N): No
**Site Name:** Land south of Aldreth Road  
**Parish:** Haddenham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/12/03  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii) Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td>Archaeological assets within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7g. Heritage / archaeology comments**

ECDC: No heritage impact

CCC: St Etheldreda’s Well, stone lined, situated c15 chains NE of Freville Farm and dedicated to St Etheldreda. It was filled in in 1847. MCB7070. Roman and Medieval metal detection finds 70m to E (MCB11109-10). No objection, but recommend a planning condition for any planning application. NGR 544790 273700

**7h. Visual Impact**

Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive  
**Score:** D

**Justification for score:**

Beyond village - feels intrusive to countryside.

**Additional criterion 7i. TPOs**

No TPO within 15m of the site  
**Score:** A

**Parish Council support and rank**

**Does Parish Council support this site?** Yes

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:** Second

**Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**

**Site Information**

- **Site Type**: New site submission (Form B)
- **Site Address**: Land adjacent to 4a High Street, Aldreth, Ely, Cambridgeshire, CB6 3PQ
- **Settlement**: Aldreth
- **LP15 Allocation Ref**: 
- **Site Area Net (ha)**: 0.47
- **Site Area Gross (ha)**: 0.549
- **Indicative no. of dwellings**: 
  - a) Submitted / estimated: 12
  - b) Recommended: 0

**Major Criteria**

1. **Settlement Hierarchy**
   - Small Village

2. **Site Availability**
   - Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

3. **Minerals and Waste assessment**

4. **Flood zone**
   - >50% of site area in Zone 1

5. **Surface Water flood risk**
   - Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is rejected on the basis that Aldreth offers very limited services and facilities; and, development of whole site could harm village character.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation</strong></td>
<td>Site does not intersect Inner Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites</strong></td>
<td>2.01km - 5km from the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Site Suitability</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</strong></td>
<td>Site within 50m of contaminated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>old farm buildings 95m to SW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5b. Local road impact</strong></td>
<td>No objections with minor mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Access off Aldreth Road
Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Access to services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6a. Proximity to public transport</strong></td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6b. Proximity to medical services</strong></td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6c. Proximity to shops</strong></td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6d. Proximity to Primary School</strong></td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</strong></td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</strong></td>
<td>No spare places but room for expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</strong></td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>old farm buildings 95m to SW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6h. Proximity to employment sites</strong></td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6i. Proximity to employment sites - professional assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Environmental impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</strong></td>
<td>CWS within 501m – 1km of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7d. Agricultural land classification</strong></td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7e. Public Rights of Way</strong></td>
<td>E – No PRoW connection opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Site Name:** Land adjacent to 4a High Street, Aldreth, Ely, Cambridgeshire, CB6 3PQ  

**Parish:** Haddenham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/12/04

### 7e.(i) PROW comments

### 7f.(i) Conservation Area

| CA within 1.01km – 2km of site | B |

### 7f.(ii). Listed building

| LB within 1.01km – 2km of site | B |

### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

| SAM more than 2km from site | A |

### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

| Archaeological assets within 500m of site | D |

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

**ECDC:** No heritage impact

**CCC:** Roman and Medieval metal detection finds found 70m to NW (MCBs7334-5). No objection, but recommend a planning condition for any planning application. NGR 544700 273720

### 7h. Visual Impact

| Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views | C |

### Justification for score:

High hedge restricts views to countryside.

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

| No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

### Parish Council support and rank

**Does Parish Council support this site?** Yes  
**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:** First  
**Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Has merit

**Date and time of site visit:** 15:05 25 July 2016

**Supersedes site submission(s)**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site has some merit, but should not be allocated as other more suitable sites are available within the village, in closer proximity to village services. Hod Hall Lane is an unadopted lane without a suitable surface and would require upgrading. Access could potentially be achieved from Metcalfe Way, subject to further investigation to demonstrate that this is suitable. The site is steeply sloping and the nature of adjoining development, may mean the site does not fit well with the built form of the village.

**Site Information**

**Site Type:** New site submission (Form B)  
**ID:** 34  
**Site Address:** Land off Metcalfe Way, Haddenham  
**Settlement:** Haddenham  
**LP15 Allocation Ref:**  
**Planning Perm. Ref:**  
**Site Description:** Agricultural land off Metcalfe Way, Haddenham  
**Brown/Greenfield:** Greenfield  
**Known Constraints:** Agent indicates site is largely free of physical constraints. New access can be provided from Metcalfe Way where the site currently borders the adopted highway.

**Current Use:** Agriculture  
**Proposed Use:** Housing  
**Current Use info:**  
**Proposed Use info:**

**Site Area Net (ha):** 1.62  
**Site Area Gross (ha):** 1.9

**Indicative no. of dwellings:**  
| a) Submitted / estimated | 40 | b) Recommended | 0 |

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  
Large Village

1b. Site Availability  
Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone  
>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

| Flood Zone 1 | 100.00% | Flood Zone 2 | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3a | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3b | 0.00% |

2b. Surface Water flood risk  
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

| 30 Year | 0.00% | 100 Year | 0.00% | 1,000 Year | 2.46% |
### Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**

**Site Name:** *Metcalfe Way*  
**Parish:** *Haddenham CP*  
**Site Ref:** *Site/12/05*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Minor Criteria

**5. Site Suitability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</th>
<th>Site located more than 250m from contaminated land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>No objections with minor mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>Access off Metcalfe Way as Hod Hall Road is a track and not suitable unless upgraded to adoptable highway. Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry. This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**6. Access to services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6a. Proximity to public transport</th>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>No spare places but room for expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6h. Proximity to employment sites</td>
<td>Less than 20 min walk (&lt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7. Environmental impact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</th>
<th>CWS within 501m – 1km of site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PWoW within the site boundary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Parish Council support and rank**

- **Does Parish Council support this site?** Yes
- **Form E - Parish Council site ranking:** Third
- **Form G - Parish Council's view:**

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- The site promoter disagrees with the findings of the site assessment and objects to the rejection of the site.
- The site is located approximately 340 metres from a Water Recycling Centre. An odour assessment will be undertaken to ensure no detrimental impact on the quality of life of future residents.
- Proposed layout of the site can easily accommodate sloping topography, and respect adjoining development, through appropriate mix of dwelling sizes and sensitive placing and orientation.
- A significant landscape buffer will be installed to protect neighbouring amenity.
- Site promoter argues that the site is just as suitable as the draft site allocations, when considered against the assessment criteria.
- Proximity to heritage assets should not be treated as a negative factor.
- Site will bring forward sustainable development, without harm to the character and facilities, and will bring investment in infrastructure.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit: 15:20 25 July 2016

Main findings and recommendations:
Site capacity is below the 10 unit threshold. The site is rejected on this basis.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  ID: 37
Site Address: Hod Hall Lane, Haddenham, Ely, Cambridgeshire, CB6 3UX
Settlement: Haddenham
LP15 Allocation Ref: Site Area Net (ha): 0.21  Site Area Gross (ha): 0.21
Site Description: Land at Hod Hall Lane, Haddenham
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: Proposed 3 units only - below threshold for site allocation.
Current Use: Agriculture  Proposed Use: Housing
Current Use info: Vacant land
Proposed Use info: 
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 3  b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  Large Village  B
1b. Site Availability  Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)  A
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment
This site lies wholly within the Safeguarding Area for the Haddenham Waste Water Treatment Works (Policy W7R) designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012). The overarching policy for this designation is Policy CS31 of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011). This policy places a presumption against allowing development which would be occupied by people; and where new development is proposed an odour assessment report should accompany any planning application. Permission should only be granted when it has been demonstrated that the proposed development would not be adversely affected by the continued operation of the existing waste water treatment works. Consideration should be given to these policies in the interests of deliverability.
1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies  B
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations W7R

2a. Flood zone  >50% of site area in Zone 1  A
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%
Site Name: Residential development at land off Hod Hall Lane, Haddenham, Ely, Cambridgeshire, CB6 3UX

Site Ref: Site/12/07

Parish: Haddenham CP

Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

2b. Surface Water flood risk

| Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW): | 30 Year: 0.00% | 100 Year: 0.00% | 1,000 Year: 4.69% |

Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation

Site does not intersect Inner Zone

4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites

More than 5km from site

4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land

Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact

No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

Hod Hall Lane is a track and not constructed to an adoptable standard. Improvements to this will be required
Junction improvements maybe required
Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport

Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6b. Proximity to medical services

Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

6c. Proximity to shops

Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School

Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

No spare places but room for expansion

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

Limited capacity

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

The school is currently operating above its physical capacity of 270 places. There is potential for expansion by another 120 places on the site which would be sufficient to provide for development in excess of 300 units in the catchment area using the Council’s standard child yield multipliers

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area

6h. Proximity to employment sites

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

CWS within 500m of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

8. Planning considerations

8a. Design

8b. History and character

8c. Heritage and conservation

8d. Archaeology

8e. Open spaces

8f. Air quality

8g. Noise

8h. Green Belt

8i. Town centre

8j. Housing need

8k. Employment and economic development

8l. Infrastructure

8m. Traffic

8n. Environmental sustainability

8o. Flood risk

8p. Watercourses and water quality

8q. Waste management

8r. Energy

8s. Climate change

8t. Non-metropolitan green belts

8u. Urban extensions

8v. countryside locations

8w. Wildlife sites

8x. Haddham CP

8y. Haddenham CP

8z. Haddenham CP

9. Legal and economic considerations

9a. Local Plan

9b. Core Strategy

9c. Development plan

9d. Development plan

9e. Development plan

9f. Development plan

9g. Development plan

9h. Development plan

9i. Development plan

9j. Development plan

9k. Development plan

9l. Development plan

9m. Development plan

9n. Development plan

9o. Development plan

9p. Development plan

9q. Development plan

9r. Development plan

9s. Development plan

9t. Development plan

9u. Development plan

9v. Development plan

9w. Development plan

9x. Development plan

9y. Development plan

9z. Development plan

10. Other relevant considerations

10a. Flood risk

10b. Watercourses and water quality

10c. Waste management

10d. Energy

10e. Climate change

10f. Non-metropolitan green belts

10g. Urban extensions

10h. Wildlife sites

10i. Haddenham CP

10j. Haddenham CP

10k. Haddenham CP

10l. Haddenham CP

10m. Haddenham CP

10n. Haddenham CP

10o. Haddenham CP

10p. Haddenham CP

10q. Haddenham CP

10r. Haddenham CP

10s. Haddenham CP

10t. Haddenham CP

10u. Haddenham CP

10v. Haddenham CP

10w. Haddenham CP

10x. Haddenham CP

10y. Haddenham CP

10z. Haddenham CP
**Site Name:** Residential development at land off Hod Hall Lane, Haddenham, Ely, Cambridgeshire, CB6 3UX

### Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

### Parish: Haddenham CP

### Site Ref: Site/12/07

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish Council support and rank</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECDC: Conservation area to the northwest - no heritage impact</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC: CANNOT FIND, ASSUME 12/08 is labelled twice. Same advice applies here if so.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification

| 5b. Parish Council support and rank | 24 |
| Energy efficiency | D |
| Ecological sustainability | D |
| Good design and architecture | D |
| Public access | D |

#### 7e. Public Rights of Way

| 5c. Parish Council support and rank | 24 |
| Public access | E |
| Environmentally sensitive | E |
| Resilience to climate change | E |
| Economic viability | E |

#### 7f.(i) PROW comments

| 5d. Parish Council support and rank | 24 |
| Public access | E |
| Environmentally sensitive | E |
| Resilience to climate change | E |
| Economic viability | E |

#### 7f.(ii) Conservation Area

| 5e. Parish Council support and rank | 24 |
| Public access | D |
| Environmentally sensitive | D |
| Resilience to climate change | D |
| Economic viability | D |

#### 7f.(iii) Listed building

| 5f. Parish Council support and rank | 24 |
| Public access | D |
| Environmentally sensitive | D |
| Resilience to climate change | D |
| Economic viability | D |

#### 7f.(iv) Scheduled Ancient Monument

| 5g. Parish Council support and rank | 24 |
| Public access | A |
| Environmentally sensitive | A |
| Resilience to climate change | A |
| Economic viability | A |

#### 7f.(v) Archaeological asset

| 5h. Parish Council support and rank | 24 |
| Public access | C |
| Environmentally sensitive | C |
| Resilience to climate change | C |
| Economic viability | C |

#### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

| 5i. Parish Council support and rank | 24 |
| Public access | B |
| Environmentally sensitive | B |
| Resilience to climate change | B |
| Economic viability | B |

#### 7h. Visual Impact

| 5j. Parish Council support and rank | 24 |
| Public access | C |
| Environmentally sensitive | C |
| Resilience to climate change | C |
| Economic viability | C |

### Justification for score:

#### Unlikely to cause harm

### Additional criterion 7l. TPOs

| 5k. Parish Council support and rank | 24 |
| Public access | B |
| Environmentally sensitive | B |
| Resilience to climate change | B |
| Economic viability | B |

#### FDLFP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**
Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:**
15:40 25 July 2016

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**
Safe highway access to the site is unlikely to be achievable. The site is therefore rejected.

---

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land at Hinton Hall Farm, Haddenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Haddenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Former orchards at Hinton Hall Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Site comprises two parcels of land contained by mature hedge boundaries. Both sites lie adjacent to existing development. One parcel adjoins allocated site HAD2 and therefore provides an opportunity for a second phase of development following the 24 units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 200 b) Recommended 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Large Village

1b. Site Availability
Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**
- Flood Zone 1: 100.00%
- Flood Zone 2: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yrs))

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):**
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation  
Site Name: Land at Hinton Hall Farm  
Parish: Haddenham CP  
Site Ref: Site/12/08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>5. Site Suitability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
<td>Site within 50m of contaminated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td>unknown quarry 38m to N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>Insurmountable safety issues that cannot be secured in accordance with CIL regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment | NO highways frontage or appropriate access to public highway as numbers would be to great to be acceptable on A1123 junction with Chewells Lane  
Third party landpurchase would be required  
Ruled out by HDM comment |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Access to services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6h. Proximity to employment sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Environmental impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land at Hinton Hall Farm  
**Parish:** Haddenham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/12/08

| **7d. Agricultural land classification** | All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower | D |
| **7e. Public Rights of Way** | B – Opportunities to connect to multiple nearby PRoW within the site boundary | B |
| **7f.(i) PROW comments** |  |
| This plots connects with Site/12/06 on the west side and Site/12/12 to the south. Footpath 3 runs between this site and Site/12/12. Provide a link between the sites for pedestrians and cyclists and also to Footpath 3. |  |
| **7f.(ii) Conservation Area** | Site is within CA | E |
| **7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument** | SAM more than 2km from site | A |
| **7f.(iv) Archaeological asset** | Archaeological assets on-site | E |
| **7g. Heritage / archaeology comments** |  |
| ECDC: Part of site in conservation area therefore potential impact on heritage asset and consideration would need to be shown |  |
| HE: 12/08: affecting setting of a conservation area. |  |
| CCC: Paired proposal areas. 1st Ed OS mapping (1885) shows layout of Hinton Hall and ground (Park & Garden). Medieval manor set on Roman and Saxo-Nornan settlement (eg MCBs 10370-1, 16166 and 7059-71). Sensitive site location. Requires pre-determination fieldwork to enable evidence base to ensure that any Masterplan work is informed by the results and locations of archaeological hotspots. NGRs 546800 275520 and 546940 275330. |  |
| **7h. Visual Impact** | Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive | D |
| **Justification for score:** |  |
| Could impact on views of Ely Cathedral and wider landscape, but at present these views are only visible to users of footpath and a small number of dwellings. |  |
| **Additional criterion 7i. TPOs** | No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

**Parish Council support and rank**

| Does Parish Council support this site? | No |
| Form E - Parish Council site ranking: | Fifth or more |
| Form G - Parish Council’s view: |  |

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Parish:** Haddenham CP  
**Site Name:** Anson Packaging Site  
**Site Ref:** Site/12/09

---

**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:** 16:10 25 July 2016

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The proposal to change the use of the site from employment to housing is rejected on the basis that the site is physically separate from the main area of the village, therefore access to village services would likely be poor; the proposal would result in the loss of employment land; and access is likely to be a constraint.

---

**Site Information**

**Site Type:** New site submission (Form B)  
**ID:** 56

**Site Address:** 62 - 64 Station Road / Ely Road, Haddenham

**Settlement:** Haddenham

**LP15 Allocation Ref:**

**Planning Perm. Ref:**

**Site Description:** Factory site at Station Rd, Haddenham

**Brown/Greenfield:** Brownfield

**Known Constraints:** Site is within Development Envelope of Haddenham, is brownfield. Anson packaging occupy site but lease with Horta Properties Ltd expires in 2017. Anson is likely to relocate its operations to another site in Sutton. Considered lack of demand for employment uses in this location. Form B indicates proportion of CLD is to be confirmed, 0 - 20%.

**Current Use:** Employment  
**Proposed Use:** Housing

**Current Use info:**

**Indicative no. of dwellings:** a) Submitted / estimated 60  
**b) Recommended** 0

---

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  
**Large Village**

1b. Site Availability  
**Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)**

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

**1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies**

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone  
>-50% of site area in Zone 1

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1:</th>
<th>100.00%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2:</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a:</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b:</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk  
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

**Date and time of site visit:** 16:10 25 July 2016  
**Supersedes site submission(s):**
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Anson Packaging Site  
**Parish:** Haddenham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/12/09

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</th>
<th>Site located on contaminated land</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land profesionial assessment</td>
<td>Factory site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>Insurmountable safety issues that cannot be secured in accordance with CIL regulations</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

Poor visibility north on A1421. Existing junction/access is unsuitable for intensification MUST be accesseded of Ely Way only Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Statement based on 60 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area.

#### 6. Access to services

| 6a. Proximity to public transport | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) | A |
| 6b. Proximity to medical services | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) | B |
| 6c. Proximity to shops | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) | B |
| 6d. Proximity to Primary School | Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m) | C |
| 6e. Proximity to Secondary School | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |
| 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity | No spare places but room for expansion | D |
| 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment | | |

The school is currently operating above its physical capacity of 270 places. There is potential for expansion by another 120 places on the site which would be sufficient to provide for development in excess of 300 units in the catchment area using the Council's standard child yield multipliers

| 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity | Limited capacity | C |
| 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment | | |

6h. Proximity to employment sites

| Less than 5 min walk (<400m) | A |

#### 7. Environmental impact

| 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites | CWS within 500m of site | D |
| 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment | | |
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Anson Packaging Site  
**Parish:** Haddenham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/12/09

### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7d. Agricultural land classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PROW within the site boundary</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7e.(i) PROW comments

The site is bounded to the north by Ely Way and to the west by Station Road, it also connects to Site/12/01. Provide a link between the Ely Way and Station Road for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders.

### 7f. (i) Conservation Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f. (ii) Listed building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f. (iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f. (iv) Archaeological asset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological assets within 500.1 – 1000m of site</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

**ECDC:** Conservation area to the southwest - no heritage impact

**CCC:** Former Haddenham railway station. No archaeological potential. No objection and no requirement. 546670 276300

### 7h. Visual Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some improvement to landscape/townscape or key views</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification for score:**

Could provide improvement through redevelopment of factory site.

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TPO tree on site</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parish Council support and rank

**Does Parish Council support this site?** Yes

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:** Fifth or more

**Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

**Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:**

- Site promoter disagrees with the findings of the site assessment, and the rejection of the site.
- The site is located within the development envelope and therefore is not physically separate from the main area of the village.
- The site is approximately 300 metres from village centre, and therefore is within walking distance of village services and amenities.
- The premises are vacant and do not therefore currently offer employment – land to the north of the site is allocated for employment use currently, therefore employment land is available in the area.
- The site generates HGV movements; therefore residential use would reduce highways impact.
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**  
Site Name:  **Land off Bury Lane**

**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**  
Has merit

**Date and time of site visit:**  
14:55 25 July 2016

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is accessible and therefore has some merit. However, development of the site could result in loss of views of the open countryside and, as the site is located at the rear of existing dwellings, may not complement the built form of the village.

**Site Information**

**Site Type:**  New site submission (Form B)  
**ID:**  57

**Site Address:**  Land off Bury Lane, Haddenham

**Settlement:**  Haddenham

**LP15 Allocation Ref:**

**Planning Perm. Ref:**

**Site Description:**  Grazing land off Bury Lane, Haddenham

**Brown/Greenfield:**  Greenfield

**Known Constraints:**  No known constraints, access and services. Site available for development with 12 months notice.

**Current Use:**  Agriculture  
**Proposed Use:**  Housing

**Current Use info:**

**Proposed Use info:**

**Site Area Net (ha):**  1.41  
**Site Area Gross (ha):**  1.66

**Indicative no. of dwellings:**  a) Submitted / estimated 60  
**b) Recommended** 0

**Major Criteria**

1a. **Settlement Hierarchy**  
Large Village

1b. **Site Availability**  
Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. **Minerals and Waste assessment**

1c.(i) **Site affected by M+W Policies**

1c.(ii) **Site affected by M+W Allocations**

2a. **Flood zone**  
>50% of site area in Zone 1

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

- **Flood Zone 1:** 100.00%  
- **Flood Zone 2:** 0.00%  
- **Flood Zone 3a:** 0.00%  
- **Flood Zone 3b:** 0.00%

2b. **Surface Water flood risk**  
Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yrs))

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):**

- **30 Year:** 0.00%  
- **100 Year:** 0.00%  
- **1,000 Year:** 0.02%
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Land off Bury Lane

| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No |

3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
   Site does not intersect Inner Zone

4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
   More than 5km from site

4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
   Site within 250m of contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
   Road haulage depot 115m t oNE

5b. Local road impact
   No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
   Access off Bury Lane
   Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry
   The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Statement based on 60 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
   Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
   Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6c. Proximity to shops
   Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
   Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
   Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
   No spare places but room for expansion

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
   Limited capacity

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
   The school is currently operating above its physical capacity of 270 places. There is potential for expansion by another 120 places on the site which would be sufficient to provide for development in excess of 300 units in the catchment area using the Council’s standard child yield multipliers

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
   The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area

6h. Proximity to employment sites
   Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
   CWS within 501m – 1km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification
   All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Land off Bury Lane
Parish: Haddenham CP
Site Ref: Site/12/10

7e. Public Rights of Way
E – No PRoW connection opportunities

7f. (i) PROW comments

7f. (i) Conservation Area
CA within 500m of site

7f. (ii). Listed building
LB within 500m of site

7f. (iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
SAM more than 2km from site

7f. (iv) Archaeological asset
Archaeological assets within 500m of site

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

ECDC: Conservation area to the north - limited heritage impact

CCC: Proximity to prehistoric tools and weapons stray find sites (MCBs 6817, 2603, 2600) in Bury Lane to the north of this plot. An archaeological condition is recommended to be placed on any planning consent granted for development on this plot. NGR 545970 274910

7h. Visual Impact
Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive

Justification for score:
Some neighbouring dwellings may be affected with loss of some views, but due to sloping topography, impacts are not likely to be significant.

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
No TPO within 15m of the site

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site? Yes

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:
Second

Form G - Parish Council's view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

• Site promoter disagrees with rejection of site, and requests its reconsideration. Site promoter indicates site has excellent access to a range of village services and facilities.
• Site has limited landscape and visual merit.
• Opportunity to incorporate amenity space and landscaping.
• Unconstrained and could provide much needed housing in short term.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Rejected**

Date and time of site visit:
Not visited, existing allocation.

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site has recently been granted planning consent for 9 dwellings (16/01642/FUM) and is under construction / soon to commence. The site capacity is therefore below the 10-unit threshold used in the Local Plan.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
<th>ID:  58</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land off Rowan Close, Haddenham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Haddenham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>HAD1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Land off Rowan Close, Haddenham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Recommended</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Large Village

1b. Site Availability
Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
- Flood Zone 1: 100.00%
- Flood Zone 2: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
- 30 Year: 0.00%
- 100 Year: 0.00%
- 1,000 Year: 0.00%
| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No |

3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation  
   Site does not intersect Inner Zone

4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites  
   More than 5km from site

4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

## Minor Criteria

### 5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land  
   Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

5a(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact  
   Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
   Does not appear to have access to highways frontage OR shown access to highway. Potential problems to access the highway third party land maybe required. Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

   This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport  
   Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services  
   Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6c. Proximity to shops  
   Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School  
   Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School  
   Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f(i) Available primary school capacity  
   No spare places but room for expansion

6f(ii) Available secondary school capacity  
   Limited capacity

6g(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

6g(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

   The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites  
   Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

### 7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites  
   CWS within 501m – 1km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification  
   All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7e. Public Rights of Way</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) PROW comments</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>CA within 500m of site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(ii) Listed building</th>
<th>LB within 500m of site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</th>
<th>SAM more than 2km from site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</th>
<th>Archaeological assets within 500m of site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECDC: Already allocated - same issues as before</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC: No archaeological sensitivity. No objection, no archaeological requirement. NGR 546140 274700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7h. Visual Impact</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justification for score:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional criterion 7i. TPOs</th>
<th>No TPO within 15m of the site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</th>
<th>Second</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form G - Parish Council’s view:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Land North of Northumbria Close, Haddenham
Parish: Haddenham CP
Site Ref: Site/12/14

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected
Date and time of site visit:
Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
Recent sites monitoring data indicates that development of site is now complete. The site is therefore rejected.

Site Information

Site Type: Site with extant planning permission
Site Address: Land North of Northumbria Close, Haddenham, Cambridgeshire
Settlement: Haddenham
LP15 Allocation Ref: 
Planning Perm. Ref: 12/00429/FUM

Site Description: Residential development of 24no. dwellings consisting of 2no. Flats, 3no. Bungalows and 19no. Houses and associated works.
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints:
Current Use: Agriculture
Proposed Use: Housing

Current Use info:
Proposed Use info:

Site Area Net (ha): 0.54
Site Area Gross (ha): 0.7224
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 24 b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Large Village
1b. Site Availability
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment
1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone >50% of site area in Zone 1
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00% Flood Zone 2: 0.00% Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMSW):
30 Year: 9.29% 100 Year: 13.24% 1,000 Year: 61.77%
### Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
### Site Name: Land North of Northumbria Close, Haddenham
### Parish: Haddenham CP
### Site Ref: Site/12/14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation**
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

**4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites**
- 2.01km - 5km from the site

**4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment**

---

### Minor Criteria

**5. Site Suitability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5b. Local road impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6a. Proximity to public transport</th>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6b. Proximity to medical services</th>
<th>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6c. Proximity to shops</th>
<th>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6d. Proximity to Primary School</th>
<th>Less than 15 min walk (&lt;1,200m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</th>
<th>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</th>
<th>No spare places but room for expansion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The school is currently operating above its physical capacity of 270 places. There is potential for expansion by another 120 places on the site which would be sufficient to provide for development in excess of 300 units in the catchment area using the Council’s standard child yield multipliers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</th>
<th>Limited capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6h. Proximity to employment sites</th>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</th>
<th>CWS within 500m of site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7d. Agricultural land classification</th>
<th>All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7e. Public Rights of Way</th>
<th>E – No PRoW connection opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7e.(i) PROW comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land North of Northumbria Close, Haddenham  
**Parish:** Haddenham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/12/14

### Site Ref:
- Site/12/14

### Parish:
- Haddenham CP

### Site Name:
- Land North of Northumbria Close, Haddenham

### Current Status:
- Rejected - not a site allocation

### Parish Council support and rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>CA within 500m of site</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii) Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td>Archaeological assets on-site</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

- CCC: Ploughed out Ridge and Furrow (medieval cultivation) remains (MCB11725). Site evaluated (ECB4164) in 2014. Site developed. 546530 276200

### 7h. Visual Impact
- Justification for score:

### Additional criterion 7l. TPOs
- No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

### Parish Council support and rank

- Does Parish Council support this site?
- Form E - Parish Council site ranking:
- Form G - Parish Council's view:

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
## Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**
Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:**
14:00 08 May 2017

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**
Were the site to be developed, it should be frontage development along the highway - reflecting the built form along the opposite side of Aldreth Road. It is unlikely that the site could accommodate 10 frontage-style dwellings, and therefore the site would not meet the minimum capacity threshold. Consequently, the site is rejected.

## Site Information

### Site Type:
FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17

### Site Address:
Aldreth Road, Haddenham

### Settlement:
Haddenham

### LP15 Allocation Ref:

### Planning Perm. Ref:

### Site Description:
The site is on an elevated position on greensand which has good drainage. It is on a quiet road with curbed footpath leading directly to the village centre. Street lighting and mains facilities are similar to those for the properties opposite. A public green footpath leads to the fens and older orchards.

### Brown/Greenfield:
Greenfield

### Known Constraints:
Submission indicates site could deliver 15 dwellings. **Net site area estimated**

### Current Use:
Agriculture

### Proposed Use:
Housing

### Indicative no. of dwellings:

- **a) Submitted / estimated:** 15
- **b) Recommended:** 0

### Site Area Net (ha):
0.43

### Site Area Gross (ha):
0.5

## Major Criteria

### 1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Large Village

### 1b. Site Availability
Available for development in med term (2023-2029)

### 1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

### 1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

### 1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

### 2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1

#### Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3a</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3b</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2b. Surface Water flood risk
Risk of Surface Water flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation</td>
<td>Site does not intersect Inner Zone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites</td>
<td>More than 5km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
<td>Site located more than 250m from contaminated land</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>No objections with Moderate mitigation measures</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Less than 15 min walk (&lt;1,200m)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>No spare places but room for expansion</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>No spare places but room for expansion</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td>CWS within 501m – 1km of site</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Site Name:** Land at Aldreth Road  
**Parish:** Haddenham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/12/15  
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation
**Site Name:**  Land at Aldreth Road

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Parish:** Haddenham CP

### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7d. Agricultural land classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7e. Public Rights of Way

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E – No PRoW connection opportunities</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7e.(i) PROW comments

- No PROW connection opportunities

### 7f. Conservation Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f.(i) Conservation Area

- CA within 500m of site

### 7f.(ii). Listed building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

- No archaeological assets within 15m of the site

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

**ECDC - Conservation area to the north, likely to have limited impact on designated heritage assets**

**HE - There are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary. Two grade II buildings - a mill and a mill house lie to the south west of the site. Any development of the site therefore has the potential to impact upon these heritage assets. Any development of this site will need to protect and enhance these listed buildings and their settings. If the site is allocated, these requirements should be included in policy and the supporting text of the Plan.**

### 7h. Visual Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification for score:**

Development could result in loss of views to open countryside. Were the site to be developed, low-density frontage development would best complement the built form in this part of the village.

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No TPO within 15m of the site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

- Does Parish Council support this site? **Yes**

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

(a) add this site to the Local Plan, and keep existing preferred site(s)?

---

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

**Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:**

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment:

Rejected

Date and time of site visit:

13:40 08 May 2017

Main findings and recommendations:

Part of the site is a current Local Plan 2015 allocation, which the Further Draft Local Plan proposed be retained (policy reference HAD.H2 and assessed under reference Site/12/12). This proposal sought to provide a larger scale development through amending the site area. The site extends eastward beyond the natural 'entrance' to the village formed by the junction of New Road and Duck Lane. Consequently, the site does not relate well to the built form of the village and would likely be visually intrusive to the open countryside, eroding the sense of separation between Haddenham and Wilburton and should be rejected.

Site Information

ID: 398

Site Type: FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb'17

Site Address: Haddenham Road, Haddenham

Settlement: Haddenham

LP15 Allocation Ref: Planning Perm. Ref:

Site Description: Site includes draft site allocation HAD.H2 and adjacent land, which is currently in agricultural use and is proposed for housing development.

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints: Submission indicates site could deliver in the region of up to 180 dwellings.

Current Use: Agriculture

Proposed Use: Housing

Proposed Use info:

Site Area Net (ha): 9.96

Site Area Gross (ha): 16.59

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 180 b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Large Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone >50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land north of Haddenham Road  
**Parish:** Haddenham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/12/17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2b. Surface Water flood risk</th>
<th>Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Year: 1.52%</td>
<td>100 Year: 0.86%</td>
<td>1,000 Year: 2.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Minor Criteria**

3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation  
Site does not intersect Inner Zone

4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites  
More than 5km from site

4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land  
Site within 50m of contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>old sand quarry 20m to south</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5b. Local road impact  
No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

Some Highways improvements needed e.g. footway widening & junction improvements Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport  
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services  
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6c. Proximity to shops  
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School  
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity  
No spare places but room for expansion

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity  
No spare places but room for expansion

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

The primary school is capable of being expanded to mitigate the impact of the development proposed in Haddenham including the additional sites in this document.

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

6h. Proximity to employment sites  
Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites  
CWS within 500m of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
Site Name: Land north of Haddenham Road

Parish: Haddenham CP

Site Ref: Site/12/17

Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Overall recommendation from site assessment: 
Preferred site

Date and time of site visit: 

Supersedes site submission(s): Site/13/08; Site/13/15

Main findings and recommendations:
The site boundary has been drawn to provide a single, coherent site, which includes both Site/13/08 and Site/13/15 within its boundary. Both sites were assessed and found to be suitable for development.

Site Information

Site Type: Strategic Planning Amended Submission
ID: 475

Site Address: 

Settlement: Isleham

LP15 Allocation Ref: 
Planning Perm. Ref: 

Site Description: Site supersedes Site/13/08 and Site/13/15.

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints: Current Use: Agriculture
Proposed Use: Housing

Current Use info:

Proposed Use info:

Site Area Net (ha): 1.17
Site Area Gross (ha): 1.56

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated: 40 
b) Recommended: 40

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Large Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

Flood Zone 1: 
Flood Zone 2: 
Flood Zone 3a: 
Flood Zone 3b: 

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

30 Year: 
100 Year: 
1,000 Year: 

Overall recommendation from site assessment: 
Preferred site

Date and time of site visit: 

Supersedes site submission(s): Site/13/08; Site/13/15

Main findings and recommendations:
The site boundary has been drawn to provide a single, coherent site, which includes both Site/13/08 and Site/13/15 within its boundary. Both sites were assessed and found to be suitable for development.
### Site Name: Land south and west of Lady Frances Court

**Current Status:** Site Allocation ISL.H1

**Parish:** Isleham CP

**Site Ref:** Site/13/18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Minor Criteria

**5. Site Suitability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land profesional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5b. Local road impact</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**6. Access to services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6a. Proximity to public transport</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6h. Proximity to employment sites</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**7. Environmental impact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Current Status: Site Allocation ISL.H1
### Site Name: Land south and west of Lady Frances Court
### Parish: Isleham CP
### Site Ref: Site/13/18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Heritage / archaeology comments

**7g. Visual Impact**

Justification for score:

**Additional criterion 7i. TPOs**

---

### Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:

---

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
**Site Name:** Existing housing allocation, land south and west of Lady Frances Court

**Current Status:** Superseded by ISL.H1

**Parish:** Isleham CP

**Site Ref:** Site/13/08

---

### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Preferred site

**Date and time of site visit:**

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and should be retained.

---

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>Local Plan 2015 allocated site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID:</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land south and west of Lady Frances Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Isleham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>ISL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Land south and west of Lady Frances Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td>Allotment gardens?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 17, b) Recommended 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

>50% of site area in Zone 1

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

| Flood Zone 1: | 100.00% | Flood Zone 2: | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3a: | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3b: | 0.00% |

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):**

| 30 Year: | 0.00% | 100 Year: | 0.00% | 1,000 Year: | 0.01% |
**Minor Criteria**

### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</th>
<th>Site within 50m of contaminated land</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td>Pit or quarry 20m to NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>No objections with Moderate mitigation measures</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>Access currently off Chippenham Road MUST remain as NO access will be permitted on to A10 as this is a principal Transport Route Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Isleham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Isleham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.

### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6a. Proximity to public transport</th>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>No spare places, no room for expansion</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The existing site is below DfE recommended size for this school. No expansion potential.

| 6h. Proximity to employment sites | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) | A |

### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</th>
<th>CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Current Status:** Superseded by ISL.H1  
**Site Name:** Existing housing allocation, land south and west of Lady Frances Court  
**Parish:** Isleham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/13/08

| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower | D |
| 7e. Public Rights of Way | E – No PRoW connection opportunities | E |

### 7e. (i) PROW comments

| 7f.(i) Conservation Area | CA within 500m of site | D |
| 7f.(ii). Listed building | LB within 500m of site | D |
| 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument | SAM within 500m of site | D |
| 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset | Archaeological assets within 500m of site | D |

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

- **ECDC:** Already allocated - same issues as before
- **CCC:** Roman and Medieval activity found in adjacent development area in 2005 (MCB16866). An archaeological condition is recommended to be placed on any planning consent granted for development on this plot. NGR 564330 273860

#### 7h. Visual Impact

**Justification for score:**

| Additional criterion 7i. TPOs | No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

### Parish Council support and rank

- **Does Parish Council support this site?**
- **Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**
- **Form G - Parish Council's view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Policy should refer to conservation area and its setting
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: 
Preferred site

Date and time of site visit: 
12 noon 02 June 2017

Supersedes site submission(s):

Main findings and recommendations:
The site offers a suitable location for development with few constraints, and is supported by the Parish Council. The site is located adjacent to Site/13/08 which was proposed for allocation by the Further Draft Local Plan. The boundary of draft site allocation ISL.H1 should be amended to include both sites.

Site Information

Site Type: FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb'17
ID: 402
Site Address: Station Road, Isleham
Settlement: Isleham
LP15 Allocation Ref: 
Planning Perm. Ref: 
Site Description: The site is on the south side of the village close to the existing Recreation Ground and is adjacent to a number of residential properties. It is currently used for agricultural purposes and is proposed for housing development. Access to the site will be provided by a single roadway from Station Road.
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: Submission indicates site could deliver 25-30 dwellings.
**Net site area estimated**
Current Use: Agriculture
Proposed Use: Housing
Indicative no. of dwellings: 
a) Submitted / estimated 30
b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy | Large Village | B
1b. Site Availability | Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22) | A
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone | >50% of site area in Zone 1 | A
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
| Flood Zone 1: | 100.00% | Flood Zone 2: | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3a: | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3b: | 0.00% |
| 2b. Surface Water flood risk | Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr)) | A
**Current Status:** Superseded by ISL.H1  
**Site Name:** Land at Station Road  
**Parish:** Isleham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/13/15

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

##### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located within 50m of contaminated land
- Site located within contaminated land professional assessment: Works on S boundary

##### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
- Site located within contaminated land professional assessment

##### 5b. Local road impact
- No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

##### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

##### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

#### 6. Access to services

##### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)
- Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

##### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

##### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places, no room for expansion

##### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

##### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- The total number of homes being proposed in the village would require a significant expansion of primary school provision (approx 1FE or 210 places) This could only be achieved through the provision of a new school or the relocation and expansion of the existing school on a new site

##### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- The combined effect of the call for additional sites is to require a further 3.3FE of additional secondary school places (500 places) Coupled with the impacts of sites identified in the earlier round the total number of places required cannot be delivered at Soham VC which already operates at (FE (1350 places) on its current site. Coupled with higher levels of growth elsewhere it would be the County Council’s intention to conduct a district wide review of secondary school provision on adoption of the new local plan.. A strategic review would need to include the need for a further new secondary school (and site) within East Cambs as a potential option

##### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 7. Environmental impact

##### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

##### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>E – No PRoW connection opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii) Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Immediately adjacent to conservation area boundary, likely to have some impact on character and setting of the designated heritage asset.

| 7h. Visual Impact | Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views |
| Justification for score: |  |

Land is flat and under mixed, and rough agricultural production. Possibly former allotments or small holdings? Localised impact on residents neighbouring site.

**Additional criterion 7i. TPOs** | No TPO within 15m of the site |

**Parish Council support and rank**

- Does Parish Council support this site? | Yes |

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Site Ref: Site/13/09
Parish: Isleham CP
Site Name: Existing housing allocation, land at 5a Fordham Road

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and should be retained.

Site Information

Site Type: Local Plan 2015 allocated site

Site Address: Land at 5a Fordham Road, Isleham

Settlement: Isleham

LP15 Allocation Ref: ISL2

Planning Perm. Ref:

Site Description: Existing housing allocation, land at 5a Fordham Road

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints:

Current Use: Agriculture

Proposed Use: Housing

Proposed Use info:

Site Area Net (ha): 0.47

Site Area Gross (ha): 0.55

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 17 b) Recommended 10

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

Large Village

B

1b. Site Availability


1c. Minerals and Waste assessment


1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies


1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations


2a. Flood zone

>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

30 Year: 0.00%  100 Year: 0.00%  1,000 Year: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))

A

Sup therein.

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and should be retained.

Site Information

Site Type: Local Plan 2015 allocated site

Site Address: Land at 5a Fordham Road, Isleham

Settlement: Isleham

LP15 Allocation Ref: ISL2

Planning Perm. Ref:

Site Description: Existing housing allocation, land at 5a Fordham Road

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints:

Current Use: Agriculture

Proposed Use: Housing

Proposed Use info:

Site Area Net (ha): 0.47

Site Area Gross (ha): 0.55

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 17 b) Recommended 10

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

Large Village

B

1b. Site Availability


1c. Minerals and Waste assessment


1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies


1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations


2a. Flood zone

>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

30 Year: 0.00%  100 Year: 0.00%  1,000 Year: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))

A

Sup therein.
| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No |

### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 2.01km - 5km from the site

### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

**5a. Proximity to contaminated land**
- Site within 250m of contaminated land

**5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment**
- Old factory or works 150m to E

**5b. Local road impact**
- No objections with minor mitigation measures

**5c. Strategic Road Network impact**

**5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**
- Site has Highways frontage
- Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Isleham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Isleham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.

#### 6. Access to services

**6a. Proximity to public transport**
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

**6b. Proximity to medical services**
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

**6c. Proximity to shops**
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

**6d. Proximity to Primary School**
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

**6e. Proximity to Secondary School**
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

**6f.(i) Available primary school capacity**
- No spare places, no room for expansion

**6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity**
- Limited capacity

**6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**
- The existing site is below DfE recommended size for this school. No expansion potential.

**6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**
- The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

**6h. Proximity to employment sites**
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 7. Environmental impact

**7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**
- CWS within 501m – 1km of site

**7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**

**7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>E – No PRoW connection opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td>Archaeological assets within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECDC: Already allocated - same issues as before</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC: Advised an archaeological condition to be placed on any planning consent granted for development on this plot in response to planning consultation for Local Plan in 2011-12. NGR 564270 273680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification for score:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional criterion 7i. TPOs</td>
<td>No TPO within 15m of the site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does Parish Council support this site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council’s view:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Preferred site**

Date and time of site visit: 15:00 25 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s):

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is an existing allocation and is accessible with few constraints and is supported by the Parish Council. The site should therefore be allocated for housing development.

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land off Hall Barn Road, Isleham, Cambs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Isleham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>ISL3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Vacant land at Hall Barn Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Planning application currently being determined (since 21/01/2016 - Ref:16/00055/OUM). Case officer: Barbara Greengrass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 31  b) Recommended 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy | Large Village | **B**
1b. Site Availability
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone | >50% of site area in Zone 1 | **A**

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

- Flood Zone 1: 100.00%
- Flood Zone 2: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk | Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA | -

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

- 30 Year: 0.00%
- 100 Year: 1.57%
- 1,000 Year: 14.82%
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

**5a. Proximity to contaminated land**
- Site located within 50m of contaminated land

**5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment**
- Old quarry 120m to SE

**5b. Local road impact**
- No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

**5c. Strategic Road Network impact**

**5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**
- Access off Hall Barn Road
- Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Isleham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Isleham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.

#### 6. Access to services

**6a. Proximity to public transport**
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

**6b. Proximity to medical services**
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

**6c. Proximity to shops**
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

**6d. Proximity to Primary School**
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

**6e. Proximity to Secondary School**
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

**6f.(i) Available primary school capacity**
- No spare places, no room for expansion

**6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity**
- Limited capacity

**6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**
- The existing site is below DfE recommended size for this school. No expansion potential.

**6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**
- The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

**6h. Proximity to employment sites**
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

#### 7. Environmental impact

**7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**
- CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

**7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**

**7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers**
### Site Information

**Current Status:** Site Allocation ISL.H3  
**Site Name:** Land off Hall Barn Road  
**Parish:** Isleham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/13/07

### Land Classification
- **7d. Agricultural land classification:** All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower  
- **Score:** D

### Public Rights of Way
- **7e. Public Rights of Way:** E – No PRoW connection opportunities  
- **Score:** E

### Site Council Support and Rank

**Does Parish Council support this site?** Yes  
**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:** Second  
**Form G - Parish Council's view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

**Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:**

- Policy should require single storey only.  
- Policy should refer to Listed Buildings to north-east of site
### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Preferred site

**Date and time of site visit:** 14:45 25 July 2016

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is accessible and has few constraints to development. It is therefore considered suitable for housing development.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land off Fordham Road, Isleham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Isleham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Agricultural land off Fordham Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Form B suggests site could also provide recreation and potentially education uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land off Fordham Road, Isleham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Agricultural land off Fordham Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td>Form B suggests site could also provide recreation and potentially education uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 270, b) Recommended 125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

| Large Village | |

1b. Site Availability

| Available for devl in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22) | |

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

- >50% of site area in Zone 1

| Flood Zone 1: | 100.00% |
| Flood Zone 2: | 0.00% |
| Flood Zone 3a: | 0.00% |
| Flood Zone 3b: | 0.00% |

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))

| 30 Year: | 0.00% |
| 100 Year: | 0.00% |
| 1,000 Year: | 0.00% |

### Overall recommendation from site assessment:
Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:
14:45 25 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s):

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is accessible and has few constraints to development. It is therefore considered suitable for housing development.
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</th>
<th>Site within 50m of contaminated land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment**

Factory or works to W boundary. Pit or quarry 200m to E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5b. Local road impact</th>
<th>No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Access off Fordham Road

Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment based on 270 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines and demonstrate how the site can be made accessible on foot, by cycle and by public transport together with identifying any remaining off-site highway implications and required mitigation. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Isleham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Isleham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6a. Proximity to public transport</th>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6b. Proximity to medical services</th>
<th>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6c. Proximity to shops</th>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6d. Proximity to Primary School</th>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</th>
<th>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</th>
<th>No spare places, no room for expansion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 6f.(ii) Primary education impacts - professional assessment | 

The existing site is below DfE recommended size for this school. No expansion potential.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</th>
<th>Limited capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment | 

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6h. Proximity to employment sites</th>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</th>
<th>CWS within 501m – 1km of site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment | 

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment based on 270 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines and demonstrate how the site can be made accessible on foot, by cycle and by public transport together with identifying any remaining off-site highway implications and required mitigation. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Isleham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Isleham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.
### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 7d. Agricultural land classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 7e. Public Rights of Way

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 7f. PROW comments

Provide a link from Site 2 to Fordham Road

### 7f.(i) Conservation Area

Site is within CA

### 7f.(ii) Listed building

LB within 500m of site

### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

SAM within 500m of site

### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

Archaeological assets on-site

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

ECDC: Conservation area to east - potential to impact views out of across the recreation ground.

HE: 13/03: affecting setting of a conservation area.

CCC: Palaeolithic hand axe found at N end of site (MCB 19231). Plot is located in an area of Mesolithic, Neolithic Bronze Age and Roman occupation evidence (e.g. MCB5 15281-2, 14001, 20930 & 12766). Requires pre-determination fieldwork to enable evidence base to be supplied with any planning application. NGR564050 273860.

### 7h. Visual Impact

Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive

**Justification for score:**

Feels like open countryside, despite being ‘enclosed’ to west.

**Additional criterion 7i. TPOs**

TPO tree on site

### Parish Council support and rank

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Does Parish Council support this site? No

Form E - Parish Council site ranking: Fourth

Form G - Parish Council’s view:

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Large volume of representations objecting to the site (summary of main issues below). Parish Council 'strongly object'.
- Policy should refer to conservation area and its setting
- Policy needs additional wording requiring a detailed ecological assessment sufficient to enable the LPA to undertake an HRA to mitigate against effects of increased recreational pressure
- Policy needs wording to require a net increase in biodiversity
- Lack of accessible green space in Isleham, which is likely impacting on recreational pressure on Local Nature Reserve 1km away, which is being degraded by visitors / dog fouling.
- Won’t help deliver objectives in Isleham2
- Not suitable because: insufficient space for 150 dwellings; access not appropriate; impact on neighbours.
- Should be safeguarded for a new school, not new houses – as was previously planned
- 2 storey limit, plus bungalows only, especially near Hall Barn Rd and West Street
- Loss of wildlife (owls / foxes / deer / bats / etc)
- ‘Significantly exceeded’ is too vague – should be a hard cap.
- If built, needs landscape buffer around entire site
- Site supported (landowner): various details in support given.
- (Landowner) Policy should be amended in various ways. Summary headlines: Happy to gift land to PC, but only ‘up to 1ha’ not 1-1.5ha; remove reference to a roundabout – better/safer solution being discussed with highways authority; endorses reference to need for bungalows and landscape buffers; reference to clusters of 25 dwellings on site is overly restrictive – should simply refer to a ‘series of character areas’; number of dwellings should be increased to 180 (not 150).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Current Status:</strong></th>
<th>Site Allocation ISL.H4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Name:</strong></td>
<td><em>Land off Fordham Road, Isleham</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parish:</strong></td>
<td>Isleham CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Ref:</strong></td>
<td>Site/13/03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:
14:30 on 25 July 2016

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and should be retained.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
<th>ID: 60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Hall Barn Road Industrial Estate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Isleham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>ISL6</td>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Agricultural land adjacent to Hall Barn Road Industrial Estate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>No known constraints.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Proposed Use: Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha): 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated</td>
<td>b) Recommended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Large Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1

| Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening): |
| Flood Zone 1: | 100.00% |
| Flood Zone 2: | 0.00% |
| Flood Zone 3a: | 0.00% |
| Flood Zone 3b: | 0.00% |

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))

| Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW): |
| 30 Year: | 0.00% |
| 100 Year: | 0.00% |
| 1,000 Year: | 0.00% |
| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No |

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

**5a. Proximity to contaminated land**

Site within 50m of contaminated land

**5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment**

Factory or works 130m to N

**5b. Local road impact**

No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

**5c. Strategic Road Network impact**


**5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**

Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Isleham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Isleham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.

#### 6. Access to services

**6a. Proximity to public transport**

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

**6b. Proximity to medical services**

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

**6c. Proximity to shops**

Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

**6d. Proximity to Primary School**

Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

**6e. Proximity to Secondary School**

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

**6f.(i) Available primary school capacity**

No spare places, no room for expansion

**6f.(ii) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**

The existing site is below DfE recommended size for this school. No expansion potential.

**6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity**

Limited capacity

**6g.(i) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

**6h. Proximity to employment sites**

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 7. Environmental impact

**7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**

CWS within 501m – 1km of site

**7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**

**7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers**

**7d. Agricultural land classification**

All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

**7e. Public Rights of Way**

C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary
Parish Council support and rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td>First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council's view:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

ECDC: Already allocated - same issues as before

CCC: Plot immediately south of excavated area in which prehistoric and undated features were evident (MCB15281 and 15282). An archaeological condition is recommended to be placed on any planning consent granted for development on this plot. NGR 564070 273600

Impact on views/setting of village. Harms feeling of leaving village and entering countryside (and vice versa).
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**
Has merit

**Date and time of site visit:**
13:45 on 25 July 2016

**Supercedes site submission(s):**

- The site has some merit as it is an accessible site close to the village centre. However, the site was not favoured by the Parish Council. The site should not be allocated on the basis that other suitable and more favoured sites are available within the village.

---

**Site Information**

- **Site Type:** New site submission (Form B)  
  - ID: 59
- **Site Address:** Land off Beck Road, Isleham
- **Settlement:** Isleham
- **LP15 Allocation Ref:**
- **Planning Perm. Ref:**
- **Site Description:** Agricultural land and vacant land (former brick pit) off Beck Road, Isleham
- **Brown/Greenfield:** Greenfield
- **Known Constraints:** The former pit area is at a lower level than adjacent land and levels would need to be adjusted if the whole site were to be developed.
- **Current Use:** Agriculture  
  - **Proposed Use:** Housing
- **Current Use info:**
- **Proposed Use info:**
- **Site Area Net (ha):** 1.02  
  - **Site Area Gross (ha):** 1.2
- **Indicative no. of dwellings:**
  - a) Submitted / estimated: 12
  - b) Recommended: 0

**Major Criteria**

1a. **Settlement Hierarchy**
   - Large Village
   - 
   - B

1b. **Site Availability**
   - Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)
   - 
   - A

1c. **Minerals and Waste assessment**
   -  
   -  
   -  

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
   - 
   -  

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations
   - 
   -  

2a. **Flood zone**
   - >50% of site area in Zone 1
   - 
   - A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 1: 100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. **Surface Water flood risk**
   - Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA
   - 
   - -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year: 0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Name: Beck Road

Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Parish: Isleham CP
Site Ref: Site/13/01

Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation</strong></td>
<td>Site does not intersect Inner Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites</strong></td>
<td>2.01km - 5km from the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</strong></td>
<td>Site located on contaminated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</strong></td>
<td>Pit or quarry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5b. Local road impact</strong></td>
<td>No objections with minor mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</strong></td>
<td>Access off Beck Road Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Isleham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Isleham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.

#### 6. Access to services

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6a. Proximity to public transport</strong></td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6b. Proximity to medical services</strong></td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6c. Proximity to shops</strong></td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6d. Proximity to Primary School</strong></td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</strong></td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</strong></td>
<td>No spare places, no room for expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</strong></td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</strong></td>
<td>The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6h. Proximity to employment sites</strong></td>
<td>Less than 15 min walk (&lt;1,200m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7. Environmental impact

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</strong></td>
<td>CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Site Name:** Beck Road

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Parish:** Isleham CP

Site Ref: Site/13/01

### 7d. Agricultural land classification
- All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower: D

### 7e. Public Rights of Way
- C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary: C

### 7e.(i) PROW comments

Provide an off road link for for pedestrians and cyclists between Beck Road and Festival Road.

### 7f.(i) Conservation Area
- CA within 500m of site: D

### 7f.(ii). Listed building
- LB within 500m of site: D

### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
- SAM within 500m of site: D

### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset
- Archaeological assets within 500m of site: D

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

**ECDC:** Conservation area to the west - limited heritage impact

**CCC:** SCHEDULED MONUMENT: 19th century limekilns at 350m to NW of this plot. (NHLE 1006871). The site is at the margins of known significant archaeology, but Medieval occupation evidence found in Orchard Close 170m to the NW (MCB 18441-2). West half of plot is former limestone (clunch) quarry. An archaeological condition is recommended to be placed on any planning consent granted for development on this plot. NGR 564790274150

### 7h. Visual Impact
- Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views: C

**Justification for score:**
- Site not overlooked. Limited public view.

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
- No TPO within 15m of the site: A

## Parish Council support and rank

### Does Parish Council support this site?
- No

### Form E - Parish Council site ranking:
- Fifth or more

### Form G - Parish Council’s view:

---

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment:
Has merit

Date and time of site visit:
13:30 25 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site has some merit as it is an accessible site close to the village centre. However, the site was not favoured by the Parish Council. The site should not be allocated on the basis that other suitable and more favoured sites are available within the village.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  ID: 62
Site Address: Land fronting Beck Road, Isleham
Settlement: Isleham
LP15 Allocation Ref:
Planning Perm. Ref:
Site Description: Land fronting Beck Road, Isleham
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: It would be possible for the County Council to provide alternative land for allotments and maybe some community led development in lieu of affordable housing.
Current Use: Other (please specify)  Proposed Use: Housing
Current Use info: Partly allotments, partly vacant/unused
Proposed Use info:
Site Area Net (ha): 1.33  Site Area Gross (ha): 1.57
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 48  b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  Large Village
1b. Site Availability
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment
1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
- >50% of site area in Zone 1
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%
2b. Surface Water flood risk  Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
30 Year: 0.00%  100 Year: 0.00%  1,000 Year: 4.29%
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Site Name:** Land fronting Beck Road, Isleham

**Parish:** Isleham CP

**Site Ref:** Site/13/04

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 2.01km - 5km from the site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

#### 5. Site Suitability

##### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site within 50m of contaminated land

##### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
- Pit or quarry 20m to NE. Bus depot adjacent to S Boundary.

##### 5b. Local road impact
- No objections with minor mitigation measures

##### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

##### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

Access off Beck Road

Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Isleham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Isleham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.

#### 6. Access to services

##### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

##### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places, no room for expansion

##### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- The existing site is below DfE recommended size for this school. No expansion potential.

##### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Limited capacity

##### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

##### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

#### 7. Environmental impact

##### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

##### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

##### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Site Name:** Land fronting Beck Road, Isleham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref:</th>
<th>Site/13/04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parish:</td>
<td>Isleham CP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Site Details

- **Site Ref:** Site/13/04
- **Parish:** Isleham CP
- **Site Name:** Land fronting Beck Road, Isleham
- **Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

#### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

---

**7d. Agricultural land classification**
- All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower
- **Score:** D

**7e. Public Rights of Way**
- C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary
- **Score:** C

**7e.(i) PROW comments**
- Provide an off road link for pedestrians and cyclists between Croft Road and Beck Road which could then connect to the off road link in Site 1.

**7f.(i) Conservation Area**
- CA within 500m of site
- **Score:** D

**7f.(ii). Listed building**
- LB within 500m of site
- **Score:** D

**7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument**
- SAM within 500m of site
- **Score:** D

**7f.(iv) Archaeological asset**
- Archaeological assets within 500m of site
- **Score:** D

**7g. Heritage / archaeology comments**

- ECDC: Conservation area to west - limited heritage impact
- HE: 13/04: affecting setting of a conservation area.
- CCC: Re-used Roman building material in Saxon occupation, and Medieval clunch working remains present in excavation area for E/00270/04/FUL (Fordham Rd/Station Rd) area. Roman coins found in field 300m to south (Portable Antiquities Scheme report. An archaeological condition is recommended to be placed on any planning consent granted for development on this plot. NGR 564730 274060

**7h. Visual Impact**
- Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive
- **Score:** D

**Justification for score:**
- Impact limited to limited number of properties on Croft Road. No wider public impact.

**Additional criterion 7i. TPOs**
- No TPO within 15m of the site
- **Score:** A

### Parish Council support and rank

**Does Parish Council support this site?**
- No

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**
- Fifth or more

**Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

---
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation  
Site Name: Land fronting Hall Barn Road, Isleham  
Parish: Isleham CP  
Site Ref: Site/13/05

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit: 14:45 on 25 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:  
The site should not be allocated on the basis that development of the site would likely result in harm to key views of the open countryside and the setting of the village.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  
ID: 63

Site Address: Land fronting Hall Barn Road, Isleham

Settlement: Isleham

LP15 Allocation Ref:  
Planning Perm. Ref:  

Site Description: Land fronting Hall Barn Road, Isleham

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints:

Current Use: Agriculture  
Proposed Use: Housing

Current Use info:

Proposed Use info:

Site Area Net (ha): 3.89  
Site Area Gross (ha): 5.19

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 14  
b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  
Large Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone  
>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  
Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  
Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  
Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

30 Year: 0.00%  
100 Year: 0.00%  
1,000 Year: 0.85%
### Site Details
- **Name:** Land fronting Hall Barn Road, Isleham
- **Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation
- **Parish:** Isleham CP
- **Site Ref:** Site/13/05

### Site Characteristics
- **Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):** No
- **Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):** No

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 2.01km - 5km from the site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

#### 5. Site Suitability

##### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site within 50m of contaminated land

##### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
- Factory or works to E Boundary

##### 5b. Local road impact
- No objections with minor mitigation measures

##### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

##### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- Access off Hall Barn Road
- Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry
- The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment based on 140 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Isleham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Isleham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.

##### 6. Access to services

##### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

##### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

##### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places, no room for expansion

##### 6f.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

##### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- The existing site is below DfE recommended size for this school. No expansion potential.

##### 6g.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Limited capacity

##### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

##### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

### Environmental Impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 501m – 1km of site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
| 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers |  |
| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower |
| 7e. Public Rights of Way | E – No PRoW connection opportunities |
| 7f.(i) PROW comments |  |
| 7f.(i) Conservation Area | CA within 500m of site |
| 7f.(ii) Listed building | LB within 500m of site |
| 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument | SAM within 500.1 – 1000m of site |
| 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset |  |
| 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments |  |
| ECDC: Conservation area to east - limited heritage impact |  |
| CCC: Site immediately east of three known prehistoric barrow ring ditches, and multiple sites of metal detection finds of later prehistoric, Roman and Medieval date (eg MCB9217-8, 16203, 12766) and west of excavated prehistoric evidence east of Hall Barn Rd (MCB15282). Requires pre-determination fieldwork to enable evidence base to be supplied with any planning application. NGR 563840 273760. |  |
| 7h. Visual Impact | Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive |
| Justification for score: | Public views across open countryside |
| Additional criterion 7i. TPOs | TPO tree within 15m of the site |

**Parish Council support and rank**

| Does Parish Council support this site? | Yes |
| Form E - Parish Council site ranking: | Third |
| Form G - Parish Council's view: |  |

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Reason for rejection inconsistent with reason for selecting ISL.H3.
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Parish: Isleham CP
Site Name: Land north of 55 Sun Street
Site Ref: Site/13/06

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit:
14:00 25 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site was not supported by the Parish Council. Development would not be well-related to adjacent land-uses. The site should not be allocated on the basis that other suitable but more favoured sites are available within the village.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B) ID: 64
Site Address: 55 Sun Street, Isleham, Ely, Cambridgeshire
Settlement: Isleham
LP15 Allocation Ref: Planning Perm. Ref:

Site Description: Land north of 55 Sun Street
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints:
Current Use: Agriculture Proposed Use: Housing
Current Use info:
Proposed Use info:

Site Area Net (ha): 1.58 Site Area Gross (ha): 1.86
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 36 b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Large Village
1b. Site Availability Available for devl in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone >50% of site area in Zone 1
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00% Flood Zone 2: 0.00% Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
30 Year: 0.00% 100 Year: 0.00% 1,000 Year: 0.53%

Date and time of site visit:
14:00 25 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site was not supported by the Parish Council. Development would not be well-related to adjacent land-uses. The site should not be allocated on the basis that other suitable but more favoured sites are available within the village.
## Minor Criteria

### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</th>
<th>Site within 50m of contaminated land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit or quarry to S boundary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>No objections with Moderate mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Access off Sun Street
Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Isleham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Isleham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.

### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6a. Proximity to public transport</th>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>No spare places, no room for expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The existing site is below DfE recommended size for this school. No expansion potential.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</th>
<th>CWS within 501m – 1km of site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.
### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Site should have been included – small site, will provide some affordable homes, access is acceptable. Site suitable for 25 dwellings (revised down from 36 previously assessed), with open space at rear.
### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Rejected**

Date and time of site visit: 

Supersedes site submission(s) 

Main findings and recommendations: 

The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. However, it is believed that the total site capacity would likely fall below the 10 unit threshold. The site is therefore rejected.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>Local Plan 2015 allocated site</th>
<th>ID: 214</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land west of Pound Lane, Isleham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Isleham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>ISL4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Existing housing allocation, land west of Pound Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha)</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  a) Submitted / estimated: 12 
  b) Recommended: 0 |

### Major Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a. Settlement Hierarchy</th>
<th>Large Village</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b. Site Availability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Minerals and Waste assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Flood zone</td>
<td>&gt;50% of site area in Zone 1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 1: 100.00%</td>
<td>Flood Zone 2: 0.00%</td>
<td>Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Surface Water flood risk</td>
<td>Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMR):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Year: 0.00%</td>
<td>100 Year: 0.00%</td>
<td>1,000 Year: 1.27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

Site Name: Existing housing allocation, land west of Pound Lane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation**
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

**4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites**
- 2.01km - 5km from the site

**4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment**

**Minor Criteria**

**5. Site Suitability**

**5a. Proximity to contaminated land**
- Site located within 250m of contaminated land

**5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment**
- Pit or quarry 190m to SE

**5b. Local road impact**
- No objections with minor mitigation measures

**5c. Strategic Road Network impact**

**5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**
- Site has Highways frontage
- Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Isleham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Isleham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.

**6. Access to services**

**6a. Proximity to public transport**
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

**6b. Proximity to medical services**
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

**6c. Proximity to shops**
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

**6d. Proximity to Primary School**
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

**6e. Proximity to Secondary School**
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

**6f.(i) Available primary school capacity**
- No spare places, no room for expansion

**6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity**
- Limited capacity

**6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**
- The existing site is below DfE recommended size for this school. No expansion potential.

**6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**
- The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

**6h. Proximity to employment sites**
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

**7. Environmental impact**

**7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**
- CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

**7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**

**7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers**
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Existing housing allocation, land west of Pound Lane  
**Parish:** Isleham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/13/10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7d. Agricultural land classification</th>
<th>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7e.(i) PROW comments

Footpath 11 runs across the middle of the site and then connects to Footpaths 8, 9, 10 and is a valuable off road link between Pound Lane and Church St and West St. Ensure this link is maintained. It may require diversion to allow development to take place and/or a temporary closure whilst works take place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>Site is within CA</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM on-site</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td>Archaeological assets on-site</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

ECDC: Already allocated - same issues as before

CCC: SCHEDULED MONUMENT: Saxon and Medieval remains confirmed in this location. Housing density is an issue. Objection to overdevelopment at the boundary of a designated site as this is harmful to the setting of the nationally important earthwork site linked to Isleham Priory site to the west. Policy ISL 4 was for 3 houses, and this should be regarded as the maximum density. An archaeological condition is recommended to be placed on any planning consent granted for development on this plot. NGR 564225 274495.

### 5h. Visual Impact

Justification for score:

| Additional criterion 7i. TPOs | No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

### Parish Council support and rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council’s view:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Existing housing allocation, land at Church Lane
Parish: Isleham CP
Site Ref: Site/13/11

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Rejected**

Date and time of site visit: 

Supersedes site submission(s): 

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. However it is believed that the total site capacity would likely fall below the 10 unit threshold. The site is therefore rejected.

Site Information

Site Type: Local Plan 2015 allocated site
Site Address: Land at Church Lane, Isleham
Settlement: Isleham
LP15 Allocation Ref: ISL5
Planning Perm. Ref: 

Site Description: Land at Church Lane, Isleham
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Current Use info:

- a) Submitted / estimated: 14
- b) Recommended: 0

Indicative no. of dwellings:

- a) Submitted / estimated: 14
- b) Recommended: 0

Proposed Use info:

- Proposed Use: Housing

Site Area Net (ha): 0.40
Site Area Gross (ha): 0.4

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

- Large Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

- >50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

- Flood Zone 1: 100.00%
- Flood Zone 2: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

- 30 Year: 0.05%
- 100 Year: 0.24%
- 1,000 Year: 0.81%
**Site Name:** Existing housing allocation, land at Church Lane

**Parish:** Isleham CP

**Site Ref:** Site/13/11

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

**Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):** No

**Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):** No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation</td>
<td>Site does not intersect Inner Zone</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites</td>
<td>2.01km - 5km from the site</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport

6b. Proximity to medical services

6c. Proximity to shops

6d. Proximity to Primary School

6e. Proximity to Secondary School

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>No spare places, no room for expansion</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7. Environmental Impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td>CWS within 501m – 1km of site</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

---

Accessed off byway 3 not an adopted highway

Junction improvements needed at Coats Drove

Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Isleham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Isleham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.

The existing site is below DfE recommended size for this school. No expansion potential.

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Existing housing allocation, land at Church Lane  
**Parish:** Isleham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/13/11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7d. Agricultural land classification</th>
<th>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td>Byway 3 runs along the northern boundary of the site. Provide a link from the site to this route.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii) Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td>Archaeological assets on-site</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td>ECDC: Already allocated - same issues as before</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCC: MCB20915 - Roman settlement remains present. Development of site is in progress. 564354 274676.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7h. Visual Impact**

**Justification for score:**

**Additional criterion 7i. TPOs**

**Parish Council support and rank**

**Does Parish Council support this site?**

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council's view:**

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment:

Rejected

Date and time of site visit:
12 noon 02 June 2017

Supersedes site submission(s):

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is located in the open countryside, physically separate from any settlement and is therefore not a sustainable location. Whilst there are some buildings exist on site, employment development would cause significant harm to the wider open countryside.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17</th>
<th>ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Floral Farm, Fordham Road, Isleham, Ely, CB7 5QY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Isleham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref</td>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>Existing commercial cucumber growing business under glass with ancillary packaging buildings, located to the south of Isleham. Proposal is for the employment allocation of the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints</td>
<td><strong>Net site area estimated</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Proposed Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info</td>
<td>Proposed Use info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha)</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated</td>
<td>b) Recommended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a. Settlement Hierarchy</th>
<th>Large Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b. Site Availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Minerals and Waste assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Flood zone</td>
<td>&gt;50% of site area in Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 1:</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Surface Water flood risk</td>
<td>Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Year:</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Minor Criteria

### 5. Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land

| Site within 50m of contaminated land | D |

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

Road haulage site on N boundary

#### 5b. Local road impact

| Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations | D |

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

- |

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

Highways improvements needed e.g. footways/cycleways/bus route Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

| |

### 6. Access to services

| Less than 10 min walk (<800m) | B |

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport

| Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services

| Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m) | D |

#### 6c. Proximity to shops

| Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m) | D |

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School

| Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School

| |

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

- |

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

- |

#### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

n/a

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

- |

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites

| Less than 10 min walk (<800m) | B |

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

| CWS within 500m of site | D |

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

- |

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

- |

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification

| All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower | D |

#### 7e. Public Rights of Way

| D – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoWs outside the site boundary | D |

#### 7e.(i) PROW comments

---
**Site Name:** Land at Floral Farm

**Site Ref:** Site/13/12

**Parish:** Isleham CP

**Parish Council support and rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form G - Parish Council's view:</th>
<th>(c) not add this site to the Local Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit:
12 noon 02 June 2017

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
Development of the site would be visually intrusive to the open countryside. Other more suitable sites are available in locations closer to the village centre.

Site Information

Site Type: FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb'17
ID: 400

Site Address: Wayside Farm, Fordham Road, Isleham

Settlement: Isleham

LP15 Allocation Ref: Planning Perm. Ref:

Site Description: The site is used for arable farming, primarily potatoes. The site is bordered to the north by allotments and draft site allocation ISL.H2. The southern boundary is demarcated by powerlines. Land to the south is in the same land ownership, and submission suggests this could be used to site a new primary school.

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints: Submission indicates site could deliver circa 80 dwellings. **Net site area estimated**

Current Use: Agriculture
Proposed Use: Housing

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 80  b) Recommended 0

Site Area Net (ha): 4.20
Site Area Gross (ha): 5.6

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Large Village

1b. Site Availability
Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone 1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3a</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3b</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))
**Site Name:** Land to the east of Wayside Farm

**Parish:** Isleham CP

**Site Ref:** Site/13/13

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
<td>Site within 50m of contaminated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td>Works 46m to N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>No spare places, no room for expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>No spare places but room for expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education capacity</td>
<td>The combined effect of the call for additional sites is to require a further 3.3FE of additional secondary school places (500 places) Coupled with the impacts of sites identified in the earlier round the total number of places required cannot be delivered at Soham VC which already operates at (FE (1350 places) on its current site. Coupled with higher levels of growth elsewhere it would eb the County Council's intention to conduct a district wide review of secondary school provision on adoption of the new local plan.. A strategic review would need to include the need for a further new secondary school (and site) within East Cambs as a potential option</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td>CWS within 501m – 1km of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Year</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 Year</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No |
**Site Name:** Land to the east of Wayside Farm

**Parish:** Isleham CP

**Site Ref:** Site/13/13

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

- **Parish Council support and rank**
  - Does Parish Council support this site? No
  - Form E - Parish Council site ranking: 
  - Form G - Parish Council’s view: (c) not add this site to the Local Plan

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.

---

| 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers |  
| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower – D  
| 7e. Public Rights of Way | E – No PRoW connection opportunities – E  
| 7f.(i) PROW comments |  
| 7f.(i) Conservation Area | CA within 500m of site – D  
| 7f.(ii) Listed building | LB within 500m of site – D  
| 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument | SAM within 500m of site – D  
| 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset |  
| 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments | Conservation area to the northeast, likely to have limited impact on designated heritage assets  
| 7h. Visual Impact | Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive – D  
| Justification for score: | Development here is some way from the village, and encroaches considerably into open countryside. Much better sites exist in Isleham, in terms of location to services, and impact and integration on the landscape / townscape.  
| Additional criterion 7i. TPOs | No TPO within 15m of the site – A  

---
Site Ref: Site/13/14
Parish: Isleham CP
Site Name: Land at Sun Street
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: 
Has merit
Date and time of site visit: 
12 noon 02 June 2017
Supersedes site submission(s): 
Main findings and recommendations:
The site has some merit, as it is located close to the village centre and has clear defined boundaries. However, this undeveloped space is considered important for the character of the village by providing a break in the built area. Development would therefore be likely to result in harm to the landscape/townscape character. Other more suitable sites are available in the village.

Site Information

Site Type: FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17
ID: 401
Site Address: Sun Street, Isleham
Settlement: Isleham
LP15 Allocation Ref: 
Planning Perm. Ref: 
Site Description: Agricultural field between Sun Street and The Causeway, proposed for housing development.
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints:
**Submission does not indicate number of proposed dwellings. Dwelling figure is therefore calculated from site area and does not reflect site constraints or characteristics.**
**Net site area estimated**
Current Use: Agriculture
Proposed Use: Housing
Current Use info: a) Submitted / estimated
Proposed Use info: b) Recommended
Site Area Net (ha): 4.66
Site Area Gross (ha): 6.21
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Large Village [B]

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1 [A]

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00% 
Flood Zone 2: 0.00% 
Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% 
Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr)) [A]

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Land at Sun Street
Parish: Isleham CP
Site Ref: Site/13/14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Site Suitability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Site Suitability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to public transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Proximity to medical services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Proximity to shops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Access to services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Access to services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6h. Proximity to employment sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Environmental impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Name: Land at Sun Street

Site Ref: Site/13/14

Parish: Isleham CP

Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

7d. Agricultural land classification
- All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower
- Score: D

7e. Public Rights of Way
- C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary
- Score: C

7e.(i) PROW comments
Provide a new Public Right of Way across the site to provide a safe off road link between Sun Street and The Causeway.

7f.(i) Conservation Area
- CA within 500m of site
- Score: D

7f.(ii) Listed building
- LB within 500m of site
- Score: D

7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
- SAM within 500m of site
- Score: D

7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
ECDC - Listed buildings immediately adjacent to the east and west of the site, potential to impact the wider setting of these heritage assets.

HE - Whilst there are no heritage assets within the site boundary there are two grade II listed buildings – one to the east and one to the west of the site. Development of this site has the potential to impact upon the setting these listed buildings. Any development of this site will need to preserve the listed buildings and their settings. Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts. If taken forward for allocation, appropriate development criteria would need to be set. Should the site be allocated, these requirements should be included in the policy and supporting text of the Plan.

7h. Visual Impact
- Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive
- Score: D

Justification for score:
An unusual site, in that it has the characteristic of a field more likely found in the open countryside (agricultural, mostly bounded by trees / hedges), but found in the middle of the village. Land provides an interesting transition between settlement and countryside.

Better sites exist in Isleham, in terms of location to services, and impact and integration on the landscape / townscape.

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
- No TPO within 15m of the site
- Score: A

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site?
- No

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:
(c) not add this site to the Local Plan

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:** 12 noon 02 June 2017

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is some way from the village centre, and encroaches considerably into open countryside. Other more suitable sites exist in Isleham, in terms of location to service, and impact and integration on the landscape / townscape.

---

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb'17</th>
<th>ID: 403</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Beck Road, Isleham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Isleham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Agricultural land, proposed for housing development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td><strong>Submission does not indicate number of proposed dwellings. Dwelling figure is therefore calculated from site area and does not reflect site constraints or characteristics.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Recommended 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

| Large Village |

1b. Site Availability

---

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

---

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

---

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

---

2a. Flood zone

| >50% of site area in Zone 1 |

2b. Surface Water flood risk

| Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr)) |

---

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

| Flood Zone 1: 100.00% | Flood Zone 2: 0.00% | Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% | Flood Zone 3b: 0.00% |

---

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):**

---

**Date and time of site visit:** 12 noon 02 June 2017

---

**Indicative no. of dwellings:** a) Submitted / estimated 119

---

**Known Constraints:** **Submission does not indicate number of proposed dwellings. Dwelling figure is therefore calculated from site area and does not reflect site constraints or characteristics.**

**Net site area estimated**
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land off Beck Road  
**Parish:** Isleham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/13/16

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 2.01km - 5km from the site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

#### 5. Site Suitability

##### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

##### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

##### 5b. Local road impact
- No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations

##### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

##### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- Access off Beck Road Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

#### 6. Access to services

##### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

##### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places, no room for expansion

##### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

##### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

##### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

#### 7. Environmental impact

##### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

##### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

##### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7d. Agricultural land classification</th>
<th>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td>Provide a new Public Right of Way across the site to provide a safe off road link between Beck Road and Festival Road and Beck Road and Kennedy Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td>Conservation area to the west, likely to have limited impact on designated heritage assets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
<td>Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification for score:</td>
<td>Development here is some way from the village, and encroaches considerably into open countryside. Much better sites exist in Isleham, in terms of location to services, and impact and integration on the landscape / townscape.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional criterion 7l. TPOs</td>
<td>No TPO within 15m of the site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

Does Parish Council support this site? No

Form E - Parish Council site ranking: 

Form G - Parish Council's view: (c) not add this site to the Local Plan

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**
- **Rejected**

**Date and time of site visit:**
- 12 noon 02 June 2017

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**
The site is some distance from the village centre and development would therefore be isolated from services and amenities. Other more suitable sites are available in more sustainable locations within the village.

**Major Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a. Settlement Hierarchy</th>
<th>Large Village</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b. Site Availability</td>
<td>Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Minerals and Waste assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2a. Flood zone</th>
<th>&gt;50% of site area in Zone 1</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**
- Flood Zone 1: 100.00%
- Flood Zone 2: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

**2b. Surface Water flood risk**
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year: 0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17</th>
<th>ID: 404</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>20, Waterside, Isleham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Isleham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>Agricultural land proposed for housing development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints</td>
<td>Submission indicates site could deliver approx. 20-25 dwellings. <strong>Net site area estimated</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha): 0.68</td>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha): 0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 25</td>
<td>b) Recommended 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Rejected
**Site Name:** Land to rear of 20 Waterside

### Current Status
Rejected - not a site allocation

**Parish:** Isleham CP

**Site Ref:** Site/13/17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Minor Criteria

##### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

##### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 2.01km - 5km from the site

##### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

### 5. Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

#### 5b. Local road impact
- No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places, no room for expansion

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

#### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

The total number of homes being proposed in the village would require a significant expansion of primary school provision (approx 1FE or 210 places) This could only be achieved through the provision of a new school or the relocation and expansion of the existing school on a new site

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The combined effect of the call for additional sites is to require a further 3.3FE of additional secondary school places (500 places) Coupled with the impacts of sites identified in the earlier round the total number of places required cannot be delivered at Soham VC which already operates at (FE (1350 places) on its current site. Coupled with higher levels of growth elsewhere it would be the County Council's intention to conduct a district wide review of secondary school provision on adoption of the new local plan.. A strategic review would need to include the need for a further new secondary school (and site) within East Cambs as a potential option

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 501m – 1km of site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification
- All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower
### 7e. Public Rights of Way
- **C** - Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>CA within 500m of site</th>
<th><strong>D</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 500.1 – 1000m of site</td>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
- No impact on designated heritage assets.

### 7h. Visual Impact
- Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views

#### Justification for score:
Land is flat and under mixed, and rough agricultural production. Localised impact on residents neighbouring site. Site is considerably isolated from village – much better sites exist in Isleham, in terms of location to services, and impact and integration on the landscape / townscape.

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
- No TPO within 15m of the site

#### Parish Council support and rank
- **Does Parish Council support this site?** No
- **Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**
- **Form G - Parish Council’s view:** (c) not add this site to the Local Plan

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received
Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit: 11:00 12 May 2017

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
A large site somewhere in the Kennett area was 'supported' in CA Devolution Deal documentation. The site provides a reduced, amended boundary of Site/14/05 (draft site allocation KEN.M1). The proposal is for a major, strategic scheme providing 500 new homes. Development of the site would require the provision of community facilities and other supporting uses. The site should also improve connectivity between Kennett village and the rail station. Site has its challenges (landscape, access, nature conservation, historic assets), but, on balance, and with a policy mitigating the impacts, it is suitable for allocation.

Site Information

Site Type: FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17
ID: 408

Site Address: Station Road, Kennett

Settlement: Kennett

LP15 Allocation Ref:

Planning Perm. Ref:

Site Description: The site is proposed as a sustainable ‘garden village’ extension including community-led development, which lies to the west of Station Road and extends from Dane Hill Road in the north to the railway line in the south. The site is currently in open agricultural use with few natural field boundaries.

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints: Submission seeks to deliver a mixed-use development delivering around 500 dwellings. This site is a reduced area of current draft site allocation KEN.M1 (assessed under reference Site/14/05). **Net site area estimated**

Current Use: Agriculture

Proposed Use: Mixed use

Proposed Use info: Housing, employment, retail, community facilities inc. primary school & open spaces inc. village green, linear park & setting for Scheduled Monument.

Site Area Net (ha): 24.00

Site Area Gross (ha): 40

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 500

b) Recommended 500

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Medium Village

1b. Site Availability Available for development in med term (2023-2029)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations
Current Status: Site Allocation KEN.M1
Site Name: Land to the west of Station Road
Parish: Kennett CP
Site Ref: Site/14/09

2a. Flood zone

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

| Flood Zone 1 | 100.00% |
| Flood Zone 2 | 0.00% |
| Flood Zone 3a | 0.00% |
| Flood Zone 3b | 0.00% |

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))

| 30 Year | 0.00% |
| 100 Year | 0.03% |
| 1,000 Year | 1.09% |

Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land

Site within 50m of contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

Sand quarries adjacent N & E, road haulage site to S.

5b. Local road impact

Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops

6d. Proximity to Primary School

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

No spare places, no room for expansion

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

No spare places but room for expansion

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

A 1FE 210 place school is planned to serve the new garden village. The site is capable of providing for a 2FE 420 place school and at the levels of development now proposed that size of primary school will be required. Subsequent plans to expand the garden village beyond 500 dwellings would require a larger school still.

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The combined effect of the call for additional sites is to require a further 3.3FE of additional secondary school places (500 places) Coupled with the impacts of sites identified in the earlier round the total number of places required cannot be delivered at Soham VC which already operates at (FE (1350 places) on its current site. Coupled with higher levels of growth elsewhere it would eb the County Council’s intention to conduct a district wide review of secondary school provision on adoption of the new local plan. A strategic review would need to include the need for a further new secondary school (and site) within East Cambs as a potential option.

6h. Proximity to employment sites

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

7. Environmental impact
Site Ref: Site/14/09  
Parish: Kennett CP  
Parish Name: Land to the west of Station Road  
Current Status: Site Allocation KEN.M1

### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 500m of site

### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

### 7d. Agricultural land classification
- All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower

### 7e. Public Rights of Way
- C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PROW within the site boundary

### 7f.(i) Conservation Area
- CA more than 2km from site

### 7f.(ii). Listed building
- LB within 500m of site

### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
- SAM on-site

### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
- ECDC - Listed building to the east, development should consider the setting of this building and preserve or enhance the building and its setting
- HE - This large mixed use allocation, KEN.M1, has been reduced in geographical size but without a reduction in the number of dwellings proposed, approximately 500 homes. The designated heritage asset, the Howe Hill bowl barrow scheduled monument, remains within the reduced site allocation area. Historic England therefore is still concerned about the allocation of all of the land within this site. We note bullet point 11 of draft Policy Kennett 4 sought to address this matter. However, we are concerned that this does not provide sufficient protection to the heritage asset, particularly if the reduced allocation area is taken forward. Our advice remains that either the monument and its setting are removed from the site allocation, or the buffer zone is increased in size to provide greater protection to the heritage asset. There is also a grade II listed building, The School House to the east of the site. Any development would need to preserve the listed building and its setting

### 7h. Visual Impact
- Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive

**Justification for score:**

**Site forms part of wide open countryside landscape, with no defensible boundaries to W. Site visible from wide area, including from A14 and railway. Rural setting of main part of village would predominantly be lost.**

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
- No TPO within 15m of the site

**Parish Council support and rank**

Does Parish Council support this site? No

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view: (b) add this site to the Local Plan, but delete an existing preferred site(s)?

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment:
- Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:
18/08/2016 at 10:30am

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:

A large site somewhere in the Kennett area was 'supported' in CA Devolution Deal documentation. The site provides a reduced, amended boundary of Site/14/05 (draft site allocation KEN.M1). The proposal is for a major, strategic scheme providing 500 new homes. Development of the site would require the provision of community facilities and other supporting uses. The site should also improve connectivity between Kennett village and the rail station. Site has its challenges (landscape, access, nature conservation, historic assets), but, on balance, and with a policy mitigating the impacts, it is suitable for allocation, subject to reduced area as per 14/09.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B) ID: 70
Site Address: Land to the west of Station Road, Kennett, Cambridgeshire
Settlement: Kennett
LP15 Allocation Ref: Site Area Net (ha): 24.30
Planning Perm. Ref: Site Area Gross (ha): 40.5
Site Description: Land to the west of Station Road, Kennett
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: Tumulus (SAM) adjacent to the north east corner. Land at north of the site is designated as part of a Mineral Safeguarding Zone.
Current Use: Agriculture Proposed Use: Housing
Proposed Use info:
Proposed Use info:
Site Area Net (ha): 24.30 Site Area Gross (ha): 40.5
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 500 b) Recommended 500

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Medium Village

1b. Site Availability
Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment
This site lies within the Mineral Safeguarding Area for Sand and Gravel, designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Core Strategy and shown on Proposals Map C (2011). The overarching policy is CS26 Mineral Safeguarding Areas which states that development will only be permitted when the applicant has demonstrated that the mineral is no longer of any economic value; or can be extracted prior to development; or it will not inhibit extraction; or the development is not incompatible. This policy needs to be taken into account when considering whether this site should be allocated. This site lies partly within the Waste Consultation Area for the waste management site at Plantation Farm, Kennett (Policy W8BB) designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012). The overarching policy for this designation is Policy CS30 of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011). This policy seeks to safeguard waste management facilities which make a significant contribution to managing Cambridgeshire's waste; and the policy states that development will only be permitted where it is demonstrated that this will not prejudice existing or future planned waste management operations. The site also partly falls in a Mineral Consultation Area for Kennett (Policy M9J) designated under...
Site Name: Land to the west of Station Road, Kennett, Cambridgeshire

Current Status: Superseded by KEN.M1

Parish: Kennett CP

Site Ref: Site/14/05

the adopted Site Specific Plan (2012). The overarching policy in the adopted Core Strategy is CS27 which states that development will only be permitted in this area when it has been demonstrated that it will not prejudice the, in this case, existing mineral extraction. These policies should be taken into consideration in the interests of deliverability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies</th>
<th>CS26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations</td>
<td>W8BB; M9J</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation

Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites

2.01km - 5km from the site

- Professional assessment

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

- Professional assessment

#### 5. Site Suitability

##### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land

Site within 50m of contaminated land

- Professional assessment

Road haulage depot on S boundary. Quarries to N and E.

##### 5b. Local road impact

No objections with minor mitigation measures

- Professional assessment

##### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

- Professional assessment

##### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

**SOUTH SITE AREA - SCORE E**

No access to A14 will be permitted from south area of the site. Shown access next to bridge is unsafe and unsuitable due to insurmountable visibility splay issues north

**NORTH SITE AREA - SCORE A**

Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on 500 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines and demonstrate how the site can be made accessible on foot, by cycle and by public transport together with identifying any remaining off-site highway implications and required mitigation. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area.

#### 6. Access to services

##### 6a. Proximity to public transport

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

- Professional assessment

##### 6b. Proximity to medical services

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

- Professional assessment

##### 6c. Proximity to shops

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

- Professional assessment

##### 6d. Proximity to Primary School

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

- Professional assessment

##### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

- Professional assessment

##### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

No spare places, no room for expansion

- Professional assessment

##### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

- Professional assessment
**Current Status:** Superseded by KEN.M1  
**Site Name:** Land to the west of Station Road, Kennett, Cambridgeshire  
**Parish:** Kennett CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/14/05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely restricted site with no further development potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All the following relate to Site KEN.M1 (Note: there was a very high volume of objections to this site, covering a wide range of issues. The following attempts to capture frequent or particularly pertinent points):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Objections (or very strongly expressed reservations) from the following councils: Cambridgeshire County; West Suffolk; Kennett Parish; Kentford Parish; Moulton Parish; Newmarket Town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Allocation not suitable regarding its anticipated impacts on the wider area singularly or cumulatively with the emerging Forest Heath Local Plan. Joint working with Suffolk Heath Council should have been done, under the Duty to Cooperate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Petition (signed approx 200) against the proposal received.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Name: Land to the west of Station Road, Kennett, Cambridgeshire

Current Status: Superseded by KEN.M1
Parish: Kennett CP
Site Ref: Site/14/05

- Site within 2km of Breckland Farmland SSSI, a component of Breckland SPA. Development therefore poses a potential risk to Stone Curlews. Evidence needed in SA and HRA to demonstrate no adverse effect on Stone Curlews (Natural England).
- Scale of development poses recreational risk pressure on Chippenham Fen NNR (part of Fenland SAC), Breckland SPA, SAC, Breckland SSSI and Red Lodge Heath SSSI. Policy needs requirement for ecological assessment to enable project level HRA. Policy also needs requirement for a GI Strategy (Natural England).
- Net gain in biodiversity needed.
- Object to the lack of protection of the Historic Asset of a scheduled monument (Howe Hill Bowl Barrow). Site allocation should be reduced to remove the monument from the allocation and/or large buffer zone.
- Site must deliver all infrastructure, including doctor’s surgery – Newmarket must not be relied upon.
- If there is a lack of evidence regarding deliverability (see 7.18.4), the allocation is questioned. Not enough evidence to suggest the site is the most suitable and sustainable option.
- Allocation contrary to CLT Policy LP5. The proposal is not a CLT development.
- Kennett CLT: withholds support for the proposal until four issues are negotiated: (a) number of homes; (b) relief road / downgrading of B1085; (c) future development of south / west parts of allocation beyond 2036; (d) infrastructure.
- Loss of biodiversity (deer, hares, birds)
- Will not contribute to five year land supply – smaller sites at Kennett would.
- Site falls within Mineral Safeguarding and Consultation Areas, and Waste Consultation Area – we support these references in the policy.
- Site has no defensible western boundary.
- Site not viable.
- Loss of agricultural land.
- South-east part of site is within a Groundwater Protection Zone.
- Profound impact on landscape, and on settlement pattern in the area.
- Air quality assessment should be required.
- Significant concern that the beneficiaries of this site are ECDC corporate objectives and finances. Potential Conflict of Interest.
- Devolution Deal, upon which this proposal rests, has no status in the plan led system. It has not been subject to necessary rigours of consultation.
- Development should be carefully limited (with particular concern for traffic).
- Support the policy where it aims to preserve and enhance the special qualities of the village.
- Support the policy for 500, we need new housing - and welcomed the planning weekend.
- Comments from promoter (brief summary):
  - Other than A14/A11 Link Rd (which should be deleted), the scheme will assist delivery of Kennett2 items
  - Site area should be reduced to about 40ha (map provided)
  - Masterplan, not concept plan, should be prepared. Draft masterplan has been prepared.
  - 500 dwellings is acceptable
  - Employment provision should be subject to demand / viability. B2 and B8 reference should be removed.
  - Requirement for joint pre-school and primary school too inflexible – might be better split.
  - Level of local centre provision should be subject to demand / viability.
  - Reference to high proportion of Community led development is unnecessary, too vague and should be deleted in favour of a cross reference to LP5.
  - Transport assessment work underway.
  - Trial pits indicate gravel deposits not high enough % to make it a viable mineral for extracting.
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Wildtracks Offroad Activity Park
Parish: Kennett CP
Site Ref: Site/14/01

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected
Date and time of site visit: 18/08/2016 at 11:30am
Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is rejected on the basis that it is isolated form any existing settlement, and therefore does not provide a sustainable location for employment development. In addition, there is no evidence of need for major new employment allocations.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)
Site Address:
Settlement: Kennett

LP15 Allocation Ref: Planning Perm. Ref:
Site Description: Offroad activity park at Chippenham Rd, Kennett
Brown/Greenfield: Brownfield

Known Constraints: Currently a commercially operated site.

Current Use: Other (please specify)
Proposed Use: Employment

Current Use info: Leisure facility involving the use of motor vehicles
Proposed Use info:

Site Area Net (ha): 11.72
Site Area Gross (ha): 19.54
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated b) Recommended

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Medium Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

This site lies largely within the Waste Consultation Area for the waste management site at Plantation Farm, Kennett (Policy W8BB) designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012). The overarching policy for this designation is Policy CS30 of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011). This policy seeks to safeguard waste management facilities which make a significant contribution to managing Cambridgeshire’s waste; and the policy states that development will only be permitted where it is demonstrated that this will not prejudice existing or future planned waste management operations. Typically industrial uses (B2, B8) are unlikely to prejudice waste management operations, but it is suggested that consideration should be given to these policies prior to allocation in order to ensure deliverability. In addition the site falls in a Mineral Consultation Area for Kennett (Policy M9J) designated under the adopted Site Specific Plan (2012). The overarching policy in the adopted Core Strategy is CS27 which states that development will only be permitted in this area when it has been demonstrated that it will not prejudice the, in this case, existing mineral extraction. Given the nature of the proposed development, and the sites separation from the mineral site by the A11 it is unlikely to affect the ongoing mineral operation, however, this policy should be taken into consideration in the interests of deliverability.

1c.(f) Site affected by M+W Policies CS26
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</th>
<th>Site located on contaminated land</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land profesional assessment</td>
<td>Pit or quarry</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6. Access to services

| 6a. Proximity to public transport | Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m) | D |
| 6b. Proximity to medical services | Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m) | C |
| 6c. Proximity to shops | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |
| 6d. Proximity to Primary School | Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m) | D |
| 6e. Proximity to Secondary School | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |
| 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity | No spare places, no room for expansion | E |
| 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment | Extremely restricted site with no further development potential | |
| 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity | Limited capacity | C |
| 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment | The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area. | |

#### 7. Environmental impact

| 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites | CWS located within site | E |
| 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment | | |

---

**Site Name:** Wildtracks Offroad Activity Park  
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Parish:** Kennett CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/14/01
### Site Information

**Site Name:** *Wildtracks Offroad Activity Park*  
**Parish:** *Kennett CP*  
**Site Ref:** *Site/14/01*

**Current Status:** *Rejected - not a site allocation*

### Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by Grade 4 or 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PROW within the site boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii) Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td>Archaeological assets within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td>CCC: Lots of previous (old) response to consultations for this scheme - no archaeological requirements and no objections to development proposed here. NGR468470 268820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
<td>Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7i. TPOs</td>
<td>No TPO within 15m of the site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parish Council Support and Rank

- **Does Parish Council support this site?** Yes
- **Form E - Parish Council site ranking:** First
- **Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received

- Other sites have been deleted for political reasons, not technical reasons
- Reasonable alternative sites have not been considered appropriately, as they should have been under SA legislation.
- Reasonable alternatives to less growth at Kennett have not been considered appropriately, as they should have been under SA legislation.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Rejected**

Date and time of site visit: 18/08/2016 at 10:50am

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is rejected on the basis that it is physically separate from the main built area of Kennett village where services and facilities are located; would result in the loss of agricultural land / stud farm and views of wider countryside.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>90 Station Road, Kennett, Newmarket, Cambridgeshire, CB8 7QF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Kennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Vacant land at stud, east of Station Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td>Vacant land at stud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Recommended 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy: Medium Village

1b. Site Availability: Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone: >50% of site area in Zone 1

| Flood Zone 1: | 100.00% |
| Flood Zone 2: | 0.00%   |
| Flood Zone 3a:| 0.00%   |
| Flood Zone 3b:| 0.00%   |

2b. Surface Water flood risk: Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))

| 30 Year: | 0.00% |
| 100 Year: | 0.00% |
| 1,000 Year: | 0.00% |
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**

Site Name: **Land to the east of Station Road**

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land

Site located within 250m of contaminated land

5a(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

Site located within 250m of contaminated land

5b. Local road impact

No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

#### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f(i) Available primary school capacity

No spare places, no room for expansion

6f(ii) Available secondary school capacity

Limited capacity

6g(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

Extremely restricted site with no further development potential

6g(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

CWS within 501m – 1km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification

All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower

7e. Public Rights of Way

E – No PRoW connection opportunities

7f(i) PROW comments

---

| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefiting from defences (Y/N): | No |

3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation

Site does not intersect Inner Zone

4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites

2.01km - 5km from the site

4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

---

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land

Site within 250m of contaminated land

5a(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

Site located within 250m of contaminated land

5b. Local road impact

No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

---

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f(i) Available primary school capacity

No spare places, no room for expansion

6f(ii) Available secondary school capacity

Limited capacity

6g(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

Extremely restricted site with no further development potential

6g(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

---

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

CWS within 501m – 1km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification

All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower

7e. Public Rights of Way

E – No PRoW connection opportunities

7f(i) PROW comments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>CA more than 2km from site</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii) Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 500.1 – 1000m of site</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listed buildings to the northwest - limited heritage impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7h. Visual Impact</th>
<th>Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Justification for score:**

Would spoil views of countryside which are afforded from the main road.

**Additional criterion 7i. TPOs**

| No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

**Parish Council support and rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td>Fifth or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council's view:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

*Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:*

- Other sites have been deleted for political reasons, not technical reasons
- Reasonable alternative sites have not been considered appropriately, as they should have been under SA legislation.
- Reasonable alternatives to less growth at Kennett have not been considered appropriately, as they should have been under SA legislation.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit: 18/08/2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is rejected on the basis that the site is physically separate from the main part of the village where services and facilities are located; vehicle access is constrained; and, the site is located behind existing residential development, which would likely result in a poor built form and potentially impact on residential amenity.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  ID: 68

Site Address: 90 Station Road, Kennett, Newmarket, Cambridgeshire, CB8 7QF

Settlement: Kennett

LP15 Allocation Ref:  Planning Perm. Ref:

Site Description: Land at stud, Station Rd, Kennett

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints:

Current Use: Other (please specify)  Proposed Use: Housing

Current Use info: Paddocks

Proposed Use info:

Site Area Net (ha): 1.43  Site Area Gross (ha): 1.68

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 60  b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

Medium Village

1b. Site Availability

Site unavailable for development

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 Year</th>
<th>100 Year</th>
<th>1,000 Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land to the south of Longstones Stud stable buildings  
**Parish:** Kennett CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/14/03

| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No |
| 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation | Site does not intersect Inner Zone |
| 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites | 2.01km - 5km from the site |
| 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment | |

**Minor Criteria**

### 5. Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land  
Site within 100m of contaminated land

#### 5b. Local road impact  
Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

NO highways frontage  
Visibility issues as safety concerns would preclude an access next to the railway bridge south of the site  
Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment based on 45 This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area.

### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport  
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School  
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity  
No spare places, no room for expansion

#### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment  
Extremely restricted site with no further development potential

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity  
Limited capacity

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites  
CWS within 501m – 1km of site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification  
All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>E – No PRoW connection opportunities</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii) Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500.1 – 1000m of site</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 500.1 – 1000m of site</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td>Listed buildings to the northwest - limited heritage impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
<td>Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification for score:</td>
<td>Views to countryside would be hindered by development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional criterion 7l. TPOs</td>
<td>No TPO within 15m of the site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does Parish Council support this site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td>Fifth or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council’s view:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Other sites have been deleted for political reasons, not technical reasons.
- Reasonable alternative sites have not been considered appropriately, as they should have been under SA legislation.
- Reasonable alternatives to less growth at Kennett have not been considered appropriately, as they should have been under SA legislation.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit:
18/08/2016 at 11:10am

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is rejected on the basis that the site is physically separate from the main part of the village where services and facilities are located; vehicle access is constrained; and, development would result in a loss of employment land.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B) ID: 69
Site Address: Hanson Quarry Products Europe Ltd, 42 Station Road, Kennett, Newmarket, CB4 7QD
Settlement: Kennett
LP15 Allocation Ref: Planning Perm. Ref:
Site Description: Land to the rear of 42 Station Road, Kennett
Brown/Greenfield: Brownfield
Current Use info: Disused quarry products depot
Proposed Use info:
Site Area Net (ha): 0.67 Site Area Gross (ha): 0.785
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 18 b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Medium Village
1b. Site Availability Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

This site lies within the Mineral Safeguarding Area for Sand and Gravel, designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Core Strategy and shown on Proposals Map C (2011). The overarching policy is CS26 Mineral Safeguarding Areas which sets out criteria which must be met in order for development to be permitted. However, in this instance the proposed site is in close proximity to existing development and the mineral resource is an isolated area. It is unlikely to be an economic resource therefore no objections would be raised in this context to this site being allocated.

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies CS26

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone >50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

| Flood Zone 1: | 100.00% | Flood Zone 2: | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3a: | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3b: | 0.00% |

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMSW):
**Minor Criteria**

### Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located on contaminated land

#### 5b. Local road impact
- Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- Access on to Station Road difficult to determine if a suitable access can be achieved to the development and therefore we are unable to determine if the access and estate roads would be suitable for adoption
- Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

### Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6f. Available primary school capacity
- No spare places, no room for expansion

#### 6g. Available secondary school capacity
- Limited capacity

### Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land to the rear of 42 Station Road, Kennett  
**Parish:** Kennett CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/14/04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7d. Agricultural land classification</th>
<th>All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>E – No PRoW connection opportunities</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7e. Public Rights of Way

- **E – No PRoW connection opportunities**

### 7f. PROW comments

- **7f.(i) Conservation Area**
  - CA more than 2km from site
  - Score: A
- **7f.(ii) Listed building**
  - LB within 500m of site
  - Score: D
- **7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument**
  - SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site
  - Score: B
- **7f.(iv) Archaeological asset**
  - Score: 

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

- **Listed buildings to the northwest - limited heritage impact**

### 7h. Visual impact

- **Some improvement to landscape/townscape or key views**
  - Score: B

#### Justification for score:

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

- **No TPO within 15m of the site**
  - Score: A

**Parish Council support and rank**

- **Does Parish Council support this site?** No
- **Form E - Parish Council site ranking:** Third

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Other sites have been deleted for political reasons, not technical reasons
- Reasonable alternative sites have not been considered appropriately, as they should have been under SA legislation.
- Reasonable alternatives to less growth at Kennett have not been considered appropriately, as they should have been under SA legislation.
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall recommendation from site assessment:</th>
<th>Rejected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date and time of site visit:</td>
<td>10:10 12 May 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Main findings and recommendations:**

Major infrastructure would be required to enable vehicular access to the site. The site is part of the open countryside and does not relate well to the built form of the village. Development may impact on the setting of heritage assets.

---

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name: Land north of Dane Hill Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref: Site/14/06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type: FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17</th>
<th>ID: 405</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address: Dane Hill Road, Kennett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement: Kennett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description: The site is a 6.7 hectare parcel of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land located to the north of Dane Hill Road. However,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>due to the need to protect the amenity of existing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dwellings and natural features the net developable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area is 4.1 hectares. The site is located immediately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposite existing residential development on the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>southern side of Dane Hill Road and the south</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eastern corner of the site is occupied by a small</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housing scheme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints: Submission indicates site can</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deliver circa 120 dwellings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use: Agriculture</td>
<td>Proposed Use: Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha): 4.10</td>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha): 6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Recommended 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Criteria

**1a. Settlement Hierarchy**

Medium Village

**1b. Site Availability**

Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

**1c. Minerals and Waste assessment**

**1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies**

**1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations**

**2a. Flood zone**

>50% of site area in Zone 1

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1:</th>
<th>100.00%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2:</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a:</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b:</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**2b. Surface Water flood risk**

Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Land north of Dane Hill Road
Parish: Kennett CP
Site Ref: Site/14/06

Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located on contaminated land

5a(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
- Sand quarries on site and to W

5b. Local road impact
- Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- A roundabout required at junction of Dane Hill Road & Station Road Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops

6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places, no room for expansion

6f(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

6g(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- A 1FE 210 place school is planned to serve the new garden village. The site is capable of providing for a 2FE 420 place school and at the levels of development now proposed that size of primary school will be required. Subsequent plans to expand the garden village beyond 500 dwellings would require a larger school still.

6g(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- The combined effect of the call for additional sites is to require a further 3.3FE of additional secondary school places (500 places)
Coupled with the impacts of sites identified in the earlier round the total number of places required cannot be delivered at Soham VC which already operates at (FE (1350 places) on its current site. Coupled with higher levels of growth elsewhere it would eb the County Council’s intention to conduct a district wide review of secondary school provision on adoption of the new local plan.. A strategic review would need to include the need for a further new secondary school (and site) within East Cambs as a potential option

6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS located within site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 Year</th>
<th>100 Year</th>
<th>1,000 Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td>1.97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land north of Dane Hill Road

### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 7d. Agricultural land classification

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 7e. Public Rights of Way

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

Does Parish Council support this site? No

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view: (c) not add this site to the Local Plan

### 7f. PROW comments

Public Footpath 3 runs within the western boundary of the site. Public Footpath 2 runs adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site. Both of these FPs provide good connections to the wider network. Create a link between these footpaths within the site.

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

HE - Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary there is the grade II* Church of St Nicholas immediately east of the site and the Howe Hill bowl barrow immediately south of the site. Development of this site has the potential to impact upon the setting this listed building and scheduled monument. In particular, the development is likely to have a significant impact upon St Nicholas’ Church and its setting within the rural landscape and alter the relationship of the building with the land. We would suggest that, if brought forward, the site should more appropriately be limited to the south eastern portion which is closer to existing development leaving the land to the west of the Church open and so securing the relationship between the Church and the land. However, we would note that further assessment of potential impacts on both the listed building and scheduled monument is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts. It may not be possible to allocate based on these impacts. Any development of this site will need to preserve the setting of the Church and scheduled monument. This might be achieved through mitigation measures such as appropriate landscaping/plant and setting the development back from the heritage assets and perhaps by limiting the development to frontage development along Dane Hill Road. Regardless, if the site is allocated, it is important that requirement to preserve the listed building and its setting should be included in the policy and supporting text of the Plan.

### 7h. Visual Impact

Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views

**Justification for score:**

Provided site boundary vegetation kept, site is virtually non-visible from public viewpoint, except private views from St Nicholas Close row of dwellings (where visual impact from private properties would be high)

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Parish:** Kennett CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/14/07

### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

#### Overall recommendation from site assessment:
Rejected

#### Date and time of site visit:
10:30 12 May 2017

#### Supersedes site submission(s):

#### Main findings and recommendations:
The site is physically separate from the main part of the village, and would unlikely offer a sustainable location for development.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17</th>
<th>ID: 406</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Dane Hill Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Kennett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>Agricultural land located west of Dane Hill Road, enclosed by vegetation, proposed for housing development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Known Constraints | Submission indicates site could deliver 28 dwellings.  
**Net site area estimated** |
| Current Use | Agriculture |
| Proposed Use | Housing |
| Current Use info | |
| Proposed Use info | |
| Site Area Net (ha) | 1.19 |
| Site Area Gross (ha) | 1.4 |
| Indicative no. of dwellings | a) Submitted / estimated 28  
b) Recommended 0 |

### Major Criteria

#### 1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Medium Village  

#### 1b. Site Availability
Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

#### 1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

#### 1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

#### 1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

#### 2a. Flood Zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1

##### Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

| Flood Zone 1 | 100.00% | Flood Zone 2 | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3a | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3b | 0.00% |

#### 2b. Surface Water flood risk
Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))

##### Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):

---

---
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land west of Dane Hill Road  
**Parish:** Kennett CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/14/07

| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |  
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No |  

### Minor Criteria

**5. Site Suitability**

| 5a. Proximity to contaminated land | Site within 100m of contaminated land | C |  
| 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment | Squarries 184m to NW, 94m to SE |  
| 5b. Local road impact | No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations | C |  
| 5c. Strategic Road Network impact |  
| 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment | Does not appear to have access to highways frontage OR shown access to highway Potential problems to access the highway Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry. |  

### 6. Access to services

| 6a. Proximity to public transport | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) | B |  
| 6b. Proximity to medical services | Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m) | D |  
| 6c. Proximity to shops |  
| 6d. Proximity to Primary School | Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m) | C |  
| 6e. Proximity to Secondary School | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |  
| 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity | No spare places, no room for expansion | E |  
| 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity | No spare places but room for expansion | D |  
| 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment | A 1FE 210 place school is planned to serve the new garden village. The site is capable of providing for a 2FE 420 place school and at the levels of development now proposed that size of primary school will be required. Subsequent plans to expand the garden village beyond 500 dwellings would require a larger school still. |  
| 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment | The combined effect of the call for additional sites is to require a further 3.3FE of additional secondary school places (500 places) Coupled with the impacts of sites identified in the earlier round the total number of places required cannot be delivered at Soham VC which already operates at (FE (1350 places) on its current site. Coupled with higher levels of growth elsewhere it would eb the County Council's intention to conduct a district wide review of secondary school provision on adoption of the new local plan.. A strategic review would need to include the need for a further new secondary school (and site) within East Cambs as a potential option |  
| 6h. Proximity to employment sites | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |  

### 7. Environmental impact

| 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites | CWS within 500m of site | D |  
| 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment |  
| 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers |  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7d. Agricultural land classification</th>
<th>All or part of site intersected by Grade 4 or 5</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>E – No PRoW connection opportunities</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 500.1 – 1000m of site</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td>Listed building immediately south, development should consider the setting of this building and preserve or enhance the building and its setting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
<td>Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification for score:**

Site enclosed from public view

**Additional criterion 7i. TPOs**

No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

**Parish Council support and rank**

Does Parish Council support this site? No

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view: (c) not add this site to the Local Plan

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Land east of Dane Hill Road
Parish: Kennett CP
Site Ref: Site/14/08

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit: 10:30 08 May 2017

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is remote from the main part of the village, and would unlikely offer a sustainable location for development.

Site Information

Site Type: FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17
Site Address: Dane Hill Road, Kennett
Settlement: Kennett
LP15 Allocation Ref: ID: 407
Planning Perm. Ref: 
Site Description: Agricultural land east of Dane Hill Road, proposed for housing development, defined by existing field and property boundaries.
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: Submission indicates site could deliver 20 dwellings.
**Net site area estimated**
Current Use: Agriculture
Proposed Use: Housing
Current Use info:
Proposed Use info:
Site Area Net (ha): 0.85 Site Area Gross (ha) 1
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 20 b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Medium Village
1b. Site Availability Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment
1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations
2a. Flood zone >50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (% of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00% Flood Zone 2: 0.00% Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%
2b. Surface Water flood risk Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))

Percent (% of site area at risk (uFMSW):
**Site Name:** Land east of Dane Hill Road

**Parish:** Kennett CP

**Site Ref:** Site/14/08

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

**5a. Proximity to contaminated land**
- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

**5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment**
- Site within 50m of contaminated land
- Quarry on E boundary

**5b. Local road impact**
- No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

**5c. Strategic Road Network impact**
- No objections

**5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**
- Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

#### 6. Access to services

**6a. Proximity to public transport**
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

**6b. Proximity to medical services**
- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

**6c. Proximity to shops**
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

**6d. Proximity to Primary School**
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

**6e. Proximity to Secondary School**
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

**6f.(i) Available primary school capacity**
- No spare places, no room for expansion

**6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity**
- No spare places but room for expansion

**6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**
- A 1FE 210 place school is planned to serve the new garden village. The site is capable of providing for a 2FE 420 place school and at the levels of development now proposed that size of primary school will be required. Subsequent plans to expand the garden village beyond 500 dwellings would require a larger school still.

**6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**
- The combined effect of the call for additional sites is to require a further 3.3FE of additional secondary school places (500 places) Coupled with the impacts of sites identified in the earlier round the total number of places required cannot be delivered at Soham VC which already operates at (FE (1350 places) on its current site. Coupled with higher levels of growth elsewhere it would eb the County Council’s intention to conduct a district wide review of secondary school provision on adoption of the new local plan. A strategic review would need to include the need for a further new secondary school (and site) within East Cambs as a potential option.

**6h. Proximity to employment sites**
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 7. Environmental impact

**7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**
- CWS located within site

**7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**
- No objections

**7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers**
| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by Grade 4 or 5 | B |
| 7e. Public Rights of Way | E – No PRoW connection opportunities | E |

### 7f. (i) PROW comments

#### 7f. (i) Conservation Area
CA more than 2km from site

#### 7f. (ii) Listed building
LB within 500m of site

#### 7f. (iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
SAM within 500.1 – 1000m of site

#### 7f. (iv) Archaeological asset

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

| ECDC - Listed building to the southeast, development should consider the setting of this building and preserve or enhance the building and its setting.
| HE - Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary there is the grade II gatehouse immediately south of the site. Any development of the site therefore has the potential to impact upon this heritage asset. Any development of this site will need to protect and enhance this listed building and its setting. If the site is allocated, these requirements should be included in policy and the supporting text of the Plan.

### 7h. Visual Impact
Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive

**Justification for score:**
Clearly part of open countryside, and visible. Lacks defensible boundaries.

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
No TPO within 15m of the site

**Parish Council support and rank**

| Does Parish Council support this site? | No |
| Form E - Parish Council site ranking: | |
| Form G - Parish Council's view: | (c) not add this site to the Local Plan |

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

**Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:**

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

Overall recommendation from site assessment:  
Rejected

Date and time of site visit:  
11:00 12 May 2017

Supersedes site submission(s):

Main findings and recommendations:

The site is located in open countryside, separate from the main part of the village. The western part of the site is outside ECDC’s administrative boundary and would therefore not be suitable for allocation.

---

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Longstones Stud, Station Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Kennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Longstones Stud is currently a quarantine stud. The stud has direct access to Station Road through an existing vehicular access between houses in in Station Road to the south and the village playing fields and pavilion further to the north. The proposal seeks to deliver housing development and extensive open spaces and other community benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Eastern part of site falls outside ECDC’s administrative area. ECDC will only consider the area falling within its boundary. <strong>Submission does not indicate proposed no. of dwellings. Dwelling figure is calculated from estimate of net site area.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td>Equestrian / stud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td>Residential, country park, riverside walk and other community benefits such as a village store and community-led development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>14.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>24.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 522  b) Recommended 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  
Medium Village  

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone  
>50% of site area in Zone 1  

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

**5a. Proximity to contaminated land**
- Site within 50m of contaminated land

**5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment**
- Sand quarry on N boundary

**5b. Local road impact**
- Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

**5c. Strategic Road Network impact**

**5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**
- Highways improvements needed e.g. footways Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

#### 6. Access to services

**6a. Proximity to public transport**
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

**6b. Proximity to medical services**
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

**6c. Proximity to shops**

**6d. Proximity to Primary School**
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

**6e. Proximity to Secondary School**
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

**6f.(i) Available primary school capacity**
- No spare places, no room for expansion

**6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity**
- No spare places but room for expansion

#### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- A 1FE 210 place school is planned to serve the new garden village. The site is capable of providing for a 2FE 420 place school and at the levels of development now proposed that size of primary school will be required. Subsequent plans to expand the garden village beyond 500 dwellings would require a larger school still.

**6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**
- No spare places but room for expansion

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- The combined effect of the call for additional schools is to require a further 3.3FE of additional secondary school places (500 places) Coupled with the impacts of sites identified in the earlier round the total number of places required cannot be delivered at Soham VC which already operates at (FE (1350 places) on its current site. Coupled with higher levels of growth elsewhere it would be the County Council’s intention to conduct a district wide review of secondary school provision on adoption of the new local plan. A strategic review would need to include the need for a further new secondary school (and site) within East Cambs as a potential option

**6h. Proximity to employment sites**
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 7. Environmental impact

**7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**
- CWS located within site

**7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**

---

### Flood Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone 1</td>
<td>60.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 2</td>
<td>16.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3a</td>
<td>16.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3b</td>
<td>16.97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

- **30 Year:** 2.01%
- **100 Year:** 8.51%
- **1,000 Year:** 8.51%

---

**Proximity to Hazardous Installation**
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

**Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites**
- 501m - 2km from the site

**Proximity to European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment**

---

**Proximity to surface water flood risk**
- Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

---

**Situated in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):** No

**Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):** No

---

**Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**
- CWS located within site
**Site Name:** Longstones Stud  
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Parish:** Kennett CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/14/10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e.(i) PROW comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nothing further to add from previous consultation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 7h. Visual Impact | Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views |
|-------------------|

**Justification for score:**
Limited impact on view of countryside.  
From a public point of view, site largely not visible

**Additional criterion 7i. TPOs**
No TPO within 15m of the site

### Parish Council support and rank

**Does Parish Council support this site?** No

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council's view:** (c) not add this site to the Local Plan

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Rejected**

Date and time of site visit: 29/6/2017 2:30pm

Supersedes site submission(s):

Main findings and recommendations:
Development of the site may be visually intrusive to the countryside, and may not reflect the built form of the village. The site is relatively isolated from local services and facilities.

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17</th>
<th>ID:</th>
<th>410</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>The Street, Kirtling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Kirtling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>The site comprises a small field lying on the eastern side of The Street at the southern end of the northernmost of the four development envelopes covering Kirtling and Kirtling Green.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Submission indicates site could deliver up to 8 dwellings. <strong>Net site area estimated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 8</td>
<td>b) Recommended 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Small Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

| Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening): |
| Flood Zone 1: 100.00% | Flood Zone 2: 0.00% | Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% | Flood Zone 3b: 0.00% |

2b. Surface Water flood risk Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))
### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 2.01km - 5km from the site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

#### 5b. Local road impact
- No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to public transport</td>
<td>&lt;5 min</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>&gt;20 min</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to shops</td>
<td>&lt;10 min</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>&gt;20 min</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>&gt;20 min</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

**Bottisham VC** is in the process of being expanded from 7FE to 10FE an additional 450 places 11-16. Future catchment forecasts indicate that there will be some limited capacity available at the school to accommodate growth. In addition, there are plans for a new secondary school to the east of Cambridge to serve that areas development needs. The school will be in part of Bottisham VC current catchment area. If pupils in this area are served by the new school that will free up further capacity to accommodate the growth proposed within the Local Plan and the sites identified in this second round.

#### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td>CWS within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Site Name:** Land at The Street, Kirtling

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

### Parish Council support and rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council's view:</td>
<td>(c) not add this site to the Local Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.

### 7e. Public Rights of Way

- **B** – Opportunities to connect to multiple nearby PROW within the site boundary

### 7f. (i) Conservation Area

- CA within 1.01km – 2km of site

### 7f. (ii). Listed building

- LB within 500m of site

### 7f. (iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

- SAM within 500m of site

### 7f. (iv) Archaeological asset

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

ECDC - Listed buildings immediately adjacent to the north and opposite (within 30m), potentially have concerns regarding development in this location, but any proposal should consider the setting of these buildings and preserve or enhance them and their setting.

HE - Whilst there are no heritage assets within the site boundary there are three grade II listed buildings to the north of the site. Development of this site has the potential to impact upon the setting these listed building. Any development of this site will need to preserve the listed buildings and their setting. This might be achieved through mitigation measures. Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts. Regardless, if the site is allocated, it is important that requirement to preserve the listed buildings and their setting should be included in the policy and supporting text of the Plan.

### 7h. Visual Impact

- Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive

**Justification for score:**

- D

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

- No TPO within 15m of the site

**Justification for score:**

- A
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Preferred site

**Date and time of site visit:**

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and should be retained.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land west of Ely Road, Little Downham, CB6 2SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Little Downham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>LTD1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Land west of Ely Road, Little Downham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Currently allocated for 25 dwellings in Local Plan 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 36 b) Recommended 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Criteria

#### 1a. Settlement Hierarchy

| Large Village |

#### 1b. Site Availability

| Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22) |

#### 1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

This site lies within the Mineral Safeguarding Area for Sand and Gravel, designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Core Strategy and shown on Proposals Map C (2011). The overarching policy is CS26 Mineral Safeguarding Areas which sets out criteria which must be met in order for development to be permitted. However, in this instance the proposed site is in close proximity to existing development and the mineral resource is an isolated area. It is unlikely to be an economic resource therefore no objections would be raised in this context to this site being allocated.

#### 1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

| CS26 |

#### 1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

|                                |

#### 2a. Flood zone

| >50% of site area in Zone 1 |

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

| Flood Zone 1: 100.00% | Flood Zone 2: 0.00% | Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% | Flood Zone 3b: 0.00% |

#### 2b. Surface Water flood risk

| Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA |

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):**
### Site Information

- **Site Ref:** Site/16/01
- **Site Name:** Land west of Ely Road, Little Downham
- **Parish:** Little Downham CP
- **Current Status:** Site Allocation LTD.H1

### Site Suitability

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- **Site does not intersect Inner Zone**

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- **2.01km - 5km from the site**

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

#### Minor Criteria

##### 5. Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- **Site within 50m of contaminated land**

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
- Former Road haulage depot on E boundary

#### 5b. Local road impact
- Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- Access off Cannon Street
- As per 16/01
  - Difficult to determine if they can provide suitable access / width and splays to development and therefore if the estate roads and access will be suitable for adoption
  - Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry
  - This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

#### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Spare capacity in every year

#### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- The College could be expanded from 1200 pupils 11-16 to 1500 pupils 11-16 on its present site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,200 new houses in the catchment area.

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

### Environmental Impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 501m – 1km of site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers
Site Name: Land west of Ely Road, Little Downham

7d. Agricultural land classification
All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

7e. Public Rights of Way
C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PROW within the site boundary

7f.(i) PROW comments
Sites 1 and 2 are next to each other. Provide links across both sites to connect Cannon Street to Ely Road.

7f.(i) Conservation Area
CA within 500m of site

7f.(ii) Listed building
LB within 500m of site

7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
SAM more than 2km from site

7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
Already allocated - same issues as before

7h. Visual Impact

Justification for score:

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
No TPO within 15m of the site

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site? Yes

Form E - Parish Council site ranking: First

Form G - Parish Council’s view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Concerns raised regarding location of access. Access to Canon Street would cause unacceptable traffic congestion at busy times and be a safety concern for pedestrians.
- Access should be onto Ely Road, preferably via a mini-roundabout.
- Site is adjacent to the conservation area. Development of the site will need to conserve, and where opportunities arise, enhance the conservation area and its setting. This requirement should be included within the policy and supporting text.
- There is a quintessential view of Ely Cathedral to the south of the site. The impact of development on this view should be considered, and the Council should demonstrate that any impacts on the historic environment would be acceptable.
- Surface water receiving system has no residual capacity. Appropriate surface water accommodation should be provided prior to development.
- Site promoter welcomes the proposed allocation. However, suggests indicative dwelling figure should increase from 25 to 35 dwellings, to make efficient use of land.
- Policy requirements are too prescriptive and should be removed.
- It is unnecessary to specify in the policy minimum open space requirement as this will be calculated on no. and size of dwellings proposed.
- Need to minimise visual impact on Ely Road is accounted for by other policies in the plan and will be addressed at the planning application stage.
- Site remains deliverable and available. Expressions of interest received from developers are currently being explored.
- Site area should be increased to include land to the south east – see Site/16/02.
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Parish: Little Downham CP
Site Ref: Site/16/02

Site Name: Land off Ely Road, (GA Hobbs & Sons Depot) Little Downham

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected
Date and time of site visit: 09.45 21 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is rejected on the basis that it would result in the loss of existing employment land; would result in the loss of views of the countryside; and, suitable access may be difficult to achieve. The site may have some merit, where brought forward as a comprehensive scheme with adjacent existing allocation.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B) ID: 72
Site Address: GA Hobbs & Sons (Farms) Ltd Depot, Ely Road, Little Downham, CB6 2SL
Settlement: Little Downham
LP15 Allocation Ref: 72
Planning Perm. Ref: 72
Site Description: Depot site, Ely Road, Little Downham
Brown/Greenfield: Mixed
Known Constraints: Adjacent to current LP2015 allocation LTD1
Current Use: Employment Proposed Use: Mixed use
Current Use info: Employment and agricultural land
Proposed Use info: Housing and employment
Site Area Net (ha): 1.57 Site Area Gross (ha): 1.85
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 34  b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Large Village
1b. Site Availability Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

This site lies partly within the Mineral Safeguarding Area for Sand and Gravel, designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Core Strategy and shown on Proposals Map C (2011). The overarching policy is CS26 Mineral Safeguarding Areas which sets out criteria which must be met in order for development to be permitted. However, in this instance the proposed site is in close proximity to existing development and the mineral resource is an isolated area. It is unlikely to be an economic resource therefore no objections would be raised in this context to this site being allocated.

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies CS26
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone >50% of site area in Zone 1
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00% Flood Zone 2: 0.00% Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW): -
### Minor Criteria

**3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation**
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

**4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites**
- 2.01km - 5km from the site

**4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment**

**Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):** No

**Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):** No

**5. Site Suitability**

**5a. Proximity to contaminated land**
- Site located on contaminated land

**5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment**
- Former road haulage depot on site

**5b. Local road impact**
- Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

**5c. Strategic Road Network impact**

**5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**

**Access off Ely Road**
- Difficult to determine if they can provide suitable access / width and splays to development and therefore if the estate roads and access will be suitable for adoption
- Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

**6. Access to services**

**6a. Proximity to public transport**
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

**6b. Proximity to medical services**
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

**6c. Proximity to shops**
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

**6d. Proximity to Primary School**
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

**6e. Proximity to Secondary School**
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

**6f.(i) Available primary school capacity**
- No spare places but room for expansion

**6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity**
- Spare capacity in every year

**6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**
- It would be possible to add a further 150 places. Using the Council's standard multiplier this equates to around 400 new homes in the catchment area.

**6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**
- The College could be expanded from 1200 pupils 11-16 to 1500 pupils 11-16 on its present site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,200 new houses in the catchment area.

**6h. Proximity to employment sites**
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

**7. Environmental impact**

**7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**
- CWS within 501m – 1km of site

**7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**

**7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers**
### Site Name: Land off Ely Road, (GA Hobbs & Sons Depot) Little Downham

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Parish:** Little Downham CP

**Site Ref:** Site/16/02

| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower | D |
| 7e. Public Rights of Way | C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary | C |

#### 7e. PROW comments
Sites 1 and 2 are next to each other. Provide links across both sites to connect Cannon Street to Ely Road.

| 7f.(i) Conservation Area | CA within 500m of site | D |
| 7f.(ii). Listed building | LB within 500m of site | D |
| 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument | SAM more than 2km from site | A |
| 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset | | |

#### 7f. Heritage / archaeology comments
Conservation area to the northwest - no heritage impact

| 7g. Visual impact | Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views – visually intrusive | D |

#### Justification for score:
Existing low density development along Ely Road. Therefore new development may feel visually intrusive.

| Additional criterion 7f. TPOs | No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

### Parish Council support and rank

| Does Parish Council support this site? | Yes |
| Form E - Parish Council site ranking: | Second |
| Form G - Parish Council's view: | |

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Site promoter objects to rejection of site.
- Site promoter supports LTD.H1, and suggests draft allocation is extended to include Site/16/02.
- Development of site would increase the supply of housing, and improve the visual character and amenity of the area through removal of existing agricultural buildings and associated heavy vehicle movements.
- Site is currently in agricultural use; therefore development of site would not result in the loss of employment.
- Site could provide vehicular access to Ely Road.
- Site supported by Parish Council.
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**
Site Name: *Land adjacent to School Lane, Pymoor*

**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Rejected**

Date and time of site visit: 10.25 21 July 2016

Main findings and recommendations:
The site capacity is below the 10 unit threshold. The site is therefore rejected.

**Site Information**

**Site Type:** New site submission (Form B)  **ID:** 73

**Site Address:** Land adjacent to School Lane, Pymoor

**Settlement:** Pymoor

**LP15 Allocation Ref:**  **Planning Perm. Ref:**

**Site Description:** Land adjacent to School Lane, Pymoor

**Brown/Greenfield:** Greenfield

**Known Constraints:** Proposed no. of units below allocation threshold

**Current Use:** Agriculture  **Provisional Use:** Housing

**Current Use info:**

**Proposed Use info:**

**Site Area Net (ha):** 0.45  **Site Area Gross (ha):** 0.53

**Indicative no. of dwellings:**

- a) Submitted / estimated 5
- b) Recommended 0

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy: Small Village

1b. Site Availability: Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone: >50% of site area in Zone 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone 1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3a</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3b</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk: Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percent (%) of site area risk (uFMISW)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Year</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 Year</td>
<td>2.82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</th>
<th>Site located more than 250m from contaminated land</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>No objections with Moderate mitigation measures</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>Preffered access off School Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6a. Proximity to public transport</th>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>No spare places but room for expansion</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>Spare capacity in every year</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>It would be possible to add a further 150 places. Using the Council’s standard multiplier this equates to around 400 new homes in the catchment area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>The College could be expanded from 1200 pupils 11-16 to 1500 pupils 11-16 on its present site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,200 new houses in the catchment area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</th>
<th>CWS within 501m – 1km of site</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>E – No PRoW connection opportunities</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land adjacent to School Lane, Pymoor  
**Parish:** Little Downham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/16/03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>CA more than 2km from site</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii) Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

Listed building to the east - No heritage impact

7h. Visual Impact

Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive

**Justification for score:**

Would involve some loss of views, but perhaps not significant. Field does add to the character of the village by providing a break in built form and providing sense of 'openness'.

| Additional criterion 7l. TPOs | No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

**Parish Council support and rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td>Third</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council’s view:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment:

Rejected

Date and time of site visit:
09.25 21 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s):

Main findings and recommendations:

Development of the site would unlikely reflect the built form of the village, as the site is separated from the village by the school and recreation field. Access may be difficult to achieve and would likely change the character of the PROW along the southern boundary of the site. The site is therefore rejected.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  ID: 74
Site Address: Rec Field, Eagles Lane, Little Downham, Cambridgeshire
Settlement: Little Downham
LP15 Allocation Ref: Planning Perm. Ref:
Site Description: Rec Field, Eagles Lane
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: Proposed site is accessed via existing concrete road which adjoins Eagles Lane at the junction with Park Lane
Current Use: Agriculture  Proposed Use: Housing
Current Use info:
Proposed Use info:
Site Area Net (ha): 1.52  Site Area Gross (ha) 2.02
Indicative no. of dwellings:
a) Submitted / estimated 60  b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Large Village
1b. Site Availability Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment
1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMSW):
30 Year: 0.00%  100 Year: 0.00%  1,000 Year: 1.26%
| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No |
| 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation | Site does not intersect Inner Zone |
| 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites | 2.01km - 5km from the site |
| 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment | |

**Minor Criteria**

### 5. Site Suitability

| 5a. Proximity to contaminated land | Site located on contaminated land |
| 5a.(i) Contaminated land profesional assessment | |
| Filled ground/pit on site | |
| 5b. Local road impact | Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations |
| 5c. Strategic Road Network impact | |
| 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment | |

NO highways frontage or Highways access The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Statement based on 60 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area.

### 6. Access to services

| 6a. Proximity to public transport | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) |
| 6b. Proximity to medical services | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) |
| 6c. Proximity to shops | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) |
| 6d. Proximity to Primary School | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) |
| 6e. Proximity to Secondary School | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) |
| 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity | No spare places but room for expansion |
| 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity | Spare capacity in every year |
| 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment | |
| 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment | |

It would be possible to add a further 150 places. Using the Council’s standard multiplier this equates to around 400 new homes in the catchment area.

| 6h. Proximity to employment sites | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) |

### 7. Environmental impact

| 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites | CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site |
| 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment | |
| 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers | |
| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower |
| 7e. Public Rights of Way | B – Opportunities to connect to multiple nearby PRoW within the site boundary |
| 7e.(i) PROW comments | |
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Parish: Little Downham CP
Site Name: Rec Field
Site Ref: Site/16/04

Footpath 21 runs along the western boundary of the site. Footpath 23 runs along the southern edge of the site. Footpath 28 provides a link from the B1411 to the site. Ensure that these links are preserved as they provide good links to the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>CA within 500m of site</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
ECDC: Conservation area to the south & listed buildings to the west - No heritage impact
HE: 16/04: affecting the setting of a conservation area.

7h. Visual Impact
Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive | D |

Justification for score:
Open green feel to site due to adjacent school playing field/recreation field/public footpath - may impact on users of these places.

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

Parish Council support and rank
Does Parish Council support this site? No
Form E - Parish Council site ranking: Fifth or more
Form G - Parish Council’s view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received
Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Rejected**

Date and time of site visit: 10.45 21 July 2016

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is located within flood zone 3a and is therefore rejected.

Site Information

- **Site Type**: New site submission (Form B)
- **Site Address**: Land south-west of Main Street, Pymoor
- **Settlement**: Pymoor
- **LP15 Allocation Ref**: 
- **Planning Perm. Ref**: 
- **Site Description**: Land south-west of Main Street, Pymoor
- **Brown/Greenfield**: Greenfield
- **Current Use info**: Agriculture
- **Proposed Use info**: Housing
- **Site Area Net (ha)**: 0.95
- **Site Area Gross (ha)**: 1.1175
- **Indicative no. of dwellings**: a) Submitted / estimated: 34

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
- Small Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
- >50% of site area in Zone 3a (housing site)

2b. Surface Water flood risk
- Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk
- Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Year</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 Year</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land south-west of Main Street, Pymoor  
**Parish:** Little Downham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/16/05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 501m - 2km from the site

### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

##### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

---

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

##### 5b. Local road impact
- No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

##### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

##### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

Access of Main Street
- Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry
- This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

#### 6. Access to services

##### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

##### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

##### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- It would be possible to add a further 150 places. Using the Council's standard multiplier this equates to around 400 new homes in the catchment area.

##### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Spare capacity in every year

##### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- The College could be expanded from 1200 pupils 11-16 to 1500 pupils 11-16 on its present site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,200 new houses in the catchment area.

##### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 7. Environmental Impact

##### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 500m of site

##### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

##### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

##### 7d. Agricultural land classification
- All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

##### 7e. Public Rights of Way
- E – No PRoW connection opportunities

##### 7e.(i) PROW comments

---
Site Ref: Site/16/05

Parish: Little Downham CP

Site Name: Land south-west of Main Street, Pymoor

Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

Parish Council support and rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td>Fifth or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council’s view:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>CA more than 2km from site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii) Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500.1 – 1000m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

Listed building to the northeast - No heritage impact

7h. Visual Impact

Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive

Justification for score:

Feels 'outside' the village. Wide open, flat farmland on east and west sides of Main Street.

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

No TPO within 15m of the site
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit: 10.05 21 July 2016

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is rejected on the basis that safe highway access may be difficult to achieve, and the site has a poor relationship to the existing built area of the village.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  ID: 77
Site Address: Land south-east of cemetery, Little Downham
Settlement: Little Downham

LP15 Allocation Ref:  Planning Perm. Ref: 

Site Description: Land south-east of cemetery, Little Downham

Brown/Greenfield:

Known Constraints:

Current Use: Agriculture  Proposed Use: Housing

Proposed Use info:

Site Area Net (ha): 2.28  Site Area Gross (ha): 3.0439

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 82  b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  Large Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

This site lies entirely within the Safeguarding Area for the Little Downham Waste Water Treatment Works (Policy W7X) designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012). The overarching policy for this designation is Policy CS31 of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011). This policy places a presumption against allowing development which would be occupied by people; and where new development is proposed an odour assessment report should accompany any planning application. Permission should only be granted when it has been demonstrated that the proposed development would not be adversely affected by the continued operation of the existing waste water treatment works. It is suggested that consideration should be given to these policies prior to allocation in the interests of deliverability.

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations W7X

2a. Flood zone  >50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
**Site Name:** Land south-east of cemetery, Little Downham  

**Parish:** Little Downham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/16/06  

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
<td>Site within 100m of contaminated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td>Sewage works 86m to SE. Former road haulage depot 190m to SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>Access off Cowbridge Hall Drove. Footways and widening of the highways along with other highways improvements maybe required to create suitable site access. Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on 82 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area.

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to services</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>No spare places but room for expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

It would be possible to add a further 150 places. Using the Council’s standard multiplier this equates to around 400 new homes in the catchment area.

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded from 1200 pupils 11-16 to 1500 pupils 11-16 on its present site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,200 new houses in the catchment area.

### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental impact</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td>CWS within 501m – 1km of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land south-east of cemetery, Little Downham  
**Parish:** Little Downham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/16/06  

---

**7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers**

**7d. Agricultural land classification**  
All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower  

**7e. Public Rights of Way**  
C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary  

**7f.(i) PROW comments**  
Provide a link for pedestrians and cyclists from Kiln Close to the north of the site and Cowbridge Hall Drove to the south.

**7f.(i) Conservation Area**  
CA within 500m of site  

**7f.(ii). Listed building**  
LB within 500m of site  

**7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument**  
SAM more than 2km from site  

**7f.(iv) Archaeological asset**

**7g. Heritage / archaeology comments**  
Conservation area to the west - No heritage impact

**7h. Visual Impact**  
Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive  

**Justification for score:**

Rural lane with agricultural fields

**Additional criterion 7i. TPOs**  
TPO tree on site  

---

**Parish Council support and rank**

**Does Parish Council support this site?**  
No

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**  
Fifth or more

**Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

---

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
**Site Ref:** Site/16/07  
**Parish:** Little Downham CP  
**Site Name:** Frithhead  
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

---

### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:** 10.50 21 July 2016

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site capacity is below the 10 unit threshold. The site is therefore rejected.

---

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Main Street, Pymoor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Little Downham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>Frithhead, Main Street, Pymoor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints</td>
<td>Proposed units below allocation threshold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info</td>
<td>Equestrian / paddocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha)</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha)</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 1 b) Recommended 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  
Large Village

1b. Site Availability  
Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c. (i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c. (ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone  
>50% of site area in Zone 3a (housing site)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 1: 0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk  
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year: 0.18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Parish:** Little Downham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/16/07

**Site Name:** Frithhead

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation</td>
<td>Site does not intersect Inner Zone</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites</td>
<td>501m - 2km from the site</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Minor Criteria**

### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
<td>Site located more than 250m from contaminated land</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment | No highways frontage  
This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required. | |

### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>No spare places but room for expansion</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>Spare capacity in every year</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**

It would be possible to add a further 150 places. Using the Council's standard multiplier this equates to around 400 new homes in the catchment area.

**6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**

The College could be expanded from 1200 pupils 11-16 to 1500 pupils 11-16 on its present site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,200 new houses in the catchment area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6h. Proximity to employment sites</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td>CWS within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>E – No PROW connection opportunities</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Site Name:** Frithhead

**Parish:** Little Downham CP

**Site Ref:** Site/16/07

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

---

Byway 36 runs south of the site. It will require a temporary closure during development of the site and any damage caused will need to be repaired.

7f. Conservation Area

- CA more than 2km from site: A

7f. Listed building

- LB within 500m of site: D

7f. Listed Scheduled Ancient Monument

- SAM more than 2km from site: A

7f. Archaeological asset

---

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

Listed building to the north - against grain of development

7h. Visual Impact

| Significant harm to landscape/townscape or key views - severe visual intrusion | E |

Justification for score:

Isolated site.

Additional criterion 7l. TPOs

| No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

---

**Parish Council support and rank**

Does Parish Council support this site? No

Form E - Parish Council site ranking: Fifth or more

Form G - Parish Council’s view:

---

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

---
Site Name: Existing housing allocation, land north-east of 9 Straight Furlong

Parish: Little Downham CP
Site Ref: Site/16/08

Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit: 10:45 10 July 2017

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is wholly in Flood Zone 3 and should be rejected.

**Site Information**

- **Site Type:** Local Plan 2015 allocated site
- **Site Address:** land north-east of 9 Straight Furlong, Pymore
- **Settlement:** Pymoor
- **LP15 Allocation Ref:** PYM1
- **Planning Perm. Ref:**
- **Site Description:** Existing housing allocation, land north-east of 9 Straight Furlong
- **Brown/Greenfield:** Greenfield
- **Current Use:** Agriculture
- **Proposed Use:** Housing
- **Site Area Net (ha):** 0.56
- **Site Area Gross (ha):** 0.8
- **Indicative no. of dwellings:**
  - a) Submitted / estimated: 20
  - b) Recommended: 0

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy: Small Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

2b. Surface Water flood risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone 1:</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 2:</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3a:</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3b:</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW): |
| 30 Year: | 0.00% |
| 100 Year:| 0.00% |
| 1,000 Year:| 2.20% |
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Existing housing allocation, land north-east of 9 Straight Furlong

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation**  
Site does not intersect Inner Zone

**4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites**  
501m - 2km from the site

**4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment**

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land  
Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

#### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport  
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity  
No spare places but room for expansion

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity  
Spare capacity in every year

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

It would be possible to add a further 150 places. Using the Council's standard multiplier this equates to around 400 new homes in the catchment area.

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded from 1200 pupils 11-16 to 1500 pupils 11-16 on its present site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,200 new houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

### 7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites  
CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification  
All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

7e. Public Rights of Way  
E – No PRoW connection opportunities

7e.(i) PROW comments
**Site Name:** Existing housing allocation, land north-east of 9 Straight Furlong

**Parish:** Little Downham CP

**Site Ref:** Site/16/08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already allocated - same issues as before</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification for score:

Development of site would be visually intrusive to open countryside and harm character of the village. Were the site to be developed, it should be frontage only to reflect character of adjacent development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional criterion 7i. TPOs</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No TPO within 15m of the site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council’s view:

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

• No residual capacity in surface water receiving system. Necessary surface water accommodation should be put in place prior to development of the site.
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Land at Mount Pleasant Farm

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit:
10:40 10 July 2017

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is wholly in Flood Zone 3 and should be rejected.

Site Information

Site Type: FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17
Site Address: Mount Pleasant Farm, Main Street, Pymoor, Ely CB6 2DY
Settlement: Pymoor
LP15 Allocation Ref:
Planning Perm. Ref:

Site Description: Agricultural land proposed for housing development.
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints:
**Submission does not indicate number of proposed dwellings. Dwelling figure is therefore
calculated from site area and does not reflect site constraints or characteristics.**
**Net site area estimated**

Current Use: Agriculture
Proposed Use: Housing

Indicative no. of dwellings:
a) Submitted / estimated 273
b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Small Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 3a (housing site)
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 0.00%
Flood Zone 2: 0.00%
Flood Zone 3a: 100.00%
Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
Site Name: Land at Mount Pleasant Farm

**Minor Criteria**

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

5a(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact
No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f(i) Available primary school capacity
No spare places but room for expansion

6f(ii) Available secondary school capacity
No spare places but room for expansion

6g(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
The levels of development can be accommodated at the expanded village primary school - Downham Feoffees

6g(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
The additional sites in Ely and Little Downham add a further 0.75FE (113 places) of secondary age children to the additional numbers previously identified. The opening of a new school in Littleport combined with the potential for further expansion on the Ely College site would provide appropriate mitigation

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
CWS within 500m of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification
All or part of site intersected by ALC1 or lower

7e. Public Rights of Way
A – Opportunities to connect to multiple nearby PRoW within the site boundary – including at least one Bridleway

7f(i) PROW comments
Public Footpath 9 crosses the site from south west to north east. Public Byway Open to All Traffic crosses the site from north west to south east. These routes to be retained within the site. They may require diverting to allow the development to take place. Public Byway Open to All Traffic 36 is situated opposite the site and this should be taken into account in the siting of the Public Rights of Way on the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>CA more than 2km from site</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500.1 – 1000m of site</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

Nothing further to add from previous consultation

7h. Visual Impact

Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive  D

Justification for score:

Development would likely be visually intrusive to countryside. Development of site would likely have a poor relationship to the built form. Development in the village is typically characterised by frontage development.

| Additional criterion 7l. TPOs | No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site? No

Form E - Parish Council site ranking: 

Form G - Parish Council’s view: (c) not add this site to the Local Plan

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Land at Straight Furlong
Parish: Little Downham CP
Site Ref: Site/16/10

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected
Date and time of site visit: 10:56 10 July 2017
Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is wholly in Flood Zone 3 and should be rejected.

Site Information

Site Type: FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17 ID: 412
Site Address: Straight Furlong, Pymoor, Ely
Settlement: Pymoor
LP15 Allocation Ref: Planning Perm. Ref:
Site Description: Agricultural land proposed for housing development.
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: **Submission does not indicate number of proposed dwellings. Dwelling figure is therefore calculated from site area and does not reflect site constraints or characteristics.**
**Net site area estimated**

Current Use: Agriculture Proposed Use: Housing
Current Use info:
Proposed Use info:
Site Area Net (ha): 1.94 Site Area Gross (ha): 2.59
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 70 b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Small Village
1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 0.00% Flood Zone 2: 0.00% Flood Zone 3a: 100.00% Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**  
**Parish:** Little Downham CP  
**Site Name:** Land at Straight Furlong  
**Site Ref:** Site/16/10

### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation

- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites

- Within 500m of site

### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

- [ ]

### 5. Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land

- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

- [ ]

#### 5b. Local road impact

- No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

- [ ]

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

- Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

#### 6. Access to services

##### 6a. Proximity to public transport

- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6b. Proximity to medical services

- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6c. Proximity to shops

- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6d. Proximity to Primary School

- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School

- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

- No spare places but room for expansion

##### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

- The levels of development can be accommodated at the expanded village primary school - Downham Feoffees

##### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

- No spare places but room for expansion

##### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

- The additional sites in Ely and Little Downham add a further 0.75FE (113 places) of secondary age children to the additional numbers previously identified. The opening of a new school in Littleport combined with the potential for further expansion on the Ely College site would provide appropriate mitigation

##### 6h. Proximity to employment sites

- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

- CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

- [ ]

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

- [ ]

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification

- All or part of site intersected by ALC1 or lower

#### 7e. Public Rights of Way

- E – No PROW connection opportunities

#### 7e.(i) PROW comments

- [ ]
**Site Ref:** Site/16/10  
**Parish:** Little Downham CP  
**Site Name:** Land at Straight Furlong  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA more than 2km from site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500.1 – 1000m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

Listed building to the south, likely to have limited impact on the designated heritage asset.

### 7h. Visual Impact

Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive | D

**Justification for score:**

Beyond entrance to village and main built area. Development would likely appear visually intrusive and would not relate well to built form.

**Additional criterion 7i. TPOs**

No TPO within 15m of the site | A

### Parish Council support and rank

**Does Parish Council support this site?**

No

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council's view:**

(c) not add this site to the Local Plan

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**
Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:**
11:00 10 July 2017

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**
The site is wholly in Flood Zone 3 and should be rejected. The site is unlikely to accommodate 10 dwellings and would not be suitable for allocation.

---

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb'17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID:</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Former Memorial Hall, Pymoor, Ely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Pymoor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>Derelict building proposed for housing development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints</td>
<td><strong>Submission does not indicate number of proposed dwellings. Dwelling figure is therefore calculated from site area and does not reflect site constraints or characteristics.</strong> <strong>Net site area estimated</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info</td>
<td>Derelict building, former memorial hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha)</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha)</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Recommended</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a. Settlement Hierarchy</th>
<th>Small Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b. Site Availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Minerals and Waste assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Flood zone</td>
<td>&gt;50% of site area in Zone 3a (housing site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 1:</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 2:</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3a:</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3b:</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Surface Water flood risk</td>
<td>Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Date and time of site visit:** 11:00 10 July 2017

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

---

**Main findings and recommendations:**
The site is wholly in Flood Zone 3 and should be rejected. The site is unlikely to accommodate 10 dwellings and would not be suitable for allocation.
**Site Name:** Former Memorial Hall

**Parish:** Little Downham CP

**Site Ref:** Site/16/11

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- Within 500m of site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

#### 30 Year: 0.00%  
100 Year: 0.00%  
1,000 Year: 0.00%

### 5. Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

#### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- The levels of development can be accommodated at the expanded village primary school - Downham Feoffees

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- The additional sites in Ely and Little Downham add a further 0.75FE (113 places) of secondary age children to the additional numbers previously identified. The opening of a new school in Littleport combined with the potential for further expansion on the Ely College site would provide appropriate mitigation

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- The additional sites in Ely and Little Downham add a further 0.75FE (113 places) of secondary age children to the additional numbers previously identified. The opening of a new school in Littleport combined with the potential for further expansion on the Ely College site would provide appropriate mitigation

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

### 7. Environmental Impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 2.01km – 5km of site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification
- All or part of site intersected by ALC1 or lower

#### 7e. Public Rights of Way
- E – No PRoW connection opportunities

#### 7e.(i) PROW comments

---

**Site Ref:** Site/16/11

**Site Name:** Former Memorial Hall

**Parish:** Little Downham CP

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Former Memorial Hall
Parish: Little Downham CP
Site Ref: Site/16/11

7f.(i) Conservation Area
CA more than 2km from site
A

7f.(ii). Listed building
LB within 1.01km – 2km of site
B

7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
SAM more than 2km from site
A

7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

7h. Visual Impact
Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive
D

Justification for score:
Development of site would likely be visually intrusive to open countryside.

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
No TPO within 15m of the site
A

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site? Yes

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:
(a) add this site to the Local Plan, and keep existing preferred site(s)?

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Preferred site

**Date and time of site visit:** 13:30 29 July 2016

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is located close to village facilities, with few constraints and should therefore be allocated. The site is heavily vegetated, and proposals should seek to retain important trees. During public consultation it was suggested that the boundary of the site includes an area of land owned by the Parish Council and not currently available for development. The site boundary should be reviewed to ensure it accurately reflects the area available for development. To overcome additional concerns raised, specific policy requirements should also ensure no adverse impact on neighbouring land uses, and ensure suitable surface water treatment.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land north of The Wyches, Little Thetford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Little Thetford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Land north of The Wyches, Little Thetford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>TPO covering hedgerow at the rear of the site (a single oak tree).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td>Vacant / scrub land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicative no. of dwellings:**

- a) Submitted / estimated: 15
- b) Recommended: 15

### Major Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a. Settlement Hierarchy</th>
<th>Medium Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b. Site Availability</td>
<td>Available for devl in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Minerals and Waste assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2a. Flood zone**

- >50% of site area in Zone 1

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

- Flood Zone 1: 100.00%
- Flood Zone 2: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

**2b. Surface Water flood risk**

Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
<td>Site located more than 250m from contaminated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td>Adjacent to cemetery. Boundary imprecise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>No objections with minor mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>“Access off The Wyches. Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry “</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>No spare places but room for expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td>CWS within 501m – 1km of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>E – No PRoW connection opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### JD CCLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- The draft site allocation is incorrect – it includes an area of land which is not available for development. Part of the site, on the western boundary, is owned by Little Thetford Parish Council and is intended to provide an extension to the cemetery. The available area is therefore smaller than indicated by the draft site allocation, and dwelling capacity likely to be lower.
- Site may have capacity for more than 15 dwellings – to be determined through a masterplanning exercise.
- No residual capacity for surface water. Necessary surface water accommodation should be put in place prior to development of site.
- Landowner supports allocation. Indicates site is largely free of constraints and has capacity for more than 15 units.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s):

Main findings and recommendations:
The site has extant planning permission and should therefore be allocated to ensure this planning decision is retained.

Site Information

Site Type: Site with extant planning permission
Site Address: Land south of Caravan Park, Two Acres, Ely Road
Settlement: Little Thetford
LP15 Allocation Ref: ID: 346
Site Area Net (ha): Site Area Gross (ha) 1.3
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 10 b) Recommended 10

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Medium Village

1b. Site Availability
Available for devl in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent (% of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening))

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (% of site area at risk (uFMfSW))
30 Year: 0.04% 100 Year: 1.66% 1,000 Year: 4.03%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation</td>
<td>Site does not intersect Inner Zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Minor Criteria**

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport

6b. Proximity to medical services

6c. Proximity to shops

6d. Proximity to Primary School

6e. Proximity to Secondary School

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

6h. Proximity to employment sites

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification

7e. Public Rights of Way

7e.(i) PROW comments
**Site Name:** Land south of Caravan Park, Two Acres

### Heritage / archaeology comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii) Listed building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Visual Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7h. Visual Impact</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justification for score:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parish Council support and rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council's view:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Impact of development on the A10 junction remains a considerable concern.
- No residual capacity for surface water. Necessary surface water accommodation should be put in place prior to development of site.
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Fish & Duck Marina
Parish: Little Thetford CP
Site Ref: Site/17/01

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected
Date and time of site visit: 12:55 29 July 2016

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is very large and could result in a range of issues relating to access, landscape and environmental impacts. Also the need for such a facility is not clear. Such proposals would likely be dealt with on a case by case basis through the planning application process.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  ID: 78
Site Address: Pope's Corner, Holt Fen, Little Thetford, Ely, CB6 3HR
Settlement: Little Thetford
LP15 Allocation Ref: Site Area Net (ha): 22.20
Planning Perm. Ref: Site Area Gross (ha): 37
Site Description: Fish & Duck Marina, Pope's Corner
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: General flood risks on adjacent land, some ecological constraints
Current Use info: Moorings/Marina  Proposed Use info: Moorings/Marina
Current Use: Moorings/Marina  Proposed Use: Moorings/Marina
Proposed Use info: Moorings/marina -further recreational/leisure/tourism development
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated  b) Recommended

Major Criteria

1. Settlement Hierarchy
   Medium Village

2. Site Availability

3. Minerals and Waste assessment

4. Flood zone
   Multiple zones - see SFRA
   *Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):*
   - Flood Zone 1: 45.89%
   - Flood Zone 2: 1.89%
   - Flood Zone 3a: 47.44%
   - Flood Zone 3b: 4.78%

5. Surface Water flood risk
   Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA
   *Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):*
   - 30 Year: 0.94%
   - 100 Year: 0.95%
   - 1,000 Year: 5.66%
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**  
Site Name: *Fish & Duck Marina*  
Parish: **Little Thetford CP**  
Site Ref: Site/17/01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 2.01km - 5km from the site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment
- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): Yes
- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): Yes

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located on contaminated land

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
- Railway traverses site

#### 5b. Local road impact
- No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- Existing access with the highway  
  Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry  
  The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on 222000m² net floor area identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines and demonstrate how the site can be made accessible on foot, by cycle and by public transport together with identifying any remaining off-site highway implications and required mitigation. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area.

#### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- Spare capacity in some years

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Limited capacity

#### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- Only limited expansion possible on present site for a 60 place increase overall. Using our standard multiplier a development of approx 165 homes in the catchment area would yield that number of pupils

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area.

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS located within site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification
- All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower
Site Name: Fish & Duck Marina
Parish: Little Thetford CP
Site Ref: Site/17/01

Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

---

**7e. Public Rights of Way**
C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary

**7f.(i) Conservation Area**
CA within 1.01km – 2km of site

**7f.(ii). Listed building**
LB within 500.1 – 1000m of site

**7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument**
SAM within 500m of site

**7f.(iv) Archaeological asset**

**7g. Heritage / archaeology comments**
SAM to the southwest and north east - Potential to impact wider setting of these

**7h. Visual Impact**
Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views

---

**Parish Council support and rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form G - Parish Council's view:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

---
### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:** 13:50 29 July 2016

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

During public consultation, the site promoter provided additional information, which sought to overcome some specific issues including vehicular access and landscaping. Whilst landscape mitigation could be provided, this would take some time to establish. Currently, the site lacks a defensible boundary; and development is likely to result in adverse visual impact upon the landscape setting - particularly in terms of its relationship to the existing built form. Development could result in harm to the tranquility of the public open space at Holt Fen Road, including the connecting public rights of way/byways, which are predominantly undeveloped in character.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
<th>ID:</th>
<th>80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land south of Popes Lane, Little Thetford, Ely, CB6 3HF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Little Thetford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Land south of Popes Lane, Little Thetford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Development to be brought forward through Community Land Trust. Details subject to further discussion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td>Housing and community uses including a shop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 25</td>
<td>b) Recommended 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy: Medium Village

1b. Site Availability: Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone: >50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

| Flood Zone 1: | 69.12% | Flood Zone 2: | 4.71% | Flood Zone 3a: | 26.18% | Flood Zone 3b: | 0.00% |

2b. Surface Water flood risk: Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA
# Site Name: Land south of Popes Lane, Little Thetford

## Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

## Site Ref: Site/17/03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (% of site area at risk (uFMSW):</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year: 1.28%</td>
<td>100 Year: 2.39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Site Located
- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): Yes
- Site located in area benefiting from defences (Y/N): Yes

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- More than 5km from site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

#### 5. Site Suitability

- **5a. Proximity to contaminated land**
  - Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

- **5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment**

- **5b. Local road impact**
  - Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

- **5c. Strategic Road Network impact**

- **5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**
  - "No shown OR identifiable highways frontage OR access to the highway" Popes and Watsons Lane are unsuitable for this proposed number dwellings and the associated trips that would generated"
  - The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Statement based on 75 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area.

### 6. Access to services

- **6a. Proximity to public transport**
  - Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

- **6b. Proximity to medical services**
  - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

- **6c. Proximity to shops**
  - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

- **6d. Proximity to Primary School**
  - Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

- **6e. Proximity to Secondary School**
  - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

- **6f.(i) Available primary school capacity**
  - No spare places but room for expansion

- **6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity**
  - Limited capacity

- **6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**
  - An additional 105 places could be provided at the school. This would be sufficient to meet the needs of a development of 300 houses in the catchment area using the Council’s standard multipliers

- **6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**
  - The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area.

- **6h. Proximity to employment sites**
  - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

### 7. Environmental Impact

- **7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**
  - CWS within 500m of site

- **7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**

- **7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers**
**Site Name:** Land south of Popes Lane, Little Thetford

**Parish:** Little Thetford CP

**Site Ref:** Site/17/03

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

### Site Assessment Criteria

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification
- All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

#### 7e. Public Rights of Way
- B – Opportunities to connect to multiple nearby PROW within the site boundary

#### 7e.(i) PROW comments
- Byways 13 and 14 run alongside west and east side of the site respectively. Provide a link between these 2 Public Rights of Way within the site boundary.

#### 7f.(i) Conservation Area
- CA more than 2km from site

#### 7f.(ii). Listed building
- LB within 500m of site

#### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
- SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site

#### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

#### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
- Listed buildings to the north - No heritage impact

#### 7h. Visual Impact
- Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive

**Justification for score:**
Likely to be visually intrusive to countryside.

**Additional criterion 7i. TPOs**

| TPO tree within 15m of the site | B |

### Parish Council support and rank

**Does Parish Council support this site?** No

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Site promoter objects to rejection of the site.
- Lt Thetford is a Medium Village with a range of facilities and services and good connectivity with Ely and Cambridge – sustainable location - level of growth should therefore be higher / more allocations should be made.
- Site could accommodate 20 – 30 dwellings, public open space, and a building for community use / local retail.
- Site available now and in single ownership.
- Site adjoins residential development and is adjoined by public byway open to all traffic.
- Concerns raised during site assessment – lack of defensible boundary, adverse visual impact, can be addressed.
- Landowner has access rights from Palisade Court – suitable access can be achieved.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit:
12:10 15 May 2017

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site lacks highways frontage, and safe, suitable vehicular access may be difficult to achieve. The site does not reflect the built form of the village. Development would be visually intrusive to the open countryside, and would result in loss of views of the countryside from the recreation ground and PROW, thereby causing adverse harm to these facilities.

Site Information

| Site Type: | FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17 | ID: 414 |
| Site Address: | The Wyches, Little Thetford, Ely |
| Settlement: | Little Thetford |
| LP15 Allocation Ref: | Planning Perm. Ref: |
| Site Description: | Agricultural land proposed for housing development, east of Caravan Park, east of draft site allocation LTT.H2 and north of draft site allocation LTT.H1. |
| Brown/Greenfield: | Greenfield |
| Known Constraints: | **Submission does not indicate number of proposed dwellings. Dwelling figure is therefore calculated from site area and does not reflect site constraints or characteristics.** **Net site area estimated** |
| Current Use: | Agriculture |
| Current Use info: | |
| Proposed Use info: | |
| Site Area Net (ha): | 1.16 |
| Site Area Gross (ha): | 1.37 |
| Indicative no. of dwellings: | a) Submitted / estimated 42 b) Recommended 0 |

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy | Medium Village | C

1b. Site Availability | Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22) | A

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone | >50% of site area in Zone 1 | A

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

Flood Zone 1: 100.00% | Flood Zone 2: 0.00% | Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% | Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk | Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr)) | A

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
Site Name: Land east of Caravan Park

Parish: Little Thetford CP

Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
   Site does not intersect Inner Zone

4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
   2.01km - 5km from the site

4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment
   Professional assessment

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
   Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

5b. Local road impact
   Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
   Does not appear to have access to highways frontage OR shown access to highway Potential problems to access the highway Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
   Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
   Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops
   Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
   Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
   Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
   No spare places but room for expansion

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
   No spare places but room for expansion

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
   The levels of development can be accommodated at the expanded village primary school - Little Thetford Primary

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
   There is potential to expand Witchford Village College on its current site. However, this latest call for site would result in much higher levels of development within the catchment area of the College if they were all included in the Local Plan. The level of development would generate another 595 secondary aged children or 4 FE. This is in addition to the additional pupils identified from the sites included in the consultation draft local plan. At this level of development suitable mitigation could not be provided at Witchford VC. It would be the Council's intention on adoption of the Local Plan to undertake a strategic review of secondary school provision across the District and the review would include the option of a further new secondary school (and site) in order to provide suitable mitigation

6h. Proximity to employment sites
   Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
   CWS within 501m – 1km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Status:</th>
<th>Rejected - not a site allocation</th>
<th>Parish: Little Thetford CP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Name:</td>
<td>Land east of Caravan Park</td>
<td>Site Ref: Site/17/05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower | C |

| 7e. Public Rights of Way | D – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoWs outside the site boundary | D |

### 7e.(i) PROW comments

Public Footpath 3 lies to the east of the site. Consider creating a safe off road link from the site to this Public Footpath which runs south from the site to the village centre and from the north of the site to the wider Public Rights of Way network.

### 7f.(i) Conservation Area

CA more than 2km from site

### 7f.(ii) Listed building

LB within 500m of site

### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site

### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listed building to the southeast, likely to have limited impact on the designated heritage asset</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7h. Visual Impact

Significant harm to landscape/townscape or key views - severe visual intrusion

#### Justification for score:

The site does not reflect the built form of the village. Development would be visually intrusive to open countryside, and would result in loss of views of countryside from recreation ground and PROW, thereby causing adverse harm to these facilities.

| 7i. TPOs | TPO tree on site | C |

### Parish Council support and rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form G - Parish Council's view:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(c) not add this site to the Local Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site has received planning consent in the past, but does not currently have planning permission. The site has few technical constraints and presents an opportunity to redevelop a brownfield site with good access to Littleport station.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  ID: 81
Site Address: Station Road, Littleport
Settlement: Littleport
LP15 Allocation Ref:  Planning Perm. Ref: 13/01165/OUM
Site Description: Old station goods yard, Station Rd, Littleport
Brown/Greenfield: Brownfield

Known Constraints:
The suitability of the site has been established through the granting of outline planning permission (07/00486) and through a subsequent approved Reserved Matters application. Note that the site does not currently have extant planning permission, decision expected in spring 2017.

Current Use: Other (please specify)  Proposed Use: Housing
Current Use info: Station yard
Proposed Use info:
Site Area Net (ha): 1.49  Site Area Gross (ha): 1.75
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 50  b) Recommended 50

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  Main Settlement  A
1b. Site Availability  Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)  A
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment
1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone  >50% of site area in Zone 1  A
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk  Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yrs))  A
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>&quot;Visibility issues in both directions and potential issues with the feasibility of the adoption of the estate roads and access. Constrained access. Popes and Watsons Lane are unsuitable for this proposed number dwellings and the associated trips that would generated&quot; The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Statement based on 50 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Littleport and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Littleport (approximately 4,200 dwellings) the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Less than 15 min walk (&lt;1,200m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>No spare places but room for expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>Spare capacity in every year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>The College could be expanded from 1200 pupils 11-16 to 1500 pupils 11-16 on its present site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,200 new houses in the catchment area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</th>
<th>CWS within 500m of site</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>E – No PRoW connection opportunities</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500.1 – 1000m of site</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification for score:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional criterion 7i. TPOs**

| No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

### Parish Council support and rank

- **Does Parish Council support this site?** Yes
- **Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**
- **Form G - Parish Council's view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit: 

Supersedes site submission(s): Site/18/18

Main findings and recommendations: The site has extant planning permission and is under construction. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and should be retained.

Site Information

Site Type: Site with extant planning permission

Site Address: Highfield Farm, Ely Road, Littleport, Ely, CB6

Settlement: Littleport

LP15 Allocation Ref: Site Area Net (ha): 21.22

Site Description: Residential development (under construction) at Highfield Farm

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Current Use: Agriculture

Proposed Use: Housing

Proposed Use info:

Site Area Gross (ha): 35.37

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 302, b) Recommended 269

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

Main Settlement: 

1b. Site Availability

Site Area: 

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 Year:</th>
<th>100 Year:</th>
<th>1,000 Year:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.27%</td>
<td>1.73%</td>
<td>7.27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land

5a(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

#### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport

6b. Proximity to medical services

6c. Proximity to shops

6d. Proximity to Primary School

6e. Proximity to Secondary School

6f(i) Available primary school capacity

6f(ii) Available secondary school capacity

6g(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

6g(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

6h. Proximity to employment sites

#### 7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification

7e. Public Rights of Way

7e.(i) PROW comments

Footpath 9 connects to the southern boundary of the site. Provide a network of routes across the site to link to adjacent sites 18/03, 18/09, 18/8 and 18/19
### Current Status: Site Allocation LIT.H2
Site Name: **Residential development (under construction) at Highfield Farm**

**Parish:** Littleport CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/18/17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>CA within 500m of site</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

n/a

#### 7h. Visual Impact

Justification for score:

| 7i. TPOs | TPO tree on site | C |

### Parish Council support and rank

- **Does Parish Council support this site?**

- **Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

- **Form G - Parish Council's view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site has extant planning permission. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and should be retained.

Site Information

Site Type: Site with extant planning permission
Site Address: Harvest Way, Littleport
Settlement: Littleport
LP15 Allocation Ref:
Planning Perm. Ref: 15/00761/FUM
Site Description: Harvest Way, Littleport
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints:
Current Use: Agriculture
Proposed Use: Housing
Current Use info:
Proposed Use info:
Site Area Net (ha): 1.16
Site Area Gross (ha): 1.36
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 60 b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00% Flood Zone 2: 0.00% Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):
30 Year: 4.75% 100 Year: 3.59% 1,000 Year: 30.02%
### Minor Criteria

**5. Site Suitability**

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land profesional assessment

#### 5b. Local road impact

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

---

### Access to services

**6a. Proximity to public transport**

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

**6b. Proximity to medical services**

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

**6c. Proximity to shops**

Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

**6d. Proximity to Primary School**

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

**6e. Proximity to Secondary School**

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

**6f.(i) Available primary school capacity**

No spare places but room for expansion

**6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity**

Spare capacity in every year

---

### Environmental impact

**7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**

CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

**7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**

---

### Access to services

**7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers**

All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

**7d. Agricultural land classification**

C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PROW within the site boundary

**7e. Public Rights of Way**

---

**7f.(i) PROW comments**

---
Provide a network of routes across the site to link to adjacent sites 18/03, 18/09, 18/8 and 18/19

| 7f.(i) Conservation Area | CA within 500m of site | D |
| 7f.(ii) Listed building | LB within 500m of site | D |
| 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument | SAM more than 2km from site | A |
| 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset | | |

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
n/a

7h. Visual Impact

Justification for score:

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council’s view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**

- Preferred site

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site has extant planning permission. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and should be retained.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>Site with extant planning permission</th>
<th>ID:</th>
<th>256</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land to North East of 5 Back Lane, Littleport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Littleport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Land To North East Of 5 Back Lane, Littleport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>0.5834</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 16, b) Recommended 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Criteria

1. **Settlement Hierarchy**
   - Main Settlement

2. **Site Availability**

3. **Minerals and Waste assessment**

4. **Flood zone**
   - >50% of site area in Zone 1

#### Flood Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone 1</td>
<td>51.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 2</td>
<td>12.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3a</td>
<td>36.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3b</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Surface Water flood risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Year</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 Year</td>
<td>2.38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Current Status:** Site Allocation LIT.H3  
**Site Name:** Land to North East of 5 Back Lane, Littleport  
**Parish:** Littleport CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/18/20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- More than 5km from site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

### 5. Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

#### 5b. Local road impact

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Spare capacity in every year

#### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

- The school currently operates above capacity and has two mobile classrooms on site. By September 2017 both of these mobile classrooms will be occupied. The site is large and will allow significant expansion of another 420 places. However, the Council’s established strategy at present is to build a new primary school on the education campus being created off Camel Rd in response to proposed housing development.

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 500m of site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification
- All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

#### 7e. Public Rights of Way
- E – No PRoW connection opportunities

#### 7e.(i) PROW comments

Current Status: Site Allocation LIT.H3
Site Name: Land to North East of 5 Back Lane, Littleport
Parish: Littleport CP
Site Ref: Site/18/20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>CA within 500m of site</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii) Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

n/a

7h. Visual Impact

Justification for score:

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

No TPO within 15m of the site

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council’s view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Main findings and recommendations:
The site has a resolution to grant planning permission. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and should be retained through allocation of the site.

Site Information

Site Type: Site with extant planning permission
Site Address: Field West Of 1B Upton Lane, Littleport
Settlement: Littleport
LP15 Allocation Ref: Site Allocation LIT.H4
Planning Perm. Ref: 15/01012/OUM
Site Description: Field West Of 1B Upton Lane, Littleport
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Current Use: Open space/outdoor recreation
Proposed Use: Housing
Indicative no. of dwellings: 63

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
30 Year: 0.00%  100 Year: 0.00%  1,000 Year: 1.44%
Current Status: Site Allocation LIT.H4  
Parish: Littleport CP  
Site Name: Field West Of 1B Upton Lane, Littleport  
Site Ref: Site/18/19

| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No |

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land

*5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5b. Local road impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6c. Proximity to shops

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School

Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

Limited capacity

*6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment*

Places in year groups higher up the school. The school has recently been extended to 2FE or 420 places to meet demand. There is no further expansion potential on this site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment*

The College could be expanded from 1200 pupils 11-16 to 1500 pupils 11-16 on its present site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,200 new houses in the catchment area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6h. Proximity to employment sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7d. Agricultural land classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7e. Public Rights of Way</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PROW within the site boundary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7e.(i) PROW comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Provide a network of routes across the site to link to adjacent sites 18/03, 18/09, 18/8 and 18/19
| 7f.(i) Conservation Area | CA within 500m of site | D |
| 7f.(ii). Listed building | LB within 500m of site | D |
| 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument | SAM more than 2km from site | A |
| 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset | | |

| 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments | n/a |
| 7h. Visual Impact | |

Justification for score:

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs | TPO tree on site | C |

**Parish Council support and rank**

Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit: 12:40 21 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s):

Main findings and recommendations:

The site includes an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation and adjoining land. The site provides a logical extension of the adjacent development site, with clearly defined boundaries, which should therefore be allocated for housing development. Provision of on-site community facilities will be required to support the development.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  ID: 92

Site Address: Land north of Grange Lane and east of the A10 in Littleport

Settlement: Littleport

LP15 Allocation Ref: LIT2  Planning Perm. Ref: 

Site Description: Land north of The Grange and east of the A10 in Littleport, including allocation LIT2

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints: Part of site covered by allocation Ref: LIT2 for 300 dwellings.

Current Use: Agriculture  Proposed Use: Housing

Current Use info:

Proposed Use info: Housing, with open space and attenuation ponds.

Site Area Net (ha): 17.44  Site Area Gross (ha): 29.07

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 300  b) Recommended 600

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability  Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone  >50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk  Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 Year</th>
<th>100 Year</th>
<th>1,000 Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td>6.06%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land  
Site within 250m of contaminated land

5b. Local road impact  
No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on 300 dwellings identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines and demonstrate how the site can be made accessible on foot, by cycle and by public transport together with identifying any remaining off-site highway implications and required mitigation. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Littleport (approximately 4,200 dwellings) the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport  
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services  
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6c. Proximity to shops  
Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School  
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity  
Limited capacity

6g.(ii) Available secondary school capacity  
Spare capacity in every year

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded from 1200 pupils 11-16 to 1500 pupils 11-16 on its present site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,200 new houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites  
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites  
CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers
### Parish Council support and rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Form E - Parish Council site ranking: | |
| Form G - Parish Council's view: | |

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Outline planning application currently being prepared for residential use with neighbourhood centre, including convenience store.
- Address should be changed from ‘The Grange’ to ‘Grange Lane’.
- Site can provide approximately 660 dwellings (of which 300 already allocated).
- Proposed scheme to provide residential development including assisted living/sheltered accommodation, self-build, bungalows/single storey dwellings and live work/dwelling with annex units, and also public open space, landscaping, community facilities inc. meeting spaces, retail and small business units, etc.
- Request removal of requirement to work jointly with promoter of LIT.M3 – aspiration unlikely to be realised as LIT.M2 already working up planning application.
- Request removal of requirement for employment development, in light of pre-application advice received.
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

- **Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Preferred site

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and should be retained.

### Site Information

- **Site Type:** New site submission (Form B)
- **Site Address:** Land west of Woodfen Road
- **Settlement:** Littleport
- **LP15 Allocation Ref:** LIT1
- **Planning Perm. Ref:** 15/01296/ESO
- **Site Description:** Existing housing/employment allocation, west of Woodfen Road - LIT 1
- **Brown/Greenfield:** Greenfield
- **Known Constraints:** Vehicular access to Woodfen Rd is a known constraint. Alternative primary access point (e.g. Wisbech Rd or A10) is required.
- **Current Use:** Agriculture
- **Proposed Use:** Housing
- **Site Area Net (ha):** 10.20
- **Site Area Gross (ha):** 17
- **Indicative no. of dwellings:** a) Submitted / estimated 400
  b) Recommended 250

### Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

- **Main Settlement:**

1b. Site Availability

- **Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22):**

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

- **Site affected by M+W Policies:**

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Allocations

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Policies

2a. Flood zone

- **>50% of site area in Zone 1:**

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

- **Flood Zone 1:** 93.87%
- **Flood Zone 2:** 2.03%
- **Flood Zone 3a:** 4.11%
- **Flood Zone 3b:** 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk

- **Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA:**

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):**

- **30 Year:** 0.93%
- **100 Year:** 5.54%
- **1,000 Year:** 21.20%
Current Status: Site Allocation LIT.M1
Parish: Littleport CP
Site Name: Housing/employment allocation, west of Woodfen Road
Site Ref: Site/18/10

Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): Yes
Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): Yes

3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
   Site does not intersect Inner Zone

4a. Proximity to internationally /
    nationally important wildlife sites
   2.01km - 5km from the site

4b. European and nationally important
    wildlife sites - professional assessment

Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact
   Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in
   accordance with CIL regulations

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
   "Vast mitigation and third party land purchases would be required. Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they
   can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry "

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on 400
   dwellings identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines and demonstrate how the site can be made accessible on foot, by cycle
   and by public transport together with identifying any remaining off-site highway implications and required mitigation. The site will
   also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local
   area. CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Littleport (approximately 4,200 dwellings) the
   cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers
   will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant
   cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
   Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
   Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6c. Proximity to shops
   Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
   Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
   Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
   No spare places but room for expansion

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
   Spare capacity in every year

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

The school currently operates above capacity and has two mobile classrooms on site. By September 2017 both of these mobile
   classrooms will be occupied. The site is large and will allow significant expansion of another 420 places. However, the Council’s
   established strategy at present is to build a new primary school on the education campus being created off Camel Rd in response
   to proposed housing development.

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded from 1200 pupils 11-16 to 1500 pupils 11-16 on its present site. Using standard child yield
   multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,200 new houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites
   Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
   CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site
Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site? Yes

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council’s view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Policy Littleport4 should include a requirement for proposals to contribute to the preparation and implementation of an integrated green infrastructure and biodiversity. The strategy should be agreed by relevant parties.
- Suggested that site has access constraints, requiring a revised policy approach.
- Site promoter indicates that the policy fails to recognise the public objection to an unfettered vehicular access onto Woodfen Road – these objections can only be addressed through provision of a new roundabout onto the A10.
- As a consequence of a need for a roundabout and affordable housing, the scheme is not viable.
- Supports employment allocation to west of A10 to assist delivery of roundabout.
- Policy wording should be amended to produce a residential-led mixed-use scheme, akin to policies for sites LIT.M2 and LIT.M3.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment:

Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s)  Site/18/03; Site/18/08

Main findings and recommendations:

The site is accessible with few constraints, suitable for major development where delivered as a coherent, masterplanned scheme. Due to the scale of development, the site would require the provision of community facilities (such as a school and open spaces) and other supporting uses such as retail and employment, and should therefore be allocated for mixed-use development. Landscaping will be required to protect the isle-landscape character, and the form and layout of the development should seek to retain distant views of Ely Cathedral.

Site Information

Site Type: Strategic Planning Amended Submission  ID: 363

Site Address: 

Settlement: Littleport

LP15 Allocation Ref: 

Planning Perm. Ref: 

Site Description: 

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints: 

Current Use: Agriculture  Proposed Use: Mixed use

Current Use info: 

Proposed Use info: 

Site Area Net (ha): 39.54  Site Area Gross (ha) 65.9

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 1200  b) Recommended 1200

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone  >50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk  Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

30 Year: 0.60%  100 Year: 0.76%  1,000 Year: 5.24%
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to services</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6h. Proximity to employment sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental impact</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Policy Littleport6 should include a requirement for proposals to contribute to the preparation and implementation of an integrated green infrastructure and biodiversity. The strategy should be agreed by relevant parties.
- Support for inclusion of Country Park (where incorporated into GI and Biodiversity strategy). However 20-25% of the development site is insufficient for delivery of a multi-functional high quality area of informal open space. Area should be increased to 40%, in line with ANGST standards.
- Small part of site lies within Waste Consultation Area. Policy Littleport6 / supporting text should make it clear that development should not prejudice the waste depot – albeit unlikely in this instance.
- Site should provide high quality natural green space, in addition to formal open space.
- Policy Littleport6 requirement for primary school welcomed by Cambs County Council, as additional provision needed to meet growth needs.

- Site promoter indicates landowners support allocation, who are proactively collaborating. Site promoter requests clarity on a number of matters relating to policy Littleport6, namely: scale and nature of employment development and retail provision; how community facilities and social infrastructure should be provided on site and other land allocations in locality; Highways Authority’s views on connectivity and vehicular access; open space requirements and how 20-25% proportion has been defined.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit: 14.10 21 July 2016

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is accessible with few constraints, suitable for major development where progressed jointly with adjacent site (Site/18/08) and delivered as a coherent, masterplanned scheme. Due to the scale of development, the site would require the provision of community facilities (such as a school and open spaces) and other supporting uses such as retail and employment, and should therefore be allocated for mixed-use development. Landscaping will be required to protect the isle-landscape character, and the form and layout of the development should seek to retain views of Ely Cathedral.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
<th>ID: 83</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land to the south of Grange Lane, Littleport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Littleport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Agricultural land to the south of Grange Lane, Littleport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Good access on to Grange Lane and the A10 - close to new development and no known constraints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>15.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Recommended 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

1. Settlement Hierarchy
   - Main Settlement

1. Site Availability
   - Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2. Flood zone
   - >50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

- Flood Zone 1: 100.00%
- Flood Zone 2: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
   - Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA
Current Status: Superseded by LIT.M2
Site Name: *Land to the south of Grange Lane, Littleport*
Parish: *Littleport CP*
Site Ref: *Site/18/03*

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

**5a. Proximity to contaminated land**
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

**5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment**

**5b. Local road impact**
- No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations

**5c. Strategic Road Network impact**

**5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**

*Would require highways improvements and mitigations e.g. Footways, cycleways, etc. The speed limit would also most likely need re-locating therefore a Grampian Condition would be needed as the highways authority can not predict the outcome of a public consultation. NO access to the A10 would be permitted - Principal Transport Route. Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.*

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on 600 dwellings identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines and demonstrate how the site can be made accessible on foot, by cycle and by public transport together with identifying any remaining off-site highway implications and required mitigation. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Littleport (approximately 4,200 dwellings) the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.

#### 6. Access to services

**6a. Proximity to public transport**
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

**6b. Proximity to medical services**
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

**6c. Proximity to shops**
- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

**6d. Proximity to Primary School**
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

**6e. Proximity to Secondary School**
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

**6f.(i) Available primary school capacity**
- Limited capacity

**6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity**
- Spare capacity in every year

**6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**

Places in year groups higher up the school. The school has recently been extended to 2FE or 420 places to meet demand. There is no further expansion potential on this site.

**6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**

The College could be expanded from 1200 pupils 11-16 to 1500 pupils 11-16 on its present site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,200 new houses in the catchment area.

**6h. Proximity to employment sites**
- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)
### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</th>
<th>CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500.1 – 1000m of site</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Listed buildings and conservation area to northeast - No heritage impact

| 7h. Visual Impact | Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive | D |
| Justification for score: | | |

Potential impact on views of Ely Cathedral.

| Additional criterion 7i. TPOs | No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

### Parish Council support and rank

| Does Parish Council support this site? | Yes |
| Form E - Parish Council site ranking: | |
| Form G - Parish Council's view: | |

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

---

**Site Name:** Land to the south of Grange Lane, Littleport

**Current Status:** Superseded by LIT.M2

**Parish:** Littleport CP

**Site Ref:** Site/18/03

---
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit: 14:00 21 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is accessible with few constraints, suitable for major development where progressed jointly with adjacent site (Site/18/03) and delivered as a coherent, masterplanned scheme. Due to the scale of development, the site would require the provision of community facilities (such as a school and open spaces) and other supporting uses such as retail and employment, and should therefore be allocated for mixed-use development. Landscaping will be required to protect the isle-landscape character, and the form and layout of the development should seek to retain views of Ely Cathedral.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  
ID: 88
Site Address: Land west of Ely Road and south of Grange Lane, Littleport
Settlement: Littleport
LP15 Allocation Ref:  
Planning Perm. Ref: 
Site Description: Land west of Ely Road and south of Grange Lane, Littleport
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: 
Current Use: Agriculture  
Proposed Use: Mixed use
Current Use info: 
Proposed Use info: 
Site Area Net (ha): 19.50  
Site Area Gross (ha): 32.5
Indicative no. of dwellings: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Submitted / estimated</th>
<th>b) Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>840</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability

Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW): 

Date and time of site visit: 14:00 21 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site within 100m of contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
- Former clay, brick & tile works 63m to east

5b. Local road impact
- No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

"Access off Grange Road And/Or Ely Road only
Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry."

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on 840 dwellings identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines and demonstrate how the site can be made accessible on foot, by cycle and by public transport together with identifying any remaining off-site highway implications and required mitigation. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Littleport (approximately 4,200 dwellings) the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- Limited capacity

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Spare capacity in every year

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

Places in year groups higher up the school. The school has recently been extended to 2FE or 420 places to meet demand. There is no further expansion potential on this site.

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded from 1200 pupils 11-16 to 1500 pupils 11-16 on its present site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,200 new houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 501m – 1km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**
- **Preferred site**

**Date and time of site visit:**
- [Details not provided]

**Supersedes site submission(s)**
- Site/18/06; Site/18/09; Site/18/16

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site includes an existing business park, a Local Plan 2015 employment allocation, and adjacent land suitable and available for employment development. The site currently provides the main focus for employment development in Littleport, which should be maintained and enhanced. Development of the site should deliver improved vehicular access and should have particular regard to the findings of the SFRA (level 2).

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>Existing business park</th>
<th>ID: 361</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land at Wisbech Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Littleport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Existing business park and adjoining sites. Supersedes site submissions: Site/18/06, Site/18/09, Site/18/16.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Proposed Use: Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td>Includes existing employment land and adjoining agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>19.80</td>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha): 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated</td>
<td>b) Recommended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a. Settlement Hierarchy</th>
<th>Main Settlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b. Site Availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Minerals and Waste assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2a. Flood zone</th>
<th>&gt;50% of site area in Zone 3a (employment sites)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 1:</td>
<td>41.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Surface Water flood risk</td>
<td>Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Year:</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

#### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport

6b. Proximity to medical services

6c. Proximity to shops

6d. Proximity to Primary School

6e. Proximity to Secondary School

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

6h. Proximity to employment sites

#### 7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification

7e. Public Rights of Way

7f.(i) Conservation Area

7e.(i) PROW comments
**Current Status:** Site Allocation LIT.E1  
**Parish:** Littleport CP  
**Site Name:** Land at Wisbech Road  
**Site Ref:** Site/18/21

---

| 7f.(i) Conservation Area |  
| 7f.(ii). Listed building |  
| 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument |  
| 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset |  

**7g. Heritage / archaeology comments**

**7h. Visual Impact**

**Justification for score:**

---

**Additional criterion 7i. TPOs**

---

### Parish Council support and rank

**Does Parish Council support this site?**

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

---

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

**Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:**

- Site lies partly in Waste Consultation Area. The waste management facility has ceased to operate; however the principle of the use is established and any development proposed should be compatible. Situation should be made clear in policy.
- Site is described as 33ha – implies this amount of land is available, but the site includes a number of existing developed sites and operational businesses. Figure should be revised / explanatory note provided.
- Site name is unhelpful / inaccurate as much of the site is located south of Wisbech Road.
- Site includes one large detached dwelling. Not clear if it is intended to change the use from residential to employment.
- Not clear how extended site will be accessed. Black Bank Road will require improvements to serve HGVs.
- Shape of southern part of site is of limited width – new access roads may make parts of this land undevelopable.
Current Status: Superseded by LIT.E1
Site Name: FP McCann Phase 2
Parish: Littleport CP
Site Ref: Site/18/06

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site includes an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation and adjoining land. The site is located within an existing business park. To enable continued employment development, allocation of the site should be considered in the wider context of the adjacent business park.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land off Wisbech Road, Littleport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Littleport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>LIT4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Land off Wisbech Road, Littleport, including site LIT4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>FP McCann owns the existing allocation and now seeks additional land that is under option from three adjacent landowners to facilitate a new factory and operations. FP McCann has submitted a preapplication enquiry for an additional factory and associated storage. Full planning application will be submitted in due course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>6.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>10.0103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability

Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

This site lies partly within the Waste Consultation Area for the waste management site Murfitts, Wisbech Road, Littleport (Policy W8AN), designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012). The overarching policy for this designation is Policy CS30 of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011). This policy seeks to safeguard waste management facilities which make a significant contribution to managing Cambridgeshire's waste; and the policy states that development will only be permitted where it is demonstrated that this will not prejudice existing or future planned waste management operations. However, in this instance the facility which was present when the designation was made has since ceased. Nonetheless the principle of its use for waste management purposes is established, and therefore some consideration to this should be given to these policies if it is proposed to take this site forward for allocation.

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations | W8AN |
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</strong></td>
<td>Site located more than 250m from contaminated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5a.(i) Contaminated land profesional assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5b. Local road impact</strong></td>
<td>No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Junction access upgrade would be required. Mitigations and highways improvements for pedestrian access would be required.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on 60000m² net area identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines and demonstrate how the site can be made accessible on foot, by cycle and by public transport together with identifying any remaining off-site highway implications and required mitigation. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6a. Proximity to public transport</strong></td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6b. Proximity to medical services</strong></td>
<td>Less than 20 min walk (&lt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6c. Proximity to shops</strong></td>
<td>Less than 20 min walk (&lt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6d. Proximity to Primary School</strong></td>
<td>Less than 15 min walk (&lt;1,200m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</strong></td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</strong></td>
<td>No spare places but room for expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</strong></td>
<td>Spare capacity in every year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school currently operates above capacity and has two mobile classrooms on site. By September 2017 both of these mobile classrooms will be occupied. The site is large and will allow significant expansion of another 420 places. However, the Council’s established strategy at present is to build a new primary school on the education campus being created off Camel Rd in response to proposed housing development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College could be expanded from 1200 pupils 11-16 to 1500 pupils 11-16 on its present site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,200 new houses in the catchment area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Table</td>
<td>Seventh Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6h. Proximity to employment sites</strong></td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</strong></td>
<td>CWS within 2.01km – 5km of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7d. Agricultural land classification</strong></td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7e. Public Rights of Way</strong></td>
<td>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7f. (i) PROW comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7f. (ii). Listed building</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7f. (iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7f. (iv) Archaeological asset</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</strong></td>
<td>Already allocated - same issues as before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7h. Visual impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Justification for score:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional criterion 7i. TPOs</strong></td>
<td>No TPO within 15m of the site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

| Does Parish Council support this site? | Yes |
| Form E - Parish Council site ranking: | |

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit: 14:20 21 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is located adjacent to an existing business park, which is mostly built out. The site should be allocated to enable the expansion of the business park. A landscape buffer will be required along the southern boundary to reduce visual impact on the countryside. Access to the site should be via the existing business park, with no direct access to the A10.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  ID: 89
Site Address: Land to west of A10, Littleport
Settlement: Littleport
LP15 Allocation Ref:
Planning Perm. Ref:
Site Description: Land to west of A10, Littleport
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: Part of site located in Flood Zone 3 (defended)
Current Use: Agriculture  Proposed Use: Employment
Current Use info:
Proposed Use info:
Site Area Net (ha): 3.00  Site Area Gross (ha): 4
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated  b) Recommended

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  Main Settlement
1b. Site Availability
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment
1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone  >50% of site area in Zone 3a (employment sites)

Percent (% of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

Flood Zone 1: 24.34%  Flood Zone 2: 2.86%  Flood Zone 3a: 72.79%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

30 Year: 0.35%  100 Year: 0.44%  1,000 Year: 2.10%

2b. Surface Water flood risk  Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Date and time of site visit: 14:20 21 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)
**Site Name:** Land to west of A10, Littleport

**Parish:** Littleport CP

**Site Ref:** Site/18/09

**Current Status:** Superseded by LIT.E1

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- N/a - employment site

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 2.01km - 5km from the site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

#### Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):
- Yes

#### Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):
- Yes

#### 5. Site Suitability

##### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

##### 5a.(i) Contaminated land profesional assessment

##### 5b. Local road impact
- Insurmountable safety issues that cannot be secured in accordance with CIL regulations

##### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

##### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

"NO highways frontage. NO access on to the A10 will be permitted - Principal Transport Route. Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry "

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on 30000m² net land area identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines and demonstrate how the site can be made accessible on foot, by cycle and by public transport together with identifying any remaining off-site highway implications and required mitigation. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Littleport (approximately 4,200 dwellings) the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.

### 6. Access to services

##### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

##### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

##### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

##### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

##### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Spare capacity in every year

### 7. Environmental impact

##### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 2.01km – 5km of site

##### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
**Site Name:** Land to west of A10, Littleport  
**Current Status:** Superseded by LIT.E1  
**Parish:** Littleport CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/18/09

| 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers |  
| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower  
| 7e. Public Rights of Way | E – No PRoW connection opportunities  
| 7f.(i) PROW comments |  
| 7f.(i) Conservation Area | CA within 1.01km – 2km of site  
| 7f.(ii) Listed building | LB within 1.01km – 2km of site  
| 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument | SAM more than 2km from site  
| 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset |  
| 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments | Conservation area to the east - No heritage impact  
| 7h. Visual Impact | Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive  
| Justification for score: | Feels like development would be more appropriate on sites contained within A10.  
| Additional criterion 7i. TPOs | No TPO within 15m of the site  

**Parish Council support and rank**

- **Does Parish Council support this site?** Yes

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**

- Preferred site

**Date and time of site visit:**

- 

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

- 

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and should be retained.

**Site Information**

**Site Type:** Local Plan 2015 allocated site

**Site Address:** Land north of Wisbech Road, Littleport

**Settlement:** Littleport

**LP15 Allocation Ref:** LIT4

**Site Description:** Existing employment allocation, land north of Wisbech Road

**Brown/Greenfield:** Greenfield

**Known Constraints:**

- Current Use: Agriculture
- Proposed Use: Employment

**Current Use info:**

- Current Use: Agriculture
- Proposed Use: Employment

**Proposed Use info:**

- Site Area Net (ha): 4.05
- Site Area Gross (ha): 4.77
- Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

- Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

This site lies partly within the Waste Consultation Area for the waste management site Murfitts, Wisbech Road, Littleport (Policy W8AN), designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012). The overarching policy for this designation is Policy CS30 of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011). This policy seeks to safeguard waste management facilities which make a significant contribution to managing Cambridgeshire’s waste; and the policy states that development will only be permitted where it is demonstrated that this will not prejudice existing or future planned waste management operations. However, in this instance the facility which was present when the designation was made has since ceased. Nonetheless the principle of its use for waste management purposes is established, and therefore some consideration to this should be given to these policies in the interests of deliverability.

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

W8AN

2a. Flood zone

- >50% of site area in Zone 3a (employment sites)

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

- 

- 

- 

-
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
<td>Site located more than 250m from contaminated land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5a. Contaminated land professional assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5b. Local road impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

NO highways frontage

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on 40545m² net land area identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines and demonstrate how the site can be made accessible on foot, by cycle and by public transport together with identifying any remaining off-site highway implications and required mitigation. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Littleport (approximately 4,200 dwellings) the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to services</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 6b. Proximity to medical services | Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 6c. Proximity to shops | Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 6d. Proximity to Primary School | Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 6e. Proximity to Secondary School | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity | No spare places but room for expansion |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment |

The school currently operates above capacity and has two mobile classrooms on site. By September 2017 both of these mobile classrooms will be occupied. The site is large and will allow significant expansion of another 420 places. However, the Council’s established strategy at present is to build a new primary school on the education campus being created off Camel Rd in response to proposed housing development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity | Spare capacity in every year |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment |

The College could be expanded from 1200 pupils 11-16 to 1500 pupils 11-16 on its present site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,200 new houses in the catchment area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 6h. Proximity to employment sites | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 7. Environmental impact

| 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites | CWS within 2.01km – 5km of site | A |
| 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment |  |
| 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers |  |
| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower | D |
| 7e. Public Rights of Way | C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary | C |
| 7f.(i) PROW comments | Byway 36 runs to the north west corner of Site/18/6 and this site connects to Site 18/16. Provide a link across the 2 sites to the Wisbech Road. | |
| 7f.(ii) Conservation Area | CA within 1.01km – 2km of site | B |
| 7f.(ii) Listed building | LB within 1.01km – 2km of site | B |
| 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument | SAM more than 2km from site | A |
| 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset |  |
| 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments | Already allocated - same issues as before | |

### 7h. Visual Impact

**Justification for score:**

### Additional criterion 7f. TPOs

| 7f. TPOs | No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

### Parish Council support and rank

**Does Parish Council support this site?**

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council's view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

**Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:**
**Current Status:** Site Allocation LIT.E2  
**Site Name:** Existing employment allocation, land west of 150 Wisbech Road  
**Parish:** Littleport CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/18/15

### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**  
Preferred site

**Date and time of site visit:**

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**  
The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and should be retained.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site Type:</strong></th>
<th>Local Plan 2015 allocated site</th>
<th><strong>ID:</strong></th>
<th>220</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Address:</strong></td>
<td>Land west of 150 Wisbech Road, Littleport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement:</strong></td>
<td>Littleport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LP15 Allocation Ref:</strong></td>
<td>LIT3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning Perm. Ref:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Description:</strong></td>
<td>Existing employment allocation, land west of 150 Wisbech Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brown/Greenfield:</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Use:</strong></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Use</strong></td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Use info:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Use info:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Area Net (ha):</strong></td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Area Gross (ha):</strong></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicative no. of dwellings:</strong></td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b) Recommended</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  
Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone  
>50% of site area in Zone 1

#### Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1</th>
<th>81.58%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2</th>
<th>7.89%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a</th>
<th>10.53%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk  
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

#### Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

| 50 Year | 1.15% | 100 Year | 0.23% | 1,000 Year | 1.74% |
### Site Allocation LIT.E2

**Site Name:** Existing employment allocation, land west of 150 Wisbech Road  
**Parish:** Littleport CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/18/15

| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | Yes |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | Yes |

| 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation | N/a - employment site |
| 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites | 2.01km - 5km from the site |
| 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment | |

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

| 5a. Proximity to contaminated land | Site located more than 250m from contaminated land |
| 5a.(i) Contaminated land profesional assessment | |
| 5b. Local road impact | No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations |
| 5c. Strategic Road Network impact | |
| 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment | "Potential issues with access. Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry"

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on 13600m² net land area identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines and demonstrate how the site can be made accessible on foot, by cycle and by public transport together with identifying any remaining off-site highway implications and required mitigation. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Littleport (approximately 4,200 dwellings) the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.

#### 6. Access to services

| 6a. Proximity to public transport | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) |
| 6b. Proximity to medical services | Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m) |
| 6c. Proximity to shops | Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m) |
| 6d. Proximity to Primary School | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) |
| 6e. Proximity to Secondary School | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) |
| 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity | No spare places but room for expansion |
| 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity | Spare capacity in every year |

#### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

The school currently operates above capacity and has two mobile classrooms on site. By September 2017 both of these mobile classrooms will be occupied. The site is large and will allow significant expansion of another 420 places. However, the Council’s established strategy at present is to build a new primary school on the education campus being created off Camel Rd in response to proposed housing development.

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded from 1200 pupils 11-16 to 1500 pupils 11-16 on its present site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,200 new houses in the catchment area.

#### 7. Environmental impact

| 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites | CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site |
| 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment | |
**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7e.(i) PROW comments**

Byway 35 runs along the north of the site. Provide a link for pedestrians from this Byway to Wisbech Road.

**7f.(i) Conservation Area**

CA within 1.01km – 2km of site | B |

**7f.(ii). Listed building**

LB within 1.01km – 2km of site | B |

**7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument**

SAM more than 2km from site | A |

**7f.(iv) Archaeological asset**

|  |
|------------------|--|

**7g. Heritage / archaeology comments**

Already allocated - same issues as before

**7h. Visual Impact**

|  |
|------------------|--|

**Parish Council support and rank**

Does Parish Council support this site?

|  |
|------------------|--|

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

|  |
|------------------|--|

Form G - Parish Council’s view:

|  |
|------------------|--|
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**
Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:**
21 July 2016

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**
The site is rejected as more than 50% of the site area is located in Flood Zone 3a.

![Map of the site](image)

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
<th>ID: 82</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land off Mow Fen Drove, Littleport, Cambridgeshire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Littleport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Land off Mow Fen Drove</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Access may be reliant on third parties and the land lies within Flood Zone 3, but does benefit from flood defences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td>Agriculture and allotments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 100 b) Recommended 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
- Main Settlement
1b. Site Availability
- Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment
- Site affected by M+W Policies
- Site affected by M+W Allocations

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
- >50% of site area in Zone 3a (housing site)

| Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening): |
| Flood Zone 1: 0.00% | Flood Zone 2: 2.06% | Flood Zone 3a: 97.94% | Flood Zone 3b: 0.00% |

2b. Surface Water flood risk
- Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

| Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW): |
| 30 Year: 0.00% | 100 Year: 0.39% | 1,000 Year: 1.83% |
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land off Mow Fen Drove  
**Parish:** Littleport CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/18/02

| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | Yes |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | Yes |

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
Site does not intersect Inner Zone  

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
More than 5km from site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

---

### 5. Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
Site within 250m of contaminated land

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land profesional assessment
sewage works 152m to west

#### 5b. Local road impact
Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
"NO access to the ADOPTED HIGHWAY access shown off Byway / Footpath 148/33. Vast amounts of highways upgrades needed as access for this number of homes would be difficult with third party land almost certainly needed needed to facilitate a viable siteSubject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry  

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on 100 dwellings identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Littleport and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Littleport (approximately 4,200 dwellings) the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.

---

### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
No spare places but room for expansion

#### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
The school currently operates above capacity and has two mobile classrooms on site. By September 2017 both of these mobile classrooms will be occupied. The site is large and will allow significant expansion of another 420 places. However, the Council’s established strategy at present is to build a new primary school on the education campus being created off Camel Rd in response to proposed housing development.

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
Spare capacity in every year

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
The College could be expanded from 1200 pupils 11-16 to 1500 pupils 11-16 on its present site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,200 new houses in the catchment area.

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

---

### 7. Environmental impact
### Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

**Site Name:** Land off Mow Fen Drove

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</th>
<th>CWS within 501m – 1km of site</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td>Conservation area to the south - No heritage impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
<td>Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

- **Does Parish Council support this site?** Yes
- **Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**
- **Form G - Parish Council's view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

Byway 33 runs along New Road to the west of the site. Provide a link from the Byway to Mowfen Drove on the east of the site. May harm views of open countryside / farmland for existing dwellings.
**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land to the north of Oak Lane, Littleport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Littleport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Land to the north of Oak Lane, Littleport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Good access to Oak Lane and A10 - no known constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td>Housing and employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 150 b) Recommended 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a. Settlement Hierarchy</th>
<th>Main Settlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b. Site Availability</td>
<td>Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Minerals and Waste assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2a. Flood zone</th>
<th>&gt;50% of site area in Zone 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 1:</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 2:</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3a:</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3b:</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Surface Water flood risk</td>
<td>Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Year:</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Year:</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 Year:</td>
<td>5.06%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit: 14.15 21 July 2016

The site is rejected as it would result in likely adverse visual impacts to the countryside; and, access to local services would be inhibited by the busy A10 road, severing the relationship between the site and Littleport.

**Known Constraints:**

- Good access to Oak Lane and A10 - no known constraints

**Current Use:**

- Agriculture

**Proposed Use:**

- Mixed use

**Indicative no. of dwellings:**

- a) Submitted / estimated 150
- b) Recommended 0

**Date and time of site visit:**

- 14.15 21 July 2016

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):**

- 30 Year: 0.88%
- 100 Year: 0.66%
- 1,000 Year: 5.06%
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to services</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7. Environmental Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impact</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td>As above the connections between this site and adjacent sites offer the opportunity to provide good links for all users including pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii) Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td>Listed buildings and conservation area to northeast - No heritage impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
<td>Significant harm to landscape/townscape or key views - severe visual intrusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

- **Does Parish Council support this site?** Yes
- **Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**
- **Form G - Parish Council's view:**

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit: 14.30 21 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s):

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is rejected as safe highway access is unlikely to be achievable; is located in Flood Zone 3a; and has a poor relationship to the built area of Littleport.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land to the east of A10 and north of Blackbank Drove, Littleport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Littleport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Agricultural land to the east of A10 and north of Blackbank Drove, Littleport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Close to A10 and opposite existing housing developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td>Housing and employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 160  b) Recommended 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

| Main Settlement | |

1b. Site Availability

| Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22) | |

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

This site lies almost entirely within the Safeguarding Area for the Littleport Waste Water Treatment Works (Policy W7Y) designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012). The overarching policy for this designation is Policy CS31 of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011). This policy places a presumption against allowing development which would be occupied by people (including residential, industrial, commercial, sport and recreational uses); and where new development is proposed an odour assessment report should accompany any planning application. Permission should only be granted when it has been demonstrated that the proposed development would not be adversely affected by the continued operation of the existing waste water treatment works. It is suggested that consideration should be given to these policies prior to allocation in the interests of deliverability.

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations W7Y

2a. Flood zone

| >50% of site area in Zone 3a (housing site) | |

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
**Site Name:** Land to the east of A10 and north of Blackbank Drove, Littleport

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Parish:** Littleport CP

**Site Ref:** Site/18/05

---

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located in area benefiting from defences (Y/N): Yes

5b. Local road impact
- Insurmountable safety issues that cannot be secured in accordance with CIL regulations

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- “NO direct access on to A10 will be permitted- Principal Transport Route insurmountable visibility splay issues with intensification of the junction of Woodfen Road/Wisbech Road. NO access to highways frontage”
- The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on 160 dwellings identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Littleport (approximately 4,200 dwellings) the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.

#### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- The school currently operates above capacity and has two mobile classrooms on site. By September 2017 both of these mobile classrooms will be occupied. The site is large and will allow significant expansion of another 420 places. However, the Council’s established strategy at present is to build a new primary school on the education campus being created off Camel Rd in response to proposed housing development.

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Spare capacity in every year

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- The College could be expanded from 1200 pupils 11-16 to 1500 pupils 11-16 on its present site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,200 new houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

---

### Environmental Impact
Site Name: Land to the east of A10 and north of Blackbank Drove, Littleport

Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

Parish: Littleport CP

Site Ref: Site/18/05

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification
All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

7e. Public Rights of Way
C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PROW within the site boundary

7f. PROW comments
Byway 35 runs to the south of the site and Byway 34 to the east and connects to the site via Highway. Create a link between these 2 Byways across the site.

7f.(i) Conservation Area
CA within 500.1 – 1000m of site

7f.(ii). Listed building
LB within 500.1 – 1000m of site

7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
SAM more than 2km from site

7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
Conservation area to southeast - No heritage impact

7h. Visual Impact
Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive

Justice for score:
Could have detrimental impact for users of bridleway.

Additional criterion 7I. TPOs
No TPO within 15m of the site

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site? Yes

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Parish:** Littleport CP  
**Site Name:** Land to the south of Croft Park Road, Littleport  
**Site Ref:** Site/18/07

---

### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:** 13:45 21 July

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is rejected as it is unlikely that safe highway access can be achieved. Other more suitable sites exist at Littleport.

---

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID:</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Site Address: | Land to the south of Croft Park Road, Littleport |

| Settlement: | Littleport |

| LP15 Allocation Ref: |  |

| Site Description: | Land to the south of Croft Park Road, Littleport |

| Brown/Greenfield: | Greenfield |

| Known Constraints: | Land requires agreement with the neighbours for access |

| Current Use: | Agriculture |
| Proposed Use: | Housing |

| Current Use info: | Vacant / scrub land |

| Proposed Use info: |  |

| Site Area Net (ha): | 0.56 |
| Site Area Gross (ha): | 0.66 |

| Indicative no. of dwellings: | a) Submitted / estimated 16 |
| b) Recommended | 0 |

---

### Major Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a. Settlement Hierarchy</th>
<th>Main Settlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b. Site Availability</td>
<td>Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Minerals and Waste assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies |  |
| 1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations |  |

| 2a. Flood zone | - >50% of site area in Zone 1 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 1: 100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2b. Surface Water flood risk | Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year: 6.38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land to the south of Croft Park Road, Littleport  
**Parish:** Littleport CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/18/07

| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No |

| 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation | Site does not intersect Inner Zone |
| 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites | More than 5km from site |

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

| 5a. Proximity to contaminated land | Site located more than 250m from contaminated land |
| 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment |

#### 5b. Local road impact

| Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations |

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

"NO direct highways frontage Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry "

This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required. Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Littleport and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Littleport (approximately 4,200 dwellings) the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.

#### 6. Access to services

| 6a. Proximity to public transport | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) |
| 6b. Proximity to medical services | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) |
| 6c. Proximity to shops | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) |
| 6d. Proximity to Primary School | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) |
| 6e. Proximity to Secondary School | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) |
| 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity | Limited capacity |

#### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

Places in year groups higher up the school. The school has recently been extended to 2FE or 420 places to meet demand. There is no further expansion potential on this site.

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

Spare capacity in every year

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded from 1200 pupils 11-16 to 1500 pupils 11-16 on its present site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,200 new houses in the catchment area.

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites

| Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m) |

#### 7. Environmental impact

| 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites | CWS within 501m – 1km of site |

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land to the south of Croft Park Road, Littleport  
**Parish:** Littleport CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/18/07

### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7d. Agricultural land classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7e. Public Rights of Way

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f(i) PROW comments

Footpath 16 runs along the western side of this site. Provide a link from the site to this Footpath.

### 7f(ii) Conservation Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f(iii) Listed building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f(iv) Scheduled Ancient Monument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f(v) Archaeological asset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No archaeological assets with a known impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

Listed building and conservation area to the northwest - No heritage impact

### 7h. Visual Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Justification for score:

Existing dwellings unlikely to benefit from views due to orientation and vegetation height. Site may be visible from Padnals Dove.

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No TPO within 15m of the site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parish Council support and rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does Parish Council support this site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council's view:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

- **Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Has merit

- **Date and time of site visit:** 13.30 21 July 2016

- **Supersedes site submission(s)**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is rejected primarily because other more suitable sites exist in Littleport. It is also possible that safe highway access may not be achievable.

---

### Site Information

- **Site Type:** New site submission (Form B)  
  **ID:** 91

- **Site Address:** Ely Road, Littleport

- **Settlement:** Littleport

- **LP15 Allocation Ref:**  
  **Planning Perm. Ref:**

- **Site Description:** Eastfield Farm, Ely Road

- **Brown/Greenfield:** Greenfield

- **Known Constraints:**

- **Current Use:** Agriculture  
  **Proposed Use:** Housing

- **Current Use info:**

- **Proposed Use info:**

- **Site Area Net (ha):** 13.11  
  **Site Area Gross (ha):** 21.85

- **Indicative no. of dwellings:**
  - a) Submitted / estimated: 150
  - b) Recommended: 0

### Major Criteria

1a. **Settlement Hierarchy**

1b. **Site Availability**

1c. **Minerals and Waste assessment**

1c.(i) **Site affected by M+W Policies**

1c.(ii) **Site affected by M+W Allocations**

2a. **Flood zone**

- >50% of site area in Zone 1

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone 1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3a</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3b</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. **Surface Water flood risk**

Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Year</td>
<td>0.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 Year</td>
<td>5.31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**  
Site Name: **Eastfield Farm**  
Parish: **Littleport CP**  
Site Ref: **Site/18/11**

| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No |
| 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation | Site does not intersect Inner Zone |
| 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites | More than 5km from site |

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

| 5a. Proximity to contaminated land | Site located more than 250m from contaminated land |
| 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment |
| 5b. Local road impact | Insurmountable safety issues that cannot be secured in accordance with CIL regulations |
| 5c. Strategic Road Network impact |
| 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment |


“No suitable access on to Ely Road for this size of development. Padnal Junction with Victoria Street is NOT able to be improved”

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on 150 dwellings identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Littleport and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Littleport (approximately 4,200 dwellings) the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.

#### 6. Access to services

| 6a. Proximity to public transport | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) |
| 6b. Proximity to medical services | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) |
| 6c. Proximity to shops | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) |
| 6d. Proximity to Primary School | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) |
| 6e. Proximity to Secondary School | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) |
| 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity | Limited capacity |
| 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity | Spare capacity in every year |

#### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

Places in year groups higher up the school. The school has recently been extended to 2FE or 420 places to meet demand. There is no further expansion potential on this site.

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded from 1200 pupils 11-16 to 1500 pupils 11-16 on its present site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,200 new houses in the catchment area.

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites

Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

#### 7. Environmental impact

| 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites | CWS within 501m – 1km of site |
| 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment |

| 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites |
| 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment |
Site Name: Eastfield Farm

Parish: Littleport CP

Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

Site Ref: Site/18/11

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification
All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

7e. Public Rights of Way
C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary

7f. (i) PROW comments
Footpath 16 connects to the north west corner of the site. Provide links across the site from Eastfields and High Street to Padnal Drove for pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrians.

7f. (ii) Conservation Area
CA within 500m of site

7f. (iii) Listed building
LB within 500m of site

7f. (iv) Scheduled Ancient Monument
SAM more than 2km from site

7f. (v) Archaeological asset

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
Listed building and conservation area to the northwest - No heritage impact

7h. Visual Impact
Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive

Justification for score:
Potential loss of views for existing dwellings. Most probably don't have good views of countryside due to high vegetation.

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
No TPO within 15m of the site

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site? Yes

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Co-owner of site requests site is included for residential development, with possibility of providing site for further primary school.
- Site would focus development in proximity of town centre.
- Site has multiple access points.
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Parish: Littleport CP
Site Name: Padnall, Littleport
Site Ref: Site/18/13

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit: 12:00 21 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is rejected as more than 50% of the site area is in Flood Zone 3a.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B) ID: 93
Site Address: Padnall, Littleport
Settlement: Littleport
LP15 Allocation Ref: Planning Perm. Ref:
Site Description: Paddock at Padnall, Littleport
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: Adjacent existing housing development with 3 access points and with existing developer. Interest who wishes to build housing immediately upon planning permission. This site will deliver housing within the next 5 years.
Current Use: Other (please specify) Proposed Use: Housing
Current Use info: Paddock Proposed Use info:
Site Area Net (ha): 0.82 Site Area Gross (ha): 0.971246
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted/estimated 25 b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Main Settlement
1b. Site Availability Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment
1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations
2a. Flood zone >50% of site area in Zone 3a (housing site)
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 28.00% Flood Zone 2: 7.00% Flood Zone 3a: 65.00% Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%
2b. Surface Water flood risk Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):
Site Name: Padnall, Littleport

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Parish:** Littleport CP

**Site Ref:** Site/18/13

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

- More than 5km from site

#### 5. Site Suitability

##### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land

- Site within 100m of contaminated land

##### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

- Factory or works 87m to NW

##### 5b. Local road impact

- Insurmountable safety issues that cannot be secured in accordance with CIL regulations

##### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

- Professional assessment

##### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

- Padnall junction with Victoria Street is NOT able to be improved

This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required. Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Littleport and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Littleport (approximately 4,200 dwellings) the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.

##### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport

- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services

- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops

- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School

- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School

- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

- Limited capacity

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

- Spare capacity in every year

#### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

- The College could be expanded from 1200 pupils 11-16 to 1500 pupils 11-16 on its present site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,200 new houses in the catchment area.

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

- Spare capacity in every year

#### 7. Environmental impact

##### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

- CWS within 500m of site

##### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

- Professional assessment

##### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

- Professional assessment
### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
## Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment:
- **Rejected**

Date and time of site visit:
- 13.35 21 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s):

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is rejected as it is unlikely that safe highway access can be achieved. Other more suitable sites exist elsewhere in Littleport.

## Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
<th>ID: 94</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Adjacent to Eastfields Farm, Eastfields, Littleport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Littleport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Eastfields Farm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>CLD and delivery not known at this stage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td>Redundant former poultry free range orchard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 46</td>
<td>b) Recommended 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
- Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
- >50% of site area in Zone 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 1: 100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk
- Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year: 0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Year: 2.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 Year: 11.14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Site Name:** Hempfield

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Parish:** Littleport CP

**Site Ref:** Site/18/14

### Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation</td>
<td>Site does not intersect Inner Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites</td>
<td>More than 5km from site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Minor Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Site Suitability</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
<td>Site located more than 250m from contaminated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>&quot;NO highways frontage. NO access on to the A10 will be permitted - Principal Transport Route. Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Access to Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Access to services</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>Spare capacity in every year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Environmental Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Environmental impact</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td>CWS within 501m – 1km of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Ref:</strong> Site/18/14</td>
<td><strong>Parish:</strong> Littleport CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Name:</strong> Hempfield</td>
<td><strong>Current Status:</strong> Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **7d. Agricultural land classification** | All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower | **C** |
| **7e. Public Rights of Way** | C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary | **C** |

**7e.(i) PROW comments**

This site connects to Site/18/11 and is also bordered by Footpath 16. Ensure that there is a link between the 2 sites.

| **7f.(i) Conservation Area** | CA within 500m of site | **D** |
| **7f.(ii). Listed building** | LB within 500m of site | **D** |
| **7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument** | SAM more than 2km from site | **A** |
| **7f.(iv) Archaeological asset** |  |  |

**7g. Heritage / archaeology comments**

Listed building and conservation area to the northwest - No heritage impact

| **7h. Visual impact** | Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views | **C** |

**Justification for score:**

Due to height of vegetation, unlikely to benefit from views.

**Additional criterion 7l. TPOs**

No TPO within 15m of the site | **A** |

**Parish Council support and rank**

| Does Parish Council support this site? | Yes |

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

---

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Parish:** Littleport CP  
**Site Name:** Land west of the A10  
**Site Ref:** Site/18/23

### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Rejected  
**Date and time of site visit:** 13:10 10 July 2017  
**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The proposal seeks to provide additional employment land and a roundabout at the A10. The need for, and deliverability of a roundabout is uncertain, and should be explored through development of site allocation’s LIT.M1 and LIT.E1.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17</th>
<th>ID: 415</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>A10, Littleport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Littleport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>The site seeks to extend site LIT.E1 to include land immediately south of the draft site allocation, located west of the A10. The proposal seeks to provide a new roundabout at the A10, thereby improving access to employment land in the area. At present this site comprises a former lagoon (now redundant) from a vegetable processing plant. The land also includes a surface water drainage pond for the adjacent Saxon Business Park, which would require relocation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td><strong>Net site area estimated</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td>Lagoon and drainage pond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td>Includes land for new roundabout / junction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated</td>
<td>b) Recommended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a. Settlement Hierarchy</th>
<th>Main Settlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b. Site Availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Minerals and Waste assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Flood zone</td>
<td>&gt;50% of site area in Zone 3a (employment sites)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 1:</td>
<td>8.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 2:</td>
<td>10.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3a:</td>
<td>81.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3b:</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Surface Water flood risk</td>
<td>Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yrs))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Minor Criteria

### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site located more than 250m from contaminated land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vast mitigation and third party land purchases would be required Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Access to services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 15 min walk (&lt;1,200m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20 min walk (&lt;1,600m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Environmental impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWS within 2.01km – 5km of site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Name: Land west of the A10

Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Parish: Littleport CP
Site Ref: Site/18/23

7f.(i) PROW comments

7f.(i) Conservation Area CA within 1.01km – 2km of site — B
7f.(ii). Listed building LB within 1.01km – 2km of site — B
7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument SAM more than 2km from site — A
7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
No impact on designated heritage assets.

7h. Visual Impact Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive — D

Justification for score:
Development of site would be visually intrusive to the open countryside.

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs No TPO within 15m of the site — A

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site? Yes
Form E - Parish Council site ranking:
Form G - Parish Council's view: (a) add this site to the Local Plan, and keep existing preferred site(s)?

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is located wholly within Flood Zone 3 and is therefore not suitable for allocation. In addition, the site would unlikely accommodate 10 or more dwellings and is therefore below the allocation threshold.

Site Information

Site Type: FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17

Site Address: Black Horse Drove, Littleport, Ely

Settlement: Black Horse Drove

LP15 Allocation Ref: ID: 416

Planning Perm. Ref:

Site Description: Agricultural land proposed for housing development, to infill gap between existing built area and recreation ground.

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints: **Submission does not indicate number of proposed dwellings. Dwelling figure is therefore calculated from site area and does not reflect site constraints or characteristics.**

Current Use info:

Current Use: Agriculture

Proposed Use info:

Proposed Use: Housing

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 4

Site Area Net (ha): 0.11

Site Area Gross (ha): 0.11

b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy: Small Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone: >50% of site area in Zone 3a (housing site)

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

Flood Zone 1: 0.00%  
Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  
Flood Zone 3a: 100.00%  
Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk: Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Site Name:** Land at Black Horse Drove

**Parish:** Littleport CP

**Site Ref:** Site/18/24

### Minor Criteria

**Site Suitability**

5. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
   - Site does not intersect Inner Zone

4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
   - More than 5km from site

4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

### 30 Year: 0.00%  
### 100 Year: 0.00%  
### 1,000 Year: 0.00%

Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): Yes

Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

### Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
   - CWS within 500m of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification
   - All or part of site intersected by ALC1 or lower

7e. Public Rights of Way
   - E – No PRoW connection opportunities

7e.(i) PROW comments

---

**5. Site Suitability**

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
   - Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact
   - No objections with minor mitigation measures

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
   - Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
   - Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
   - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops

6d. Proximity to Primary School
   - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
   - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
   - No spare places but room for expansion

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
   - No spare places but room for expansion

6f.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The additional site to appear in this round does not alter the previous response given. There will be a need to increase the size of the secondary school by a further form of entry to 6FE and it is now confirmed that this is possible on the current site.

6h. Proximity to employment sites
   - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

### 7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification
   - All or part of site intersected by ALC1 or lower

7e. Public Rights of Way
   - E – No PRoW connection opportunities

7e.(i) PROW comments

---

The previous response to proposed growth levels in Littleport was to establish a new 1FE primary school on the Littleport Education Campus and a further site for another new primary school was identified in a major housing development area. At the level of housing proposed both of these schools will be required.
Site Ref: Site/18/24
Parish: Littleport CP
Site Name: Land at Black Horse Drove
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

Parish Council support and rank
Does Parish Council support this site? Yes
Form E - Parish Council site ranking:
Form G - Parish Council’s view: (a) add this site to the Local Plan, and keep existing preferred site(s)?

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received
Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Rejected**

Date and time of site visit: 11:45 10 July 2017

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
- The site is mostly in Flood Zone 3 and may not be suitable for development. The site boundary extends some distance into the open countryside and would likely result in adverse visual impact and harm to the landscape.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17 ID: 417</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Wisbech Road, Littleport, Ely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Littleport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>The site is currently in agricultural use, located adjacent to an existing employment area. Proposal seeks employment allocation of site to enable future expansion of existing business. Part of site has recently been granted planning permission for new factory site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td><strong>Net site area estimated</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td>Agricultural land, part of which has permission for employment development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>7.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>11.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
- Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
- >50% of site area in Zone 3a (employment sites)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 1: 0.51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk
- Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Date and time of site visit: 11:45 10 July 2017

Supersedes site submission(s)
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**  
Site Name: *Land north of Wisbech Road*  
Parish: **Littleport CP**  
Site Ref: **Site/18/25**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites</td>
<td>2.01km - 5km from the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</th>
<th>Site within 100m of contaminated land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>No objections with Moderate mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Access to services</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Less than 20 min walk (&lt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Less than 20 min walk (&lt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Less than 15 min walk (&lt;1,200m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6h. Proximity to employment sites</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Environmental impact</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td>CWS within 2.01km – 5km of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC1 or lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Site Name:** Land north of Wisbech Road

**Parish:** Littleport CP

**Site Ref:** Site/18/25

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>CA within 1.01km – 2km of site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii) Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

Nothing further to add from previous consultation

7h. Visual Impact

Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive

**Justification for score:**

Development of site would be visually to the open countryside. Most of the site area is physically separate from the main built area along Wisbech Road, and would not therefore reflect the built form.

Additional criterion 7f. TPOs

No TPO within 15m of the site

---

**Parish Council support and rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

(a) add this site to the Local Plan, and keep existing preferred site(s)?

---

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit: 21 July 2016 at 12.05pm

Main findings and recommendations:
The site provides a location for development close to the village centre with few constraints, and therefore is allocated for housing development. The site is located in the conservation area and in proximity of listed buildings. Proposals should therefore have particular regard to heritage matters.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  ID: 95
Site Address: Station Road, Lode
Settlement: Lode with Long Meadow

LP15 Allocation Ref: Site Area Net (ha): 0.51  Site Area Gross (ha): 0.6
Planning Perm. Ref: Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 20  b) Recommended 20

Site Description: Sunny Ridge Farmyard
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: Lies within Lode village Conservation Area. CLD not considered at this stage. 15-20 dwelling capacity

Current Use: Agriculture  Proposed Use: Housing

Known Constraints:

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  Medium Village  C
1b. Site Availability  Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)  A
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment
1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone  >50% of site area in Zone 1  A

Percent (% of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk  Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA
Percent (% of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
30 Year: 0.00%  100 Year: 0.04%  1,000 Year: 1.31%
**Site Name:** Sunny Ridge Farmyard

**Current Status:** Site Allocation LOD.H1

**Parish:** Lode CP

**Site Ref:** Site/19/01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation</td>
<td>Site does not intersect Inner Zone</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites</td>
<td>More than 5km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5. Site Suitability**

| 5a. Proximity to contaminated land | Site located more than 250m from contaminated land | A |
| 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment | | A |
| 5b. Local road impact | No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations | C |
| 5c. Strategic Road Network impact | | A |
| 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment | "Mill Road junction has potential visibility issues. Mill Road access at Station Road would be suitable for pedestrians and cyclists ONLY as it is not wide enough for vehicles. Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry" This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required. | | |

**6. Access to services**

| 6a. Proximity to public transport | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) | A |
| 6b. Proximity to medical services | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |
| 6c. Proximity to shops | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) | A |
| 6d. Proximity to Primary School | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |
| 6e. Proximity to Secondary School | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |
| 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity | No spare places, no room for expansion | E |
| 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment | Small village school on a very restricted site | | |
| 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity | No spare places but room for expansion | D |
| 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment | The school is being expanded to 10 FE - 1500 places 11-16. This is to address the forecast demand for places and makes no allowance for any further housing development. The pupils are already in the primary feeder schools for Bottisham VC. The VC will NOT expand beyond 10FE even if the site allows it. | | |
| 6h. Proximity to employment sites | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |

**7. Environmental impact**

| 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites | CWS within 500m of site | D |
| 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment | | D |
| 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers | | | |
| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower | C |
| 7e. Public Rights of Way | C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary | C |
**Current Status:** Site Allocation LOD.H1  
**Site Name:** Sunny Ridge Farmyard

**Parish:** Lode CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/19/01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>7e.(i) PROW comments</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FP33 runs inside the north east boundary of the site - Provide a link from FP33 to Mill Road at the south east boundary of the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>7f.(i) Conservation Area</strong></th>
<th>Site is within CA</th>
<th><strong>E</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7f.(ii). Listed building</strong></td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</strong></td>
<td>SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECDC: Within conservation area and close proximity to listed buildings - care must be taken to ensure no harm caused to the significance of the heritage assets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE: 19/01: site within conservation area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **7h. Visual Impact** | Positively enhances landscape/townscape / enhances views of assets and features | **A** |

**Justification for score:**
Residential development would enhance the current state of the site and will overall enhance the village.

| **Additional criterion 7i. TPOs** | No TPO within 15m of the site | **A** |

**Parish Council support and rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council's view:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- LOD.H1 - site is located within the Lode Conservation Area. There are two grade II listed buildings and any development of this site has the potential to impact upon these heritage assets and their settings
- Support for LOD.H1 allocation.
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:**
21 July 2016 at 12.40pm

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**
The site is located outside the natural extent of the village. Development in this location would not reflect the built form and would likely be visually intrusive to the countryside. More suitable sites are available closer to the village centre.

---

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Station Road, Lode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Lode with Long Meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Former Lode Station Yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Capacity - 30-40 dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td>Largely vacant, some farm vehicle parking, former station yard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td>Housing with potential for some employment development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 40  b) Recommended 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

1. **Settlement Hierarchy**
   - Medium Village

2. **Site Availability**
   - Available for devl in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

3. **Minerals and Waste assessment**

4. **Flood zone**
   - >50% of site area in Zone 1
   - **Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**
     - Flood Zone 1: 94.12%  
     - Flood Zone 2: 5.88%  
     - Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  
     - Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

5. **Surface Water flood risk**
   - Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))

---

**Polygon (ha):** 1.7

---

**Site Ref:** Site/19/02

**Parish:** Lode CP

**Site Name:** Former Lode Station Yard

---

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

---

**Date and time of site visit:**
21 July 2016 at 12.40pm

---

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

---

**Main findings and recommendations:**
The site is located outside the natural extent of the village. Development in this location would not reflect the built form and would likely be visually intrusive to the countryside. More suitable sites are available closer to the village centre.
**Site Name:** Former Lode Station Yard

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Parish:** Lode CP

**Site Ref:** Site/19/02

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- More than 5km from site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

#### 5. Site Suitability

##### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

##### 5a(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

##### 5b. Local road impact
- No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

##### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

##### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- "Access off Station Road. Problem with limited highways frontage and therefore could have visibility splay issues Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry"
- This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

#### 6. Access to services

##### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6f(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places, no room for expansion

##### 6f(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

##### 6g(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- Small village school on a very restricted site

##### 6g(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- The school is being expanded to 10 FE - 1500 places 11-16. This is to address the forecast demand for places and makes no allowance for any further housing development. The pupils are already in the primary feeder schools for Bottisham VC. The VC will NOT expand beyond 10FE even if the site allows it.

##### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 7. Environmental impact

##### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 500m of site

##### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

##### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

##### 7d. Agricultural land classification
- All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower

##### 7e. Public Rights of Way
- D – Opportunities to connect to nearby PROW's outside the site boundary

##### 7e(i) PROW comments
Provide a link from Fen Rd to FP9 which runs along Cranney Droveway to the north west of the site. This would require negotiation with the landowner of the affected land to the north of the site.

7f.(i) Conservation Area
CA within 500m of site

7f.(ii). Listed building
LB within 500m of site

7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site

7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
No heritage impact

7h. Visual Impact
Positively enhances landscape/townscape / enhances views of assets and features

Justification for score:
Residential development would enhance the current state of the site and will overall enhance the village. However, more suitable sites are available within the village boudary.

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
No TPO within 15m of the site

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

• Support for site 19/02 should be allocated, previously developed land, could accommodate 41 dwellings including affordable and is available for immediate development.
• Disagree with scoring for site 19/02, accessibility to services is incorrect.
**Site Name:** Former Lode Station Yard  
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

---

### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:** 16/05/2017 at 10:45am

**Main findings and recommendations:**
The site is located outside the natural extent of the village. Development in this location would not reflect the built form and would likely be visually intrusive to the countryside. More suitable sites are available closer to the village centre.

---

### Site Information

**Site Type:** FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17  
**ID:** 418

**Site Address:** Former Station Yard, Station Road, Lode

**Settlement:** Lode with Long Meadow

**LP15 Allocation Ref:**  
**Planning Perm. Ref:**

**Site Description:** The site was formerly used as the station yard, and is currently used for the storage and parking of vehicles and trailers. The site was previously proposed and assessed for mixed use development, as Site/19/02. This proposal seeks to deliver housing development of the site.

**Brown/Greenfield:** Brownfield

**Known Constraints:** Submission indicates site could deliver 41 dwellings. **Net site area estimated**

**Current Use:** Employment  
**Proposed Use:** Housing

**Current Use info:** Vehicle and trailer storage and parking.

**Proposed Use info:**

**Site Area Net (ha):** 1.45  
**Site Area Gross (ha):** 1.7

**Indicative no. of dwellings:**
- a) Submitted / estimated: 41
- b) Recommended: 0

### Major Criteria

1a. **Settlement Hierarchy:** Medium Village  
   
1b. **Site Availability:** Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. **Flood zone**
   - >50% of site area in Zone 1  
   - **Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**
     - Flood Zone 1: 94.12%  
     - Flood Zone 2: 5.88%  
     - Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  
     - Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. **Surface Water flood risk**
   - Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))  
   - **Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):** A

---

**Date and time of site visit:** 16/05/2017 at 10:45am

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

---
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Site Name:** Former Lode Station Yard

**Parish:** Lode CP

**Site Ref:** Site/19/03

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site does not intersect Inner Zone</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites

- 501m - 2km from the site | C |

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

- No objections with Moderate mitigation measures | B |

#### 5. Site Suitability

**5a. Proximity to contaminated land**

- Site located on contaminated land | E |

**5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment**

- Former railway use | |

**5b. Local road impact**

- No objections with Moderate mitigation measures | B |

**5c. Strategic Road Network impact**

- | |

**5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**

- Access off Station Road Problem with limited highways frontage and therefore could have visibility splay issues Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry | |

#### 6. Access to services

**6a. Proximity to public transport**

- Less than 5 min walk (<400m) | A |

**6b. Proximity to medical services**

- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |

**6c. Proximity to shops**

- Less than 5 min walk (<400m) | A |

**6d. Proximity to Primary School**

- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |

**6e. Proximity to Secondary School**

- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |

**6f.(i) Available primary school capacity**

- No spare places but room for expansion | D |

**6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity**

- Limited capacity | C |

**6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**

- The levels of development can be accommodated at the expanded catchment primary school - Bottisham Primary | |

**6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**

- Bottisham VC is in the process of being expanded from 7FE to 10FE an additional 450 places 11-16. Future catchment forecasts indicate that there will be some limited capacity available at the school to accommodate growth. In addition, there are plans for a new secondary school to the east of Cambridge to serve that areas development needs. The school will be in part of Bottisham VC current catchment area. If pupils in this area are served by the new school that will free up further capacity to accommodate the growth proposed within the Local Plan and the sites identified in this second round. | |

**6h. Proximity to employment sites**

- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |

#### 7. Environmental impact

**7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**

- CWS within 500m of site | D |

**7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**

- | |

**7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers**

- All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower | C |

**7d. Agricultural land classification**

- | |
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Former Lode Station Yard
Parish: Lode CP
Site Ref: Site/19/03

7e. Public Rights of Way
E – No PRoW connection opportunities

7f.(i) Conservation Area
CA within 500m of site
D

7f.(ii). Listed building
LB within 500m of site
D

7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
SAM within 500m of site
D

7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
ECDC - Lode Station house was designated a Building of Local Interest in Feb 2017. Consideration should be given to the character, appearance and setting of the designated heritage asset.

HE - There are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary. A scheduled monument, a Roman settlement lies to the east of the site and Lode Conservation Area to the south. Any development of the site therefore has the potential to impact upon these heritage assets. Any development of this site will need to protect and enhance the scheduled monument and conservation area their settings. If the site is allocated, these requirements should be included in policy and the supporting text of the Plan. Our principal comment would be that development of this site would project out into the countryside.

7h. Visual Impact
Some improvement to landscape/townscape or key views
B

Justification for score:

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
No TPO within 15m of the site
A

Parish Council support and rank
Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
**Site Name:** North-east Mepal  
**Parish:** Mepal CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/20/01

**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:**  
10:50 25 July 2016

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is open meadow land (with notable trees and hedgerows) crossed by PROWs, providing an open space valued by the local community. The site surrounds the listed church and the northwestern section is designated as a County Wildlife Site. The site is therefore rejected due to likely adverse impacts on: the tranquility and natural character of the public open space; the historic environment; and ecology.

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  
Medium Village

1b. Site Availability  
Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

>50% of site area in Zone 1

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 Year</th>
<th>100 Year</th>
<th>1,000 Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.13%</td>
<td>1.74%</td>
<td>8.71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date and time of site visit:**  
10:50 25 July 2016

**Indicative no. of dwellings:**

a) Submitted / estimated  140  
b) Recommended  0

**Site Information**

**Site Type:** New site submission (Form B)  
**ID:** 97

**Site Address:** Land to the east of Mepal Church, Mepal

**Settlement:** Mepal

**LP15 Allocation Ref:**  
**Planning Perm. Ref:**

**Site Description:** Land to the east of Mepal Church, Mepal

**Brown/Greenfield:** Greenfield

**Known Constraints:** Form indicates capacity for 120 - 140 units

**Current Use info:**

- Current Use: Agriculture  
- Proposed Use: Housing

**Proposed Use info:**

**Site Area Net (ha):** 3.00  
**Site Area Gross (ha):** 4

**Polygon (ha):** 3.92

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Rejected

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is open meadow land (with notable trees and hedgerows) crossed by PROWs, providing an open space valued by the local community. The site surrounds the listed church and the northwestern section is designated as a County Wildlife Site. The site is therefore rejected due to likely adverse impacts on: the tranquility and natural character of the public open space; the historic environment; and ecology.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- Within 500m of site

### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

### Minor Criteria

### 5. Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

#### 5b. Local road impact
- No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

> "Access off Bridge Road ONLY as River Close is not suitable. Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry."

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on 140 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area.

### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- Spare capacity in every year

#### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

No expansion potential as the site is already undersized. Although the school has capacity the number of places in each year group are small as it is a small village school with a capacity of 105 places.

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Limited capacity

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area.

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS located within site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification
- All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower

#### 7e. Public Rights of Way
- C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary
Site Name: North-east Mepal

Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Parish: Mepal CP
Site Ref: Site/20/01

7f.(i) PROW comments
Footpath 2 runs across the site from Footpath 8 to School Lane. This route may need diverting to allow development to take place.

7f.(i) Conservation Area
CA within 1.01km – 2km of site

7f.(ii) Listed building
LB within 500m of site

7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site

7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
Site completely surrounds Grade II* listed church - would fundamentally alter the character and setting of the church - would have serious concerns regarding scale of development

7h. Visual impact
Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive

Justification for score:
Development would be detrimental to users of site / public footpath. Potentially may harm setting of church and other historic buildings.

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
TPO tree on site

Parish Council support and rank
Does Parish Council support this site?
No

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:
Fifth or more

Form G - Parish Council’s view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received
Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Site promoter objects to rejection of site.
- Site can make a valuable contribution to housing land requirement.
- Site is in a sustainable location. Good access to services and facilities.
- Available to deliver and in single ownership.
- Objects to the site being described as public open space. It is private land in agricultural use.
- PROW onsite can be diverted or incorporated into site layout.
- Site is agricultural in character and is likely to be of low ecological value.
- Site Assessment Evidence Report provides no assessment of the potential impact of the development on the County Wildlife Site (located to the north-west). No assessment of trees has been undertaken to support CWS SPD.
- CWS could be incorporated into site.
- Church site is well contained within defined grounds, and screened by mature trees and hedgerows. Therefore development would no fundamentally alter the character and setting of the church – and could provide an opportunity to improve setting of the church.
## Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**
- Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:**
- 11:00 25 July 2016

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is rejected due to likely adverse impacts on ecology as a County Wildlife Site is located on site, and the site adjoins a SSSI and area of international importance for wildlife. In addition, a PROW crossing the site is valued by the local community. Development would result in a change to the character of this route.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Land to the west of Mepal Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Mepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>Land to the west of Mepal Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints</td>
<td>90 - 105 proposed units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Recommended 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha)</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy: Medium Village

1b. Site Availability: Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone: >50% of site area in Zone 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 1: 94.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 2: 0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3b: 5.59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk: Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year: 1.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Year: 1.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 Year: 12.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Site Name:** Land to the west of Mepal Church  

**Parish:** Mepal CP  

**Site Ref:** Site/20/02  

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No |

**3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation**  
Site does not intersect Inner Zone  

**4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites**  
Within 500m of site  

**4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment**

| Minor Criteria | Site located more than 250m from contaminated land | A |
| Local road impact | No objections with Moderate mitigation measures | B |
| Strategic Road Network impact |  |
| Transport impacts - professional assessment |  |

"Access off Brangehill Lane. Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry "

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on 105 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area.

**6. Access to services**

| Proximity to public transport | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) | A |
| Proximity to medical services | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |
| Proximity to shops | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) | A |
| Proximity to Primary School | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) | A |
| Proximity to Secondary School | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |
| Available primary school capacity | Spare capacity in every year | A |
| Available secondary school capacity | Limited capacity | C |

**6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**

No expansion potential as the site is already under sized. Although the school has capacity the number of places in each year group are small as it is a small village school with a capacity of 105 places.

**6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**

The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area.

**6h. Proximity to employment sites**  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

**7. Environmental impact**

| Proximity to County Wildlife Sites | CWS located within site | E |
| County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment |  |

**7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers**  

| Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower | C |
| Public Rights of Way | C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary | C |
Site Name: Land to the west of Mepal Church
Parish: Mepal CP
Site Ref: Site/20/02

Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

Parish Council support and rank
Does Parish Council support this site? No
Form E - Parish Council site ranking: Fourth
Form G - Parish Council's view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received
Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Site promoter objects to rejection of site.
- Site can make a valuable contribution to housing land requirement.
- Site is in a sustainable location. Good access to services and facilities.
- Available to deliver and in single ownership.
- Questions ecological value of CWS present on site, and suggests this could easily be incorporated into site layout.

7e.(i) PROW comments
Footpath 3 runs across the site from Footpath 7 to Brangehill Lane. Footpath 7 runs outside and inside the western boundary of the site. These routes may require diversion to allow development to take place.

7f.(i) Conservation Area
CA within 1.01km – 2km of site \[ B \]

7f.(ii). Listed building
LB within 500m of site \[ D \]

7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site \[ B \]

7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
Again within close proximity to Grade II* listed church - however would have less of an impact than 20/01

7h. Visual impact
Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views \[ C \]

Justification for score:
Inaccessible grazing land of no particular merit.

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
TPO tree within 15m of the site \[ B \]
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation  
Parish: Mepal CP  
Site Ref: Site/20/03

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:** 10.45 08 May 2017

**Supersedes site submission(s)**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is located beyond the natural edge of the village; development would therefore not complement the village's built form. Other more suitable sites are available in the village.

**Site Information**

- **Site Type:** FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17
- **ID:** 419
- **Site Address:** Witcham Road, Mepal, Ely
- **Settlement:** Mepal
- **LP15 Allocation Ref:**
- **Planning Perm. Ref:**
- **Site Description:** Agricultural land proposed for housing development.
- **Brown/Greenfield:** Greenfield
- **Known Constraints:** **Submission does not indicate number of proposed dwellings. Dwelling figure is therefore calculated from site area and does not reflect site constraints or characteristics.**  
**Net site area estimated**

- **Current Use:** Agriculture
- **Proposed Use:** Housing
- **Current Use info:**
- **Proposed Use info:**
- **Site Area Net (ha):** 2.58
- **Site Area Gross (ha):** 3.04
- **Indicative no. of dwellings:** a) Submitted / estimated 93 b) Recommended 0

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  
Medium Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone 1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Zone 2     | 0.00%  
| Zone 3a    | 0.00%  
| Zone 3b    | 0.00%  

2b. Surface Water flood risk  
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):

Date and time of site visit: 10.45 08 May 2017

Supersedes site submission(s)
**Site Name:** Land south of Witcham Road

**Parish:** Mepal CP

**Site Ref:** Site/20/03

---

**Minor Criteria**

### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 501m - 2km from the site

### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

### 5. Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site within 100m of contaminated land

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
- Former RAF Mepal 55m to S

#### 5b. Local road impact
- No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places, no room for expansion

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 501m – 1km of site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Site Name:** Land south of Witcham Road

---

### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country, County, Region, or City</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7d. Agricultural land classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country, County, Region, or City</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7e. Public Rights of Way

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country, County, Region, or City</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E – No PRoW connection opportunities</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7e.(i) PROW comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country, County, Region, or City</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E – No PRoW connection opportunities</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f.(i) Conservation Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country, County, Region, or City</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f.(ii) Listed building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country, County, Region, or City</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country, County, Region, or City</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country, County, Region, or City</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

No impact on designated heritage assets.

### 7h. Visual Impact

Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country, County, Region, or City</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification for score:**

Whilst there is a development located south of Witcham Rd, this site feels 'outside' of village extent. Point of transition to open countryside.

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country, County, Region, or City</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No TPO within 15m of the site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Parish Council support and rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country, County, Region, or City</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does Parish Council support this site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country, County, Region, or City</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(c) not add this site to the Local Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

(c) not add this site to the Local Plan

---

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
**Site Information**

**Site Name:** Land between New Road and Witcham Road  
**Site Ref:** Site/20/04  
**Parish:** Mepal CP  
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

---

**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**  
Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:**  
11:00 08 May 2017

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

The site lacks vehicular access, and is accessible from PROW only. The site is physically separate from the built area of the village. Development would likely be visually intrusive and result in harm to the landscape.

---

**Site Information**

**Site Type:** FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17  
**ID:** 420

**Site Address:** New Road, Mepal, Ely

**Settlement:** Mepal

**LP15 Allocation Ref:**  
**Planning Perm. Ref:**

**Site Description:** Agricultural land proposed for housing development.

**Brown/Greenfield:** Greenfield

**Known Constraints:**  
**Submission does not indicate number of proposed dwellings. Dwelling figure is therefore calculated from site area and does not reflect site constraints or characteristics.**  
**Net site area estimated**

**Current Use:** Agriculture  
**Proposed Use:** Housing

**Current Use info:**  
**Proposed Use info:**

**Site Area Net (ha):** 1.84  
**Site Area Gross (ha):** 2.45

**Indicative no. of dwellings:**  
a) Submitted / estimated 66  
b) Recommended 0

---

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  
Medium Village  

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  
Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  
Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  
Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):
### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 501m - 2km from the site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

#### 6a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

5a. Proximity to contaminated land - professional assessment

#### 5. Site Suitability

##### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

##### 5b. Local road impact
- No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations

5b. Local road impact

##### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

##### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

##### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6a. Proximity to public transport

6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6b. Proximity to medical services

6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6c. Proximity to shops

6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places, no room for expansion

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- No spare places, no room for expansion

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

There is no potential for expansion of the primary school as the site is already below the DfE size guidelines for the number of pupils it can accommodate. Unless additional site area can be obtained or the school relocated within the village mitigation of development may require the expansion of neighbouring village schools.

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

There is potential to expand Witchford Village College on its current site. However, this latest call for site would result in much higher levels of development within the catchment area of the College if they were all included in the Local Plan. The level of development would generate another 595 secondary aged children or 4FE. This is in addition to the additional pupils identified from the sites included in the consultation draft local plan. At this level of development suitable mitigation could not be provided at Witchford VC. It would be the Council's intention on adoption of the Local Plan to undertake a strategic review of secondary school provision across the District and the review would include the option of a further new secondary school (and site) in order to provide suitable mitigation.

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

#### 7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 501m – 1km of site

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
**Site Name:** Land between New Road and Witcham Road

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Parish:** Mepal CP

**Site Ref:** Site/20/04

### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7d. Agricultural land classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7e. Public Rights of Way

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7e.(l) PROW comments

FP1 connects to the north east corner of the site. Provide a safe off road link from this to the Witcham Rd at the south boundary of the site.

### 7f.(i) Conservation Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f.(ii) Listed building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

Listed buildings to the west, likely to have no impact on designated heritage assets.

### 7h. Visual Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant harm to landscape/townscape or key views - severe visual intrusion</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification for score:**

Site physically separate from built area of the village, and therefore does not complement the built form of the village. Development would be visually intrusive to the open countryside.

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TPO tree on site</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Parish Council support and rank

- **Does Parish Council support this site?** No
- **Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**
- **Form G - Parish Council's view:** (c) not add this site to the Local Plan

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Land south of Chippenham Road, Snailwell

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected
Date and time of site visit: 18/08/2016 at 1:30pm

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is located outside the logical boundary of the village, formed by Chippenham Road. Development of the site would likely harm the form and character of the village and impact on the conservation area.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type: New site submission (Form B)</th>
<th>ID: 99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address: Land south of Chippenham Road, Snailwell, Ely Cambridgeshire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement: Snailwell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref: Snailwell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description: Agricultural land south of Chippenham Road, Snailwell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints: Possible access to Chippenham Road. Safeguarded minerals areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use: Agriculture</td>
<td>Proposed Use: Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha): 0.62</td>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha): 0.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 22</td>
<td>b) Recommended 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a. Settlement Hierarchy</th>
<th>Small Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b. Site Availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Minerals and Waste assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2a. Flood zone</th>
<th>&gt;50% of site area in Zone 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent (% of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 1: 100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 2: 0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2b. Surface Water flood risk</th>
<th>Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent (% of site area at risk (uFMfSW):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Year: 0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Year: 0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 Year: 0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

**Site Name:** Land south of Chippenham Road, Snailwell

**Parish:** Snailwell CP

**Site Ref:** Site/22/01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minors Criteria</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation</td>
<td>Site does not intersect Inner Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites</td>
<td>501m - 2km from the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Minor Criteria

**5. Site Suitability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
<td>Site within 50m of contaminated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td>Old gravel pit to S boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>No objections with minor mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>&quot;Access off Chippenham Road. Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry&quot; This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**6. Access to services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>Spare capacity in some years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>The school is being expanded in size from 1FE to 2FE (210 places to 420 places) This is in part to meet an existing need but also in anticipation of a certain level of further housing development in the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6h. Proximity to employment sites</td>
<td>Less than 15 min walk (&lt;1,200m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7. Environmental impact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td>CWS within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bridleway 5 runs parallel to the north east corner of the site. Ensure that Bridleway 5 is accessible from the site.

7f.(i) Conservation Area
Site is within CA

7f.(ii) Listed building
LB within 500m of site

7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site

7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

ECDC: On edge of conservation area - Limited heritage impact

HE: 22/01: site is adjacent to conservation area.

7h. Visual Impact
Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views

Justification for score:

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
No TPO within 15m of the site

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Land north of Chippenham Road, Snailwell
Parish: Snailwell CP
Site Ref: Site/22/02

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit: 18/08/2016 at 1:45

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is located beyond the ‘entrance’ to the village from Chippenham road. Development is unlikely to reflect the built form of surrounding dwellings, and would likely harm wide open views of the countryside. The site is therefore rejected.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type: New site submission (Form B)</th>
<th>ID: 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address: Land north of Chippenham Road, Snailwell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement: Snailwell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description: Land north of Chippenham Road, Snailwell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints: Possible extension of allotments and access to Chippenham Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use: Agriculture</td>
<td>Proposed Use: Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 30</td>
<td>b) Recommended 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site Area Net (ha): 0.81 Site Area Gross (ha): 0.958

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Small Village

1b. Site Availability Available for devl in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies |

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations |

2a. Flood zone >50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

Flood Zone 1: 100.00% | Flood Zone 2: 0.00% | Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% | Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

30 Year: 0.00% | 100 Year: 0.00% | 1,000 Year: 0.00%

Date and time of site visit: 18/08/2016 at 1:45

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is located beyond the ‘entrance’ to the village from Chippenham road. Development is unlikely to reflect the built form of surrounding dwellings, and would likely harm wide open views of the countryside. The site is therefore rejected.
**Site Name:** Land north of Chippenham Road, Snailwell  
**Parish:** Snailwell CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/22/02  

### Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefiting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 501m - 2km from the site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</th>
<th>Site within 100m of contaminated land</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
- Old gravel pit 80m to S

#### 5b. Local road impact
- No objections with minor mitigation measures | A |

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- "Access off Chippenham Road. Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry."
- This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6a. Proximity to public transport</th>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- Spare capacity in some years | B |

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Limited capacity | C |

#### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- The school is being expanded in size from 1FE to 2FE (210 places to 420 places). This is in part to meet an existing need but also in anticipation of a certain level of further housing development in the village.

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m) | C |

### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</th>
<th>CWS within 500m of site</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification
- All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower | C |

#### 7e. Public Rights of Way
- E – No PRoW connection opportunities | E |

#### 7e.(i) PROW comments
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land north of Chippenham Road, Snailwell  
**Parish:** Snailwell CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/22/02

### 7f.(i) Conservation Area
- Site is within CA
  - **Score:** E

### 7f.(ii). Listed building
- LB within 500m of site
  - **Score:** D

### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
- SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site
  - **Score:** B

### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
- ECDC: On edge of conservation area - Limited heritage impact
- HE: 22/02: site is adjacent to conservation area.

### 7h. Visual Impact
- Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views
  - **Score:** C

#### Justification for score:

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
- No TPO within 15m of the site
  - **Score:** A

### Parish Council support and rank

#### Does Parish Council support this site?

#### Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

#### Form G - Parish Council's view:

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

---

**Note:** The summary of comments received includes details regarding conservation areas, listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments, archaeological assets, visual impact, and TPOs, along with the Parish Council's support and ranking of the site.
Current Status: Site Allocation SOH.H1  
Parish: Soham CP  
Site Name: LP15 allocation SOH1, Brook St, Soham  
Site Ref: Site/23/04

### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Preferred site

**Date and time of site visit:**

**Supersedes site submission(s)**: Site/23/13; Site/23/19

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and should be retained.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
<th>ID: 104</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Brook St, Soham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Soham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>SOH1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>LP15 allocation SOH1, Brook St, Soham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>13.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 400</td>
<td>b) Recommended 300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Criteria

**1a. Settlement Hierarchy**

Main Settlement

**1b. Site Availability**

**1c. Minerals and Waste assessment**

**1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies**

**1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations**

**2a. Flood zone**

>50% of site area in Zone 3b

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

| Flood Zone 1: | 29.82% |
| Flood Zone 2: | 1.93%  |
| Flood Zone 3a:| 13.86% |
| Flood Zone 3b:| 54.39% |

**2b. Surface Water flood risk**

Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 Year</th>
<th>0.19%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 Year</td>
<td>2.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 Year</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</th>
<th>Site within 100m of contaminated land</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old factory or works 85m to N. Old gravel pit 230m to E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"NO access to the highways NO access to the A142 will be permitted - Principal Transport Route Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry ALSO SEE 23/04 + 23/13 + 23/15 + 23/19"

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on 400 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Soham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. A Transport Strategy for Soham would be required should this much development be intended within the town. This would need to model the impact of the combined developments.

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6a. Proximity to public transport</th>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f. Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>No spare places but room for expansion</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f(i) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

| 6h. Proximity to employment sites | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) | B |

#### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</th>
<th>CWS located within site</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification

All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower

C

7e. Public Rights of Way

B – Opportunities to connect to multiple nearby PRoW within the site boundary

B

7f.(i) PROW comments

Footpath 82 runs across the south of the site. Byway 86 runs along the south east corner of the site. Footpath 78 runs along the north west corner of the site. Footpath 76 runs along part of the north east boundary of the site. Ensure that these routes are maintained and provide additional connections across the site.

7f.(ii) Conservation Area

CA within 500m of site

D

7f.(iiii) Listed building

LB within 500m of site

D

7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site

B

7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

Already allocated - same issues as before

7h. Visual Impact

Justification for score:

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

No TPO within 15m of the site

A

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site?

No

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Fifth or more

Form G - Parish Council’s view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

• All / Part lies within Mineral Safeguard Area – if mineral is extracted, it should be put to sustainable use. Policy should refer to this.
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**
- Preferred site

**Main findings and recommendations:**
The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and should be retained.

---

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
<th>ID: 113</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Brook Street, Soham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Soham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref</td>
<td>SOH1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>Brook Street, Soham - part of LP15 site allocation SOH1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints</td>
<td>Likely to include balancing, POS etc and elements of affordable housing and self-build subject to viability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha)</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha)</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Recommended 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
- Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability
- Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
- >50% of site area in Zone 3b

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**
- Flood Zone 1: 30.49%
- Flood Zone 2: 0.58%
- Flood Zone 3a: 14.60%
- Flood Zone 3b: 54.32%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
- Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):**
- 30 Year: 0.25%
- 100 Year: 3.43%
- 1,000 Year: 19.76%
Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
Site within 100m of contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
Old factory or works 85 m to N. Old gravel pit 230m to E.

5b. Local road impact
Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
"NO access to the highways NO access to the A142 will be permitted - Principal Transport Route Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry. ALSO SEE 23/04 + 23/13 + 23/15 + 23/19"
The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on 450 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Soham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. A Transport Strategy for Soham would be required should this much development be intended within the town. This would need to model the impact of the combined developments.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6c. Proximity to shops
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
Spare capacity in some years

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
The school site is currently undersized for this school. The plan is to acquire more playing field land for the school as part of the Eastern Gateway development. Discussions are underway between the CCC and the Town Council regarding a land swap.

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
Limited capacity

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
CWS within 500m of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>B – Opportunities to connect to multiple nearby PRoW within the site boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpath 74 and 78 run along the boundaries of this site. Maintain these routes and create links across the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECDC: Already allocated - same issues as before</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE: 23/13: a part of the site is adjacent to a conservation area. We would refer you to any comments we made during the 2015 Local Plan process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification for score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site? No

Form E - Parish Council site ranking: Fifth or more

Form G - Parish Council’s view:  

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)
Site Address: Land off Brook Street, Soham
Settlement: Soham
LP15 Allocation Ref: SOH1
Site Description: Land off Brook Street, Soham. LP15 site allocation SOH 1
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: Current Use: Agriculture
Proposed Use info: Proposed Use: Housing
Site Area Net (ha): 13.20
Site Area Gross (ha): 22
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 400
b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 3b

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34.36%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>8.25%</td>
<td>57.39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 Year</th>
<th>100 Year</th>
<th>1,000 Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main findings and recommendations:
The site forms part of an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and should be retained.
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
<td>Site within 100m of contaminated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old factory or works 85 m to N. Old gravel pit 230 m to E.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>Major infrastructure required to offset safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;NO access to the highways NO access to the A142 will be permitted - Principal Transport Route Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry ALSO SEE 23/04 + 23/13 + 23/15 + 23/19&quot; The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on 400 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Soham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. A Transport Strategy for Soham would be required should this much development be intended within the town. This would need to model the impact of the combined developments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Access to services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Less than 15 min walk (&lt;1,200m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Less than 15 min walk (&lt;1,200m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>No spare places but room for expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school is currently operating above physical capacity of 402 places capacity of 420 places. The site has potential for a significant expansion and the addition of another 210 places. Using the pupil multipliers 600 houses in the catchment area would yield this number of pupils.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6h. Proximity to employment sites</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Environmental impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td>CWS located within site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key Information

**Current Status:** Superseded by SOH.H1

**Site Name:** Land off Brook Street, Soham

**Parish:** Soham CP

**Site Ref:** Site/23/19

### Site Ref

- County Ref: [391x0]Site/23/19
- Parish Ref: [391x0]Soham CP
- Site Name: [22x783]Land off Brook Street, Soham
- Current Status: [25x412]Superseded by SOH.H1

### Parish Council Support and Rank

- **Parish Council Support and Rank:**
  - FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received
  - Does Parish Council support this site? **No**
  - Form E - Parish Council site ranking: **Fifth or more**
  - Form G - Parish Council's view:

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

- **Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:**

### Table: Comments

| 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers |  |
| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower | C |
| 7e. Public Rights of Way |  |
| 7e.(i) PROW comments |  |
| 7f.(i) Conservation Area | CA within 500m of site | D |
| 7f.(ii). Listed building | LB within 500m of site | D |
| 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument | SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site | B |
| 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset |  |
| 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments | Aliased allocated - same issues as before |  |
| 7h. Visual Impact |  |
| Justification for score: |  |
| Additional criterion 7i. TPOs | No TPO within 15m of the site | A |
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment:  
Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:  
09:00 02/06/2017

Supersedes site submission(s):  

Main findings and recommendations:  
The site offers a suitable, accessible location for development.

Site Information

| Site Type: | FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17 | ID: 421 |
| Settlement: | Soham |
| Site Address: | 117 Mereside, Soham |
| LP15 Allocation Ref: |  |
| Site Description: | Site includes dwelling and garden land, proposed for housing development. |
| Brown/Greenfield: | Greenfield |
| Known Constraints: | **Submission does not indicate number of proposed dwellings. Dwelling figure is therefore calculated from site area and does not reflect site constraints or characteristics.**  
**Net site area estimated** |
| Current Use: | Housing |
| Current Use info: | Dwelling and garden land |
| Proposed Use: | Housing |
| Proposed Use info: |  |
| Site Area Net (ha): | 0.39 |
| Site Area Gross (ha): | 0.39 |
| Indicative no. of dwellings: | a) Submitted / estimated 14  
b) Recommended 11 |

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  
Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone  
>50% of site area in Zone 1

Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  
Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  
Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  
Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk  
Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yrs))

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):  
A
**Minor Criteria**

### 5. Site Suitability

**5a. Proximity to contaminated land**

**5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment**

**5b. Local road impact**

No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

**5c. Strategic Road Network impact**

**5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**

Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

### 6. Access to services

**6a. Proximity to public transport**

Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

**6b. Proximity to medical services**

Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

**6c. Proximity to shops**

Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

**6d. Proximity to Primary School**

Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

**6e. Proximity to Secondary School**

Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

**6f.(i) Available primary school capacity**

No spare places but room for expansion

**6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity**

No spare places but room for expansion

**6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**

The additional sites mean a cumulative allocation in Soham of 1839 dwellings. The pupil yield using the CCC multiplier will be 644 primary aged children. While The Shade can be expanded by 1FE (210) places this level of development will require the provision and site for a new 2FE primary school. There is some development potential at St Andrew’s but not to accommodate 2FE

**6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**

The combined effect of the call for additional sites is to require a further 3.3FE of additional secondary school places (500 places) Coupled with the impacts of sites identified in the earlier round the total number of places required cannot be delivered at Soham VC which already operates at (FE (1350 places) on its current site. Coupled with higher levels of growth elsewhere it would eb the County Council’s intention to conduct a district wide review of secondary school provision on adoption of the new local plan.. A strategic review would need to include the need for a further new secondary school (and site) within East Cambs as a potential option

**6h. Proximity to employment sites**

Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

### 7. Environmental impact

**7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**

CWS within 500m of site

**7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**

**7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers**
Current Status: Site Allocation SOH.H2  
Site Name: Land at 117 Mareside  
Parish: Soham CP  
Site Ref: Site/23/41

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7d. Agricultural land classification</th>
<th>All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>E – No PRoW connection opportunities</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 500m of site</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td>No impact on designated heritage assets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual impact</td>
<td>Some improvement to landscape/townscape or key views</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification for score:  
Loss of present building, replacement with high quality design, would be a visual improvement

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs  
No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site?  
No

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:  
(c) not add this site to the Local Plan

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:  
This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
**Current Status:** Site Allocation SOH.H3  
**Parish:** Soham CP  
**Site Name:** Land Bound by Fordham Road, Staples Lane and Brook Street, Soham  
**Site Ref:** Site/23/34

### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Preferred site

**Date and time of site visit:**

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site has extant planning permission. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and the site should be allocated to ensure this decision is retained.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site Type:</strong></th>
<th>Site with extant planning permission</th>
<th><strong>ID:</strong></th>
<th>245</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Address:</strong></td>
<td>Land Bound by Fordham Road, Staples Lane and Brook Street, Soham, Cambridgeshire, CB7 5A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement:</strong></td>
<td>Soham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LP15 Allocation Ref:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning Perm. Ref:</strong></td>
<td>15/01254/RMM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Description:</strong></td>
<td>Land Bound by Fordham Road, Staples Lane and Brook Street, Soham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brown/Greenfield:</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Known Constraints:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Use:</strong></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Use:</strong></td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicative no. of dwellings:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Area Net (ha):</strong></td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Area Gross (ha):</strong></td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **a) Submitted / estimated** | 96 |
| **b) Recommended** | 87 |

### Major Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>1a. Settlement Hierarchy</strong></th>
<th>Main Settlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1b. Site Availability</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1c. Minerals and Waste assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies** | |
| **1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations** | |

| **2a. Flood zone** | >50% of site area in Zone 1 |
| **Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):** | |
| **Flood Zone 1:** | 100.00% |
| **Flood Zone 2:** | 0.00% |
| **Flood Zone 3a:** | 0.00% |
| **Flood Zone 3b:** | 0.00% |

### Flood Zone

| **Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):** | |
| **Flood Zone 1:** | 100.00% |
| **Flood Zone 2:** | 0.00% |
| **Flood Zone 3a:** | 0.00% |
| **Flood Zone 3b:** | 0.00% |

| **2b. Surface Water flood risk** | Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr)) |
| **Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):** | |
| **30 Year:** | 0.00% |
| **100 Year:** | 0.00% |
| **1,000 Year:** | 0.00% |
## Minor Criteria

### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 2.01km - 5km from the site

### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

### 5b. Local road impact

### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Limited capacity

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

The school is currently operating above physical capacity of 402 places capacity of 420 places. The site has potential for a significant expansion and the addition of another 210 places. Using the pupil multipliers 600 houses in the catchment area would yield this number of pupils.

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 500m of site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification
- Site is not located on agricultural land

#### 7e. Public Rights of Way
- E – No PRoW connection opportunities

7e.(i) PROW comments

---

**Current Status:** Site Allocation SOH.H3  
**Parish:** Soham CP  
**Site Name:** Land Bound by Fordham Road, Staples Lane and Brook Street, Soham

---

**Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):** No

**Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):** No

---

3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
   - Site does not intersect Inner Zone

4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
   - 2.01km - 5km from the site

4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

---

### 5. Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

#### 5b. Local road impact

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

---

### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Limited capacity

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

The school is currently operating above physical capacity of 402 places capacity of 420 places. The site has potential for a significant expansion and the addition of another 210 places. Using the pupil multipliers 600 houses in the catchment area would yield this number of pupils.

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

---

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 500m of site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification
- Site is not located on agricultural land

#### 7e. Public Rights of Way
- E – No PRoW connection opportunities

7e.(i) PROW comments

---

---
### Site Ref: Site/23/34

**Parish:** Soham CP  
**Site Name:** Land Bound by Fordham Road, Staples Lane and Brook Street, Soham  
**Current Status:** Site Allocation SOH.H3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>Site is within CA</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii) Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7h. Visual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justification for score:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Additional criterion 7i. TPOs | No TPO within 15m of the site | A  |

### Parish Council support and rank

- **Does Parish Council support this site?**
- **Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**
- **Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

---

---

---
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

| Overall recommendation from site assessment: |  | Preferred site |
| Date and time of site visit: |  |  |
| Supersedes site submission(s): |  |  |

**Main findings and recommendations:**
The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and should be retained.

### Site Information

| Site Type: | Local Plan 2015 allocated site | ID: 216 |
| Site Address: | Land off Fordham Road, Soham |
| Settlement: | Soham |
| LP15 Allocation Ref: | SOH4 |
| Planning Perm. Ref: |  |
| Site Description: | Land off Fordham Road, Soham |
| Brown/Greenfield: | Greenfield |
| Known Constraints: |  |
| Current Use: | Agriculture |
| Proposed Use: | Housing |
| Site Area Net (ha): | 2.89 |
| Site Area Gross (ha): | 3.85 |
| Indicative no. of dwellings: | a) Submitted / estimated 104  b) Recommended 90 |

### Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
- Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

This site lies partly within the Mineral Safeguarding Area for Sand and Gravel, designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Core Strategy and shown on Proposals Map C (2011). The overarching policy is CS26 Mineral Safeguarding Areas which sets out criteria which must be met in order for development to be permitted. However, in this instance the proposed site is in close proximity to existing development. It is unlikely to be an economic resource therefore no objections would be raised in this context to this site being allocated.

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
- CS26

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
- >50% of site area in Zone 1

| Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening): |
| Flood Zone 1: | 100.00% |
| Flood Zone 2: | 0.00% |
| Flood Zone 3a: | 0.00% |
| Flood Zone 3b: | 0.00% |

2b. Surface Water flood risk
- Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

| Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFIMISW): |
|  | - |
Site Name: Existing housing allocation, land off Fordham Road

Minor Criteria

3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
   Site does not intersect Inner Zone

4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
   2.01km - 5km from the site

4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
   Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on 104 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Soham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Soham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. A Transport Strategy for Soham would be required should this much development be intended within the town. This would need to model the impact of the combined developments.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
   Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
   Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops
   Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
   Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
   Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
   No spare places but room for expansion

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
   Limited capacity

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

The school is currently operating above physical capcity of 402 places capacity of 420 places. The site has potential for a significant expansion and the addition of another 210 places. Using the pupil multipliers 600 houses in the catchment area would yield this number of pupils.

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites
   Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
   CWS within 500m of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Parish Council support and rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7d. Agricultural land classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Parish Council support and rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7e. Public Rights of Way

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Parish Council support and rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f.(i) PROW comments

Byway 92 crosses the site. Maintain this connection the route may need diverting for development to take place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Parish Council support and rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f.(ii) Conservation Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Parish Council support and rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA within 500.1 – 1000m of site</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f.(iii) Listed building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Parish Council support and rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f.(iv) Scheduled Ancient Monument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Parish Council support and rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f.(v) Archaeological asset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Parish Council support and rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

Already allocated - same issues as before

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Parish Council support and rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7h. Visual Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Parish Council support and rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Justification for score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Parish Council support and rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Parish Council support and rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No TPO within 15m of the site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parish Council support and rank

**Does Parish Council support this site?**

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council's view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan–Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

**Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Parish Council support and rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Site Name:** Existing housing allocation, land off Fordham Road

**Site Ref:** Site/23/23

**Parish:** Soham CP

**Current Status:** Site Allocation SOH.H4
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**
- Preferred site

**Date and time of site visit:**

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and should be retained.

---

**Site Information**

**Site Type:** New site submission (Form B)  
**ID:** 108

**Site Address:** Land south of Blackberry Lane

**Settlement:** Soham

**LP15 Allocation Ref:** SOH5  
**Planning Perm. Ref:**

**Site Description:** Land south of Blackberry Lane

**Brown/Greenfield:** Greenfield

**Known Constraints:** Site flanked by mature hedgerows. Close to Soham Wet Horse Fen SSSI. Public footpath crosses the site on a NE-SW alignment. Orbit Homes (2020) Ltd are currently preparing a planning application for residential development, with pre-application advice request submitted.

**Current Use:** Agriculture  
**Proposed Use:** Housing

**Current Use info:**

**Proposed Use info:**

**Site Area Net (ha):** 5.20  
**Site Area Gross (ha):** 6.93

**Indicative no. of dwellings:**
- a) Submitted / estimated: 178
- b) Recommended: 130

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  
- Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability  
- Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment  

This site lies within the Mineral Safeguarding Area for Sand and Gravel, designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Core Strategy and shown on Proposals Map C (2011). The overarching policy is CS26 Mineral Safeguarding Areas which sets out criteria which must be met in order for development to be permitted. However, in this instance the proposed site is in close proximity to existing development. It is unlikely to be an economic resource therefore no objections would be raised in this context to this site being allocated.

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies  
- CS26

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone  
- >50% of site area in Zone 1

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

- Flood Zone 1: 84.38%
- Flood Zone 2: 0.43%
- Flood Zone 3a: 15.04%
- Flood Zone 3b: 0.14%
Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land

Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact

Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

"NO direct access to the A142 will be permitted - Principal Transport Route Highways mitigations to Regal Lane and Brook Street would be required Potential Visibility Splay issues ALSO SEE 23/06 + 23/08 + 23/20"

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on 178 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Soham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. A Transport Strategy for Soham would be required should this much development be intended within the town. This would need to model the impact of the combined developments.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services

Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

6c. Proximity to shops

Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School

Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School

Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

No spare places but room for expansion

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

Limited capacity

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

The school is currently operating above physical capacity of 402 places capacity of 420 places. The site has potential for a significant expansion and the addition of another 210 places. Using the pupil multipliers 600 houses in the catchment area would yield this number of pupils.

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites

Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

CWS within 500m of site
**Current Status:** Site Allocation SOH.H5  
**Site Name:** Land south of Blackberry Lane  
**Parish:** Soham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/23/08

### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

---

### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

---

### 7d. Agricultural land classification
All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower  

### 7e. Public Rights of Way
C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary  

### 7f.(i) PROW comments
Footpath 93 crosses the site. Byway 91 runs along the south and west of the site. Byway 90 runs between this site and Site 23/20 which is in the north of the site. Maintain these links and supplement them with additional links for pedestrian, cycle and equestrian use.

7f.(ii) Conservation Area
CA within 500m of site  

7f.(ii) Listed building
LB within 500m of site  

7f.(ii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site  

7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
Already allocated - same issues as before

### 7h. Visual Impact

**Justification for score:**

---

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
No TPO within 15m of the site

**Parish Council support and rank**

- **Does Parish Council support this site?** No
- **Form E - Parish Council site ranking:** Fifth or more
- **Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- All / Part lies within Mineral Safeguard Area – if mineral is extracted, it should be put to sustainable use. Policy should refer to this.
- Object to improve crossing of A142 – this could increase dog walkers etc, and thereby impact on SSSI.
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**
- Preferred site

**Date and time of site visit:**

**Supersedes site submission(s)** Site/23/06

**Main findings and recommendations:**
- The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and should be retained.

---

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
<th>ID:</th>
<th>120</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Land north of Blackberry Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Soham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref</td>
<td>SOH6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>Land north of Blackberry Lane. Site allocated in LP2015 as SOH6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha)</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Recommended</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
- Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment
- This site lies within the Mineral Safeguarding Area for Sand and Gravel, designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Core Strategy and shown on Proposals Map C (2011). The overarching policy is CS26 Mineral Safeguarding Areas which sets out criteria which must be met in order for development to be permitted. However, in this instance the proposed site is in close proximity to existing development. It is unlikely to be an economic resource therefore no objections would be raised in this context to this site being allocated.

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
- CS26

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
- Multiple zones - see SFRA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 1: 39.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 2: 0.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3a: 23.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3b: 36.02%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk
- Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW): -
### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to Internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 2.01km - 5km from the site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

#### 5. Site Suitability

##### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site within 100m of contaminated land

##### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
- Old quarry 85m to N.

##### 5b. Local road impact
- Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

##### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

##### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

SEE 23/06 + 23/08 + 23/20

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on 100 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Soham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. A Transport Strategy for Soham would be required should this much development be intended within the town. This would need to model the impact of the combined developments.

#### 6. Access to services

##### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

##### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

##### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

##### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

##### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

##### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Limited capacity

##### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

The school is currently operating above physical capacity of 402 places capacity of 420 places. The site has potential for a significant expansion and the addition of another 210 places. Using the pupil multipliers 600 houses in the catchment area would yield this number of pupils.

##### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

##### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

#### 7. Environmental impact

##### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS located within site

##### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
### Parish Council support and rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td>Fifth or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council's view:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

**Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:**

- Object to improve crossing of A142 – this could increase dog walkers etc, and thereby impact on SSSI.
Overall recommendation from site assessment:

Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:
11:00 11 Aug 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:

The western parcel of land is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and should be retained.

However, the eastern land parcel should be rejected on the basis that highway access is unlikely to be achievable and development would be an intrusion into the countryside as it is located beyond the A142.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  ID: 106

Site Address: Land north of Blackberry Lane, Soham, Cambridgeshire

Settlement: Soham

LP15 Allocation Ref: SOH6  Planning Perm. Ref: 

Site Description: Land north of Blackberry Lane, Soham

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints: The southern part of the site is owned by WJ Mason Trust. Northern part owned by BJ & P Audus, whose agent is Mr S Pott from Bury St Edmunds. Working together to bring site forward for development. Part of site available for public open space/amenity. CLD to be discussed. Delivery 2017/18 onward.

Current Use: Agriculture  Proposed Use: Housing

Current Use info:

Proposed Use info:

Site Area Net (ha): 3.30  Site Area Gross (ha): 4.4

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 100  b) Recommended 100

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability  Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

This site lies on the very edge of the Mineral Safeguarding Area for Sand and Gravel, designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Core Strategy and shown on Proposals Map C (2011). The overarching policy is CS26 Mineral Safeguarding Areas which sets out criteria which must be met in order for development to be permitted. However, in this instance as only a tiny part of the site lies in the Mineral Safeguarding Area and therefore no objections would be raised in this context to this site being allocated.

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies  CS26

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone  >50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

Flood Zone 1: 56.94%  Flood Zone 2: 0.64%  Flood Zone 3a: 16.75%  Flood Zone 3b: 25.68%
Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
Site located within 100m of contaminated land

5a(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
Old quarry 85m to N.

5b. Local road impact
Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
"No direct access on to the A142 will be permitted - Principal Transport Route. ALSO SEE 23/06 + 23/08 + 23/20 EAST SITE AREA - SCORE E East area E due to insurmountable safety issues with the visibility in this area with the development. WEST SITE AREA SCORE D - West site area would be D as highways improvements and mitigating highways infrastructure as it is currently unsuitable. There is poor visibility with Green Hill and Brook Street and major mitigations to the highways infrastructure would be required Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry."

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

6c. Proximity to shops
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

6f(i) Available primary school capacity
No spare places but room for expansion

6f(ii) Available secondary school capacity
Limited capacity

6g(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
The school is currently operating above physical capacity of 402 places capacity of 420 places. The site has potential for a significant expansion and the addition of another 210 places. Using the pupil multipliers 600 houses in the catchment area would yield this number of pupils.

6g(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
CWS located within site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
| 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers                   |  |
| 7d. Agricultural land classification             | All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower | C |
| 7e. Public Rights of Way                         | D – Opportunities to connect to nearby PROWs outside the site boundary | D |
| 7f.(i) PROW comments                             | Footpath90 and Byway 90 run around the east and south boundaries of this site. Ensure that this link is maintained. |
| 7f.(i) Conservation Area                        | CA within 500m of site | D |
| 7f.(ii). Listed building                         | LB within 500.1 – 1000m of site | C |
| 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument             | SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site | B |
| 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset                     |  |
| 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments              | ECDC: Already allocated - same issues as before |
|                                                    | HE: 23/06: affecting setting of a listed building. We would refer you to any comments we made during the 2015 Local Plan process. |
| 7h. Visual Impact                                | Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive | D |
| Justification for score:                         | A142 forms natural barrier to setting of Soham. |
| Additional criterion 7l. TPOs                    | TPO tree on site | C |

**Parish Council support and rank**

- Does Parish Council support this site? No
- Form E - Parish Council site ranking: Fifth or more
- Form G - Parish Council’s view: 

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: 
Preferred site

Date and time of site visit: 

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and should be retained.

Site Information

Site Type: Local Plan 2015 allocated site
Site Address: Land adjacent to the cemetery, Fordham Road, Soham
Settlement: Soham
LP15 Allocation Ref: SOH7
Planning Perm. Ref: 15/01491/FUM
Site Description: Existing housing allocation, land adjacent to the cemetery
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints:
Current Use: Agriculture
Proposed Use: Housing
Proposed Use info:
Site Area Net (ha): 3.60
Site Area Gross (ha): 4.8
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 130
b) Recommended 126

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment
This site lies partly within the Mineral Safeguarding Area for Sand and Gravel, designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Core Strategy and shown on Proposals Map C (2011). The overarching policy is CS26 Mineral Safeguarding Areas which sets out criteria which must be met in order for development to be permitted. However, in this instance the proposed site is in close proximity to existing development. It is unlikely to be an economic resource therefore no objections would be raised in this context to this site being allocated.

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
CS26

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone 1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3a</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3b</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
Site Name: Existing housing allocation, land adjacent to the cemetery

Current Status: Site Allocation SOH.H7
Parish: Soham CP
Site Ref: Site/23/24

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

**5a. Proximity to contaminated land**
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

**5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment**
- Adjacent to cemetery.

**5b. Local road impact**
- No objections with minor mitigation measures

**5c. Strategic Road Network impact**

**5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**
- "Has Highways frontage Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry"

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on 130 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Soham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Soham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. A Transport Strategy for Soham would be required should this much development be intended within the town. This would need to model the impact of the combined developments.

#### 6. Access to services

**6a. Proximity to public transport**
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

**6b. Proximity to medical services**
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

**6c. Proximity to shops**
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

**6d. Proximity to Primary School**
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

**6e. Proximity to Secondary School**
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

**6f.(i) Available primary school capacity**
- No spare places but room for expansion

**6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity**
- Limited capacity

**6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**

The school is currently operating above physical capcity of 402 places capacity of 420 places. The site has potential for a significant expansion and the addition of another 210 places. Using the pupil multipliers 600 houses in the catchment area would yield this number of pupils.

**6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

**6h. Proximity to employment sites**
- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

#### 7. Environmental impact

**7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**
- CWS within 500m of site
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e.(i) PROW comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a link from Byway 104 to the west of the site and the Fordham Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already allocated - same issues as before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification for score:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional criterion 7l. TPOs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

- **Does Parish Council support this site?**

- **Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

- **Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- All / Part lies within Mineral Safeguard Area – if mineral is extracted, it should be put to sustainable use. Policy should refer to this.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s) Site/23/09; Site/23/10; Site/23/26

Main findings and recommendations:
The site has extant planning permission and should be allocated to retain this planning decision.

Site Information

Site Type: Site with extant planning permission

Site Address: 2 The Shade, Soham, Cambridgeshire

Settlement: Soham

LP15 Allocation Ref: ID: 462

Planning Perm. Ref: 16/00535/FUM

Site Description: Erection of 88 dwellings, garages, parking, roads & associated site works

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints:

Current Use: Agriculture

Proposed Use: Housing

Proposed Use info:

Site Area Net (ha): 2.83

Site Area Gross (ha): 3.77

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 88 b) Recommended 88

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

Flood Zone 1: 

Flood Zone 2: 

Flood Zone 3a: 

Flood Zone 3b: 

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

30 Year: 

100 Year: 

1,000 Year: 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Site Suitability</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Access to services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6h. Proximity to employment sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Environmental impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e.(i) PROW comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Status: Site Allocation SOH.H8
Site Name: Land Parcel East Of 2 The Shade
Parish: Soham CP
Site Ref: Site/23/46

Parish Council support and rank
Does Parish Council support this site?
Form E - Parish Council site ranking:
Form G - Parish Council's view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received
Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit: 15:45 28 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
Site has benefit of consent, and is therefore considered appropriate for allocation.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  ID: 110
Site Address: The Shade, Soham
Settlement: Soham

LP15 Allocation Ref: SOH8  Planning Perm. Ref:
Site Description: Land adjacent to The Shade, Soham formerly allocated in the LP15 as site SOH 8.
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: No known constraints. Agent indicates that ecology, trees, landscaping, drainage and highways reports have been obtained and indicate development is achievable.

Current Use: Agriculture  Proposed Use: Housing
Current Use info: Vacant
Proposed Use info:

Site Area Net (ha): 1.36  Site Area Gross (ha): 1.6
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 45  b) Recommended 45

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  Main Settlement
1b. Site Availability  Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment
This site lies within the Mineral Safeguarding Area for Sand and Gravel, designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Core Strategy and shown on Proposals Map C (2011). The overarching policy is CS26 Mineral Safeguarding Areas which sets out criteria which must be met in order for development to be permitted. However, in this instance the proposed site is in close proximity to existing development. It is unlikely to be an economic resource therefore no objections would be raised in this context to this site being allocated.

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies  CS26
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone  >50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk  Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</th>
<th>Site located more than 250m from contaminated land</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Appears to ONLY have access to highway off North Field Road. Mitigations measures and highways upgrades and improvements to the surrounding junctions and Northfirls Road will be required. Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.*

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Statement based on 45 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. Individually this site may not generate severe impact within Soham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Soham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. A Transport Strategy for Soham would be required should this much development be intended within the town. This would need to model the impact of the combined developments.

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6a. Proximity to public transport</th>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Less than 20 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>Spare capacity in every year</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This new school was designed ot be expanded from 1FE to 2FE (210 additional places) to take account of future development in the Northern gateway.

#### 7. Environmental impact

| 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites | CWS within 500m of site | D |
Site Ref: Site/23/10

Parish: Soham CP

Site Name: Land adjacent to The Shade, Soham

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification
All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

7e. Public Rights of Way
B – Opportunities to connect to multiple nearby PRoW within the site boundary

7e.(i) PROW comments
Footpath 25 runs across the site from south to north and connects to Byway 21 in site 23/26 to the north. Footpath 23 runs across the top of the site. Ensure these links are maintained.

7f.(i) Conservation Area
CA within 500m of site

7f.(ii). Listed building
LB within 500m of site

7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
SAM more than 2km from site

7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
Already allocated - same issues as before

7h. Visual Impact
Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views

Justification for score:

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
No TPO within 15m of the site

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site? No

Form E - Parish Council site ranking: Fifth or more

Form G - Parish Council’s view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

• All / Part lies within Mineral Safeguard Area – if mineral is extracted, it should be put to sustainable use. Policy should refer to this.
Current Status: Superseded by SOH.H8
Site Name: Land adjacent to The Shade, Soham
Parish: Soham CP
Site Ref: Site/23/09

Site Information
Site Type: New site submission (Form B)
Site Address: Land adjacent to The Shade, Soham
Settlement: Soham
LP15 Allocation Ref: SOH9
Planning Perm. Ref: 
Site Description: Land adjacent to The Shade, Soham - part of SOH 9 employment allocation.
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: No known constraints. Agent indicates that ecology, trees, landscaping, drainage and highways reports have been obtained and indicate development is achievable.
Current Use: Agriculture
Current Use info: Vacant land
Proposed Use info: 
Proposed Use: Housing
Site Area Net (ha): 1.45
Site Area Gross (ha): 1.7
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 45
b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria
1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Main Settlement
A

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1

Flood Zone 1: 100.00% Flood Zone 2: 0.00% Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%):
30 Year: 1.36% 100 Year: 1.06% 1,000 Year: 8.18%

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:
15:30 28 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
Site has benefit of consent, and is therefore considered appropriate for allocation.

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit: 15:30 28 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
Site has benefit of consent, and is therefore considered appropriate for allocation.
**Current Status:** Superseded by SOH.H8  
**Parish:** Soham CP  
**Site Name:** Land adjacent to The Shade, Soham  
**Site Ref:** Site/23/09

### Minor Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation</td>
<td>Site does not intersect Inner Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites</td>
<td>2.01km - 5km from the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
<td>Site located more than 250m from contaminated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land profesional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Access off The Shades Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry*

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Statement based on 45 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. Individually this site may not generate severe impact within Soham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Soham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. A Transport Strategy for Soham would be required should this much development be intended within the town. This would need to model the impact of the combined developments.

### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Less than 20 min walk (&lt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>Spare capacity in every year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This new school was designed to be expanded from 1FE to 2FE (210 additional places) to take account of future development in the Northern gateway.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6h. Proximity to employment sites</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td>CWS within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Site Ref: Site/23/09
Parish: Soham CP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name: Land adjacent to The Shade, Soham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Status: Superseded by SOH.H8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish Council support and rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td>Second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council's view:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7d. Agricultural land classification</th>
<th>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Already allocated - same issues as before

| 7h. Visual Impact | Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views | C |

Justification for score:
Relatively enclosed. Rather undescriptive site.

| Additional criterion 7i. TPOs | No TPO within 15m of the site | A |
### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

- **Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Preferred site
- **Date and time of site visit:** 09:40 11 Aug 2016
- **Supersedes site submission(s):**

### Main findings and recommendations:

The site offers a suitable location for development with few constraints, and should therefore be allocated for housing development.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
<th>ID: 103</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Land south of Cherry Tree Lane, Soham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Soham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>Land south of Cherry Tree Lane, Soham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints</td>
<td>New/improved access required. 400 units over sites /02 &amp; /03. Assumed 250/150 split.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 150 b) Recommended 200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Criteria

**1a. Settlement Hierarchy**
- Main Settlement

**1b. Site Availability**
- Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

**1c. Minerals and Waste assessment**

**1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies**

**1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations**

**2a. Flood zone**

- >50% of site area in Zone 1

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone 1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3a</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3b</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2b. Surface Water flood risk**

- Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Year</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 Year</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Status: Site Allocation SOH.H9  
Site Name: Land south of Cherry Tree Lane, Soham  
Parish: Soham CP  
Site Ref: Site/23/03

| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No | A |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No | B |

### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 2.01 km - 5 km from the site

### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

#### Minor Criteria

### 5. Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

#### 5b. Local road impact
- No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

"Access off Orchard Row OR road to the south of the site if mitigations and highways upgrades and improvements to the junctions and access on to Military Road will be required. Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry."

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on 150 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Soham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. A Transport Strategy for Soham would be required should this much development be intended within the town. This would need to model the impact of the combined developments.

### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

#### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

The school is currently operating above physical capcity of 402 places capacity of 420 places. The site has potential for a significant expansion and the addition of another 210 places. Using the pupil multipliers 600 houses in the catchment area would yield this number of pupils.

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Limited capacity

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 500m of site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PROW within the site boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpath 105 runs through the west side of the site. This path may need diverting to allow development to take place. Provide a link from this FP to Orchard Row and Fordham Road and also to Site23/11 to the south.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECDC: Conservation area to the north - limited heritage impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/03: affecting setting of conservation area and listed buildings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
<td>Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification for score:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited impact, though pleasant views of countryside.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional criterion 7i. TPOs</td>
<td>No TPO within 15m of the site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

| Does Parish Council support this site? | Yes |
| Form E - Parish Council site ranking: | Fifth or more |
| Form G - Parish Council's view: |  |

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

• All / Part lies within Mineral Safeguard Area – if mineral is extracted, it should be put to sustainable use. Policy should refer to this.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment:
Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s) Site/23/01

Main findings and recommendations:
The site offers an accessible site which is available for development. This submission provides an amended boundary of Site/23/01 to omit the area potentially affected by odour from the water recycling centre, and to enable suitable vehicular access.

Site Information

Site Type: Strategic Planning Amended Submission
ID: 515

Site Address: South west of the Shade, Soham, CB7 5GP

Settlement: Soham

LP15 Allocation Ref: Site Area Net (ha): 6.63
Site Area Gross (ha): 8.83

Planning Perm. Ref: Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

Site Description: South west of the Shade, Soham

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints: Proximity to Water Recycling Centre

Current Use: Agriculture
Proposed Use: Housing

Current Use info:

Proposed Use info:

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 100
b) Recommended 100

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1:
Flood Zone 2:
Flood Zone 3a:
Flood Zone 3b:

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
30 Year: 100 Year: 1,000 Year:
### Minor Criteria

**5. Site Suitability**

- **5a. Proximity to contaminated land**
- **5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment**
- **5b. Local road impact**
- **5c. Strategic Road Network impact**
- **5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**

**6. Access to services**

- **6a. Proximity to public transport**
- **6b. Proximity to medical services**
- **6c. Proximity to shops**
- **6d. Proximity to Primary School**
- **6e. Proximity to Secondary School**
- **6f.(i) Available primary school capacity**
- **6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**
- **6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity**
- **6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**
- **6h. Proximity to employment sites**

**7. Environmental impact**

- **7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**
- **7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**
- **7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers**
- **7d. Agricultural land classification**
- **7e. Public Rights of Way**
- **7e.(i) PROW comments**
### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

- **Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Preferred site
- **Date and time of site visit:** 15:20 28 July 2016
- **Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site offers an accessible site which is available for development. Part of the site is affected by odour from the water recycling centre. The draft site allocation boundary should be amended to reflect this constraint.

---

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>South west of the Shade, Soham, CB7 5GP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Soham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>South west of the Shade, Soham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha)</td>
<td>6.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha)</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Recommended 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

- **1a. Settlement Hierarchy**
  - Main Settlement
- **1b. Site Availability**
  - Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)
- **1c. Minerals and Waste assessment**

This site lies wholly within the Safeguarding Area for the Soham Waste Water Treatment Works (Policy W7AK) designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012). The overarching policy for this designation is Policy CS31 of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011). This policy places a presumption against allowing development which would be occupied by people; and where new development is proposed an odour assessment report should accompany any planning application. Permission should only be granted when it has been demonstrated that the proposed development would not be adversely affected by the continued operation of the existing waste water treatment works. Consideration must be given to these policies in the interests of ensuring deliverability.

- **1c(i) Site affected by M+W Policies**
  - W7AK
- **1c(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations**
  - W7AK

**2a. Flood zone**

>50% of site area in Zone 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone 1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3a</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3b</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Current Status:** Superseded by SOH.H10

**Parish:** Soham CP

**Site Name:** Land off Kingfisher Drive

**Site Ref:** Site/23/01

---

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation

- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites

- 2.01km - 5km from the site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

- 

---

#### 5. Site Suitability

##### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land

- Site within 50m of contaminated land

##### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

- Sewage works to NW boundary. Old factory or works 50m to S. At the current time Anglian Water would look to enforce the presumption against the development within this area until it is confirmed what mitigation will be put in place against agreed odour evidence. Anglian Water may then move to mitigation and/or site layout restrictions/alterations in policy wording. (Advice from AW 05/10/16)

##### 5b. Local road impact

- Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

##### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

- 

##### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

- "Vast mitigation and third party land purchases would be required to upgrade Broad piece and access to town for ALL road users

Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry"

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on 260 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines and demonstrate how the site can be made accessible on foot, by cycle and by public transport together with identifying any remaining off-site highway implications and required mitigation. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Soham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Soham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. A Transport Strategy for Soham would be required should this much development be intended within the town. This would need to model the impact of the combined developments.

---

### 6. Access to services

##### 6a. Proximity to public transport

- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6b. Proximity to medical services

- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

##### 6c. Proximity to shops

- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

##### 6d. Proximity to Primary School

- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School

- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

- Spare capacity in every year

##### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

- Limited capacity

##### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

- This new school was designed to be expanded from 1FE to 2FE (210 additional places) to take account of future development in the Northern gateway.

##### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

- 

---
The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

### 6h. Proximity to employment sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>CWS within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7e. Public Rights of Way

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PROW within the site boundary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7f. PROW comments

Footpath 17 runs to the north of the site. Provide links for pedestrians between this footpath and Broad Piece to the south of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>CA within 500.1 – 1000m of site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7f.(ii). Listed building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

#### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

No heritage impact

#### 7h. Visual Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification for score:**

Clearly open countryside. Site forms agricultural setting of Soham, though not as much as Site/23/07.

#### Additional criterion 7h. TPOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>No TPO within 15m of the site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parish Council support and rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fifth or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Form G - Parish Council's view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Site should have its own policy
- Site is close to Soham Water Recycling Centre. Buffer will need agreeing. Detailed policy wording suggested (Anglian Water)
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site
Date and time of site visit: 11:00 11 Aug 16
Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site offers a suitable location for development with few constraints, and should therefore be allocated for housing development.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  ID: 114
Site Address: Northfield Road, Soham
Settlement: Soham
LP15 Allocation Ref:  Planning Perm. Ref: 
Site Description: Northfield Road, Soham
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: Application to be submitted later this year. Highway improvements to A142 junction.
Current Use: Agriculture  Proposed Use: Housing
Current Use info:
Proposed Use info:
Site Area Net (ha): 5.70  Site Area Gross (ha): 7.6
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 200  b) Recommended 170

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  Main Settlement
1b. Site Availability  Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

This site lies within the Mineral Safeguarding Area for Sand and Gravel, designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Core Strategy and shown on Proposals Map C (2011). The overarching policy is CS26 Mineral Safeguarding Areas which sets out criteria which must be met in order for development to be permitted. However, in this instance the proposed site is in close proximity to existing development. It is unlikely to be an economic resource therefore no objections would be raised in this context to this site being allocated.

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies  CS26
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone >50% of site area in Zone 1
Percent (% of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk  Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA
Percent (% of site area at risk (uFMISW): -
**Site Name:** Northfield Road, Soham

**Current Status:** Site Allocation SOH.H11

**Minor Criteria**

### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 2.01km - 5km from the site

### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

### 5. Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

#### 5b. Local road impact
- Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

"NO access to the A142 will be permitted - Principal Transport Route Major mitigation measures will be required at the junction of the A142 and Northfield Road and highways improvements to Northfield Road will be required. Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry."

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on 200 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines and demonstrate how the site can be made accessible on foot, by cycle and by public transport together with identifying any remaining off-site highway implications and required mitigation. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Soham the cumulative impact could be significant.

Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. A Transport Strategy for Soham would be required should this much development be intended within the town. This would need to model the impact of the combined developments.

### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- Spare capacity in every year

#### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

This new school was designed to be expanded from 1FE to 2FE (210 additional places) to take account of future development in the Northern gateway.

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Limited capacity

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

### 7. Environmental impact
**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site has extant planning permission. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and the site should be allocated to ensure this decision is retained.

Site Information

Site Type: Site with extant planning permission
Site Address: Land to rear of 7 & 7A TOWNSEND, SOHAM, CAMBRIDGESHIRE, CB7 5DB
Settlement: Soham

LP15 Allocation Ref: ID: 244
Planning Perm. Ref: 12/00923/FUM

Site Description: Land to rear of 7 & 7A TOWNSEND, SOHAM
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints:

Current Use: Employment
Proposed Use: Housing

Site Area Net (ha): 0.45
Site Area Gross (ha): 0.53

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 17 b) Recommended 17

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 Year</th>
<th>100 Year</th>
<th>1,000 Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Minor Criteria

### 5. Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land

- **Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):** No
- **Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):** No

#### 5b. Proximity to site does not intersect Inner Zone

- **Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):** No

#### 5c. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites

- **Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):** No

#### 5d. Proximity to European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

- **Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):** No

### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport

- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services

- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops

- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School

- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School

- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

#### 6f(i). Available primary school capacity

- Spare capacity in every year

#### 6f(ii). Available secondary school capacity

- Limited capacity

#### 6g. Primary education impacts - professional assessment

- This new school was designed to be expanded from 1FE to 2FE (210 additional places) to take account of future development in the Northern gateway.

#### 6g. Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

- The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites

- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

- CWS within 500m of site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers
| 7d. Agricultural land classification | Site is not located on agricultural land | A |
| 7e. Public Rights of Way | E – No PRoW connection opportunities | E |
| 7f.(i) PROW comments | | |
| 7f.(i) Conservation Area | CA within 500m of site | D |
| 7f.(ii) Listed building | LB within 500m of site | D |
| 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument | SAM more than 2km from site | A |
| 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset | | |
| 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments | n/a | |
| 7h. Visual impact | | |
| Justification for score: | | |
| Additional criterion 7i. TPOs | No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site? [ ]

Form E - Parish Council site ranking: [ ]

Form G - Parish Council’s view: [ ]

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation: 

[Blank space]
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Main findings and recommendations:
The site has extant planning permission. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and the site should be allocated to ensure this decision is retained.

Site Information

Site Type: Site with extant planning permission
Site Address: Soham Health Centre, Pratt Street, Soham
Settlement: Soham
LP15 Allocation Ref: Site with extant planning permission
Planning Perm. Ref: 16/00373/FUM
Site Description: Construction of 10 two storey residential units at Soham Health Centre, Pratt Street
Brown/Greenfield: Brownfield
Known Constraints:
Current Use: Community facility
Proposed Use: Housing
Proposed Use info:
Site Area Net (ha): 0.27
Site Area Gross (ha): 0.27
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated: 10
b) Recommended: 10

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Main Settlement
1b. Site Availability
Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment
1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

1d. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 Year</th>
<th>100 Year</th>
<th>1,000 Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.92%</td>
<td>19.76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

#### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport

6b. Proximity to medical services

6c. Proximity to shops

6d. Proximity to Primary School

6e. Proximity to Secondary School

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

6h. Proximity to employment sites

#### 7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification

7e. Public Rights of Way

7e.(i) PROW comments
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii) Listed building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification for score:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional criterion 7i. TPOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

- **Does Parish Council support this site?**

- **Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

- **Form G - Parish Council's view:**

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

[Blank space for comments]
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment:

Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:

The site has extant planning permission. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and the site should be allocated to ensure this decision is retained.

Site Information

Site Type: Site with extant planning permission

Site Address: 90 Paddock Street, Soham, Ely Cambridgeshire

Settlement: Soham

LP15 Allocation Ref: ID: 250

Planning Perm. Ref: 15/00748/FUM

Site Description: 90 Paddock Street, Soham

Brown/Greenfield: Mixed

Known Constraints: Erection of 10 dwellings following the demolition of 90 Paddock Street. Creation of new vehicular access. Alterations and extensions to front boundary wall.

Current Use: Housing

Proposed Use: Housing

Current Use info:

Proposed Use info:

Site Area Net (ha): 0.18

Site Area Gross (ha): 0.178

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 10

b) Recommended 10

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

A

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

A

2a. Flood zone

>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

A

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yrr))

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

30 Year: 0.00%  100 Year: 0.00%  1,000 Year: 0.33%

A
Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6c. Proximity to shops

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School

Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

Spare capacity in some years

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

Limited capacity

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

The school site is currently undersized for this school. The plan is to acquire more playing field land for the school as part of the Eastern Gateway development. Discussions are underway between the CCC and the Town Council regarding a land swap.

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

CWS within 500m of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification

Site is not located on agricultural land

7e. Public Rights of Way

E – No PRoW connection opportunities

7e.(i) PROW comments
### Site Name:
90 Paddock Street, Soham

### Current Status:
Site Allocation SOH.H14

### Parish:
Soham CP

### Site Ref:
Site/23/35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>Site is within CA</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7h. Visual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justification for score:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Additional criterion 7f. TPOs | No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

### Parish Council support and rank

- **Does Parish Council support this site?**

- **Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

- **Form G - Parish Council's view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**
- Preferred site

**Date and time of site visit:**

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**
The site has extant planning permission and should be allocated to retain this planning decision.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site Type:</strong></th>
<th>Site with extant planning permission</th>
<th><strong>ID:</strong></th>
<th>465</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Address:</strong></td>
<td>Grassed Area Opposite 2 The Shade Soham Cambridgeshire CB7 5DE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement:</strong></td>
<td>Soham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LP15 Allocation Ref:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning Perm. Ref:</strong></td>
<td>16/01364/F3M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Description:</strong></td>
<td>The construction of 13 dwellings, including associated external works and parking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brown/Greenfield:</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Known Constraints:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Use:</strong></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Use:</strong></td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Use info:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Use info:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Area Net (ha):</strong></td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Area Gross (ha):</strong></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicative no. of dwellings:</strong></td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 13 b) Recommended 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
- Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 1:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Site Ref:** Site/23/47  
**Parish:** Soham CP  
**Site Name:** Grassed Area Opposite 2 The Shade  
**Current Status:** Site Allocation SOH.H15

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 5. Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 5b. Local road impact

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 6c. Proximity to shops

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 7e. Public Rights of Way

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 7e.(i) PROW comments

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Site Ref: Site/23/47  
### Site Name: Grassed Area Opposite 2 The Shade

#### Current Status: Site Allocation SOH.H15
#### Parish: Soham CP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

|  
|  

#### 7h. Visual Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification for score:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

|  
|  

---

## Parish Council support and rank

### Does Parish Council support this site?

|  
|  

### Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

|  
|  

### Form G - Parish Council's view:

|  
|  

## FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

|  
|  

**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**
- Preferred site

**Main findings and recommendations:**
The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation for mixed-use development (the eastern gateway). The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process. Due to the scale of the site, development should be supported by the provision of infrastructure and community facilities.

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>Local Plan 2015 allocated site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Soham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Soham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>Site/23/12; Site/23/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Eastern Gateway site. Supersedes site submissions Site/23/12 and Site/23/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>20.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha)</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a. Settlement Hierarchy</th>
<th>Main Settlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b. Site Availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Minerals and Waste assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2a. Flood zone</th>
<th>&gt;50% of site area in Zone 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

| Flood Zone 1 | 66.68% |
| Flood Zone 2 | 3.68%  |
| Flood Zone 3a| 9.64%  |
| Flood Zone 3b| 0.00%  |

**2b. Surface Water flood risk**
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year: 0.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minor Criteria

**5. Site Suitability**

- **5a. Proximity to contaminated land**
  - 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

- **5b. Local road impact**

- **5c. Strategic Road Network impact**

- **5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**

**6. Access to services**

- **6a. Proximity to public transport**

- **6b. Proximity to medical services**

- **6c. Proximity to shops**

- **6d. Proximity to Primary School**

- **6e. Proximity to Secondary School**

- **6f.(i) Available primary school capacity**

- **6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**

- **6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity**

- **6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**

- **6h. Proximity to employment sites**

**7. Environmental impact**

- **7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**

- **7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**

- **7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers**

- **7d. Agricultural land classification**

- **7e. Public Rights of Way**

- **7f.(i) Conservation Area**

- **7e.(i) PROW comments**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7g. Heritage / archaeology comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7h. Visual Impact</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Justification for score:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional criterion 7i. TPOs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Parish Council support and rank

- **Does Parish Council support this site?**

- **Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

- **Form G - Parish Council's view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
## Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Preferred site

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site forms part of an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation for mixed-use development (the eastern gateway). The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process. The site suggestion proposes change of use of the land for housing development. It is proposed that the existing allocation be retained.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
<th>ID: 112</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Former Garden Centre site, Paddock Street, Soham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Soham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>SOH3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Former Garden Centre site, Soham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Site currently forms part of the Eastern Gateway Site (SOH3) but current policy requires use of the site for garden centre or employment purposes. It is now proposed that the site be developed for housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td>Former garden centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 103</td>
<td>b) Recommended 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a. Settlement Hierarchy</th>
<th>Main Settlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b. Site Availability</td>
<td>Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Minerals and Waste assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This site lies within the Mineral Safeguarding Area for Sand and Gravel, designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Core Strategy and shown on Proposals Map C (2011). The overarching policy is CS26 Mineral Safeguarding Areas which sets out criteria which must be met in order for development to be permitted. However, in this instance the proposed site is in close proximity to existing development and the mineral resource is an isolated area. It is unlikely to be an economic resource therefore no objections would be raised in this context to this site being allocated.

| 1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies | CS26 |
| 1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations |

| 2a. Flood zone | >50% of site area in Zone 1 |

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

| Flood Zone 1: | 100.00% | Flood Zone 2: | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3a: | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3b: | 0.00% |
Site Name: Former Garden Centre site, Soham

Parish: Soham CP

Site Ref: Site/23/12

Current Status: Superseded by SOH.M1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation</td>
<td>Site does not intersect Inner Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites</td>
<td>2.01km - 5km from the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Suitability</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
<td>Site located more than 250m from contaminated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>Major infrastructure required to offset safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"NO access to the A142 will be permitted - Principal Transport Route Mitigations to the nearby junctions will be required

Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry ALSO SEE 23/12 + 23/18"

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on 103 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Soham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. A Transport Strategy for Soham would be required should this much development be intended within the town. This would need to model the impact of the combined developments.

6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to services</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td>Less than 15 min walk (&lt;1,200m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Less than 15 min walk (&lt;1,200m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>Spare capacity in some years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6h. Proximity to employment sites</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</th>
<th>CWS located within site</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a link from this site to FP66 and Site 23/18 to the north.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 500.1 – 1000m of site</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500.1 – 1000m of site</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already allocated - same issues as before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7h. Visual Impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification for score:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional criterion 7i. TPOs</strong></td>
<td>No TPO within 15m of the site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parish Council support and rank

| Does Parish Council support this site? | Yes |
| Form E - Parish Council site ranking: | Fifth or more |
| Form G - Parish Council's view: | |

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Current Status: Superseded by SOH.M1
Site Name: Soham Eastern Gateway (SOH3)
Parish: Soham CP
Site Ref: Site/23/18

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site forms part of an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation (Soham eastern gateway). The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and should be retained.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Soham Eastern Gateway, A142, Soham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Soham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>SOH3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>LP15 site allocation SOH3 for a housing-led/mixed-use allocation, Eastern Gateway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>19.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 600 b) Recommended 600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

This site lies within the Mineral Safeguarding Area for Sand and Gravel, designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Core Strategy and shown on Proposals Map C (2011). The overarching policy is CS26 Mineral Safeguarding Areas which sets out criteria which must be met in order for development to be permitted. However, in this instance the proposed site is in close proximity to existing development. It is unlikely to be an economic resource therefore no objections would be raised in this context to this site being allocated.

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies CS26

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (% of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening)):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 1: 84.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 2: 4.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3a: 10.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (% of site area at risk (uFMfSW): -
**Site Name:** Soham Eastern Gateway (SOH3)  
**Parish:** Soham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/23/18

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites

| Distance from site: 2.01km - 5km |

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year:</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Year:</td>
<td>0.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 Year:</td>
<td>8.36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land

| Site located within 250m of contaminated land | B |

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

- Factory or works 237m to SW

#### 5b. Local road impact

| Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations | D |

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

**5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**

"NO access to the A142 will be permitted unless it forms part of a larger scheme e.g. Soham Gateway however this will require major mitigation measures and highways improvements. This MUST also be part of a comprehensive scheme and include application sites 12 & 15 & 18 and MUST serve all three development sites directly Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry ALSO SEE 23/12 + 23/18 + 23/04 + 23/13 + 23/19".  
The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on 600 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Soham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. A Transport Strategy for Soham would be required should this much development be intended within the town.  
This would need to model the impact of the combined developments.

#### 6. Access to services

| Proximity to public transport | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) | A |
| Proximity to medical services | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) | A |
| Proximity to shops | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) | A |
| Proximity to Primary School | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) | A |
| Proximity to Secondary School | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) | B |
| Available primary school capacity | Spare capacity in some years | B |
| Available secondary school capacity | Limited capacity | C |

#### 6f. Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

- The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites

| Less than 5 min walk (<400m) | A |

### Environmental Impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

| CWS located within site | E |
### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Wildlife Sites</th>
<th>Professional assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

No significant impacts identified.

### 7d. Agricultural land classification

All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower

### 7e. Public Rights of Way

B – Opportunities to connect to multiple nearby PRoW within the site boundary

### 7e.(i) PROW comments

This site is crossed by Footpaths 66, 63, 62, 61, 60, 52 54, 55 and 57 which will require diversion to allow development to take place.

### 7f.(i) Conservation Area

CA within 500m of site

### 7f.(ii). Listed building

LB within 500m of site

### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site

### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

Already allocated - same issues as before

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

No significant impacts identified.

### 7h. Visual Impact

No significant visual impact.

### Justification for score:

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

No TPO within 15m of the site

### Parish Council support and rank

- **Does Parish Council support this site?** Yes
- **Form E - Parish Council site ranking:** First
- **Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and should be retained. However, the principle of some housing development is deemed suitable, with the southern half of the site possibly developed for employment uses. The allocation should therefore be changed to mixed-use.

Site Information

Site Type: Strategic Planning Amended Submission
Site Address: Soham
Settlement: Soham

LP15 Allocation Ref: Planning Perm. Ref: 

Site Description: Supersedes Site/23/05 and Site/23/25
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints:
Current Use: Agricultural
Proposed Use: Mixed use

Proposed Use Info:

Site Area Net (ha): 2.00
Site Area Gross (ha): 2.8

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 0 b) Recommended 20

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+Wi Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+Wi Allocations

2a. Flood zone

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
30 Year: 0.63%  100 Year: 1.20%  1,000 Year: 28.30%
**Minor Criteria**

### 5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land

5a. (i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport

6b. Proximity to medical services

6c. Proximity to shops

6d. Proximity to Primary School

6e. Proximity to Secondary School

6f. (i) Available primary school capacity

6f. (ii) Available secondary school capacity

6g. (i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

6g. (ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

6h. Proximity to employment sites

### 7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification

7e. Public Rights of Way

7e. (i) PROW comments
Current Status: Site Allocation SOH.M2
Site Name: Land north west of The Shade School
Parish: Soham CP
Site Ref: Site/23/39

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

| 7h. Visual Impact |  |

Justification for score:

| Additional criterion 7i. TPOs |  |

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received
Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment:  Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:
14:50 28 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site offers a suitable location for development and should therefore be allocated for mixed-use development, with the southern half of the site possibly developed for employment uses. Highway improvement will be required to ensure safe access to the site.

Site Information

Site Type:  New site submission (Form B)  ID:  105
Site Address:  Land west of the Shade, Soham
Settlement:  Soham
LP15 Allocation Ref:  SOH10  Planning Perm. Ref:  
Site Description:  Two parcels of land (recorded as a single site suggestion) at the Shade, Soham, located either side of access road.
Brown/Greenfield:  Greenfield
Known Constraints:  The site is immediately deliverable with no known constraints.
Current Use:  Agriculture  Proposed Use:  Housing
Current Use info:  Vacant / scrubland
Proposed Use info:  
Site Area Net (ha):  1.49  Site Area Gross (ha):  1.75
Indicative no. of dwellings:  
   a) Submitted / estimated  54  b) Recommended  20

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  Main Settlement
1b. Site Availability  Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

This site lies almost entirely within the Safeguarding Area for the Soham Waste Water Treatment Works (Policy W7AK) designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012). The overarching policy for this designation is Policy CS31 of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011). This policy places a presumption against allowing development which would be occupied by people; and where new development is proposed an odour assessment report should accompany any planning application. Permission should only be granted when it has been demonstrated that the proposed development would not be adversely affected by the continued operation of the existing waste water treatment works. It is suggested that consideration should be given to these policies prior to allocation in the interests of deliverability.

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations  W7AK

2a. Flood zone  >50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):  

---

ID:  105  LP15 Allocation Ref:  SOH10  Site Address:  Land west of the Shade, Soham  Site Area Net (ha):  1.49  Site Area Gross (ha):  1.75  Indicative no. of dwellings:  54  20

---
### Current Status: Superseded by SOH.M2
**Parish:** Soham CP  
**Site Name:** Parcels A and B  
**Site Ref:** Site/23/05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1:</th>
<th>100.00%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2:</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a:</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b:</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2b. Surface Water flood risk</strong></td>
<td>Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (% of site area at risk (uFMISW))</th>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year: 0.57%</td>
<td>100 Year: 0.96%</td>
<td>1,000 Year: 60.28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 2.01km - 5km from the site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

### Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land profesional assessment

#### 5b. Local road impact
- Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

*North site area does not have highways frontage but the south area does.*

- BOTH would have to egress the highway at the current location which is an un-adopted existing road. NO access would be permitted on to The Shades as it is to close to a roundabout.  The highways authority are unable to ascertain the land ownership And/Or if third party land would be required to be purchased to facilitate this development "

- The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Statement based on 54 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. Individually this site may not generate severe impact within Soham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Soham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. A Transport Strategy for Soham would be required should this much development be intended within the town. This would need to model the impact of the combined developments.

### Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- Spare capacity in every year

#### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

- **This new school was designed to be expanded from 1FE to 2FE (210 additional places) to take account of future development in the Northern gateway.**

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Limited capacity

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

- **The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Parish Council Support and Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6h. Proximity to employment sites</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Environmental impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td>CWS within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7(e)(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a connection between Sites 23/07 to the north and 23/25 to the south</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 500.1 – 1000m of site</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already allocated - same issues as before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
<td>Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification for score:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels part of Soham, rather than urban area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional criterion 7i. TPOs</td>
<td>No TPO within 15m of the site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

- Does Parish Council support this site? Yes
- Form E - Parish Council site ranking: Third
- Form G - Parish Council’s view: 

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment:

Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:

The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and should be retained. However, allocation should be changed to mixed-use.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>Local Plan 2015 allocated site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land west of The Shade, Soham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Soham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>SOH10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Existing employment allocation, land west of The Shade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Recommended 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

This site lies almost entirely within the Safeguarding Area for the Soham Waste Water Treatment Works (Policy W7AK) designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012). The overarching policy for this designation is Policy CS31 of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011). This policy places a presumption against allowing development which would be occupied by people; and where new development is proposed an odour assessment report should accompany any planning application. Permission should only be granted when it has been demonstrated that the proposed development would not be adversely affected by the continued operation of the existing waste water treatment works. It is suggested that consideration should be given to these policies prior to allocation in the interests of deliverability.

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

W7AK

2a. Flood zone

>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
<td>Site within 50m of contaminated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td>Builder’s yard and depot to east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on net area identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Soham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Soham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. A Transport Strategy for Soham would be required should this much development be intended within the town. This would need to model the impact of the combined developments.

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Less than 15 min walk (&lt;1,200m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>Spare capacity in every year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This new school was designed to be expanded from 1FE to 2FE (210 additional places) to take account of future development in the Northern gateway.

#### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td>CWS within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Table for Flood Zone Risk:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone 1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3a</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3b</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table for Surface Water Flood Risk:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Year</td>
<td>1.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 Year</td>
<td>46.32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table for Proximity to Hazardous Installation:**

| N/a - employment site | - |

**Table for Proximity to Internationally / nationally important wildlife sites:**

| 2.01km - 5km from the site | B |

**Table for European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment:**

| - | - |
### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

- Requires further assessment.

### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

- All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

### 7d. Agricultural land classification

- D

### 7e. Public Rights of Way

- C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary

### 7e.(i) PROW comments

Provide a link from The Shade to Footpath 17 which runs along the southern boundary of the site.

### 7f.(i) Conservation Area

- CA within 500.1 – 1000m of site

### 7f.(ii). Listed building

- LB within 500m of site

### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

- SAM more than 2km from site

### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

- A

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

- Already allocated - same issues as before

### 7h. Visual Impact

#### Justification for score:

- A

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

- No TPO within 15m of the site

## Parish Council support and rank

### Does Parish Council support this site?

- Needs further assessment.

### Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

- C

### Form G - Parish Council’s view:

- A

## FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s): Site/23/21; Site/23/27

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and should be retained. Development of the site should support the provision of a new rail station for Soham - a corporate objective of East Cambridgeshire District Council.

Site Information

Site Type: Strategic Planning Amended Submission  ID: 368

Site Address: Soham

Settlement: Soham

LP15 Allocation Ref:  Planning Perm. Ref: 

Site Description: Supersedes Site/23/21 and Site/23/27.

Brown/Greenfield: Brownfield

Known Constraints:

Current Use: Employment  Proposed Use: Mixed use

Current Use info:

Proposed Use info:

Site Area Net (ha): 3.10  Site Area Gross (ha): 4.1

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 0  b) Recommended 90

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone >50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

Flood Zone 1: 97.33%  Flood Zone 2: 1.70%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.97%

2b. Surface Water flood risk Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):

30 Year: 2.11%  100 Year: 6.88%  1,000 Year: 18.02%
## Minor Criteria

### 5. Site Suitability

- **5a. Proximity to contaminated land**

- **5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment**

- **5b. Local road impact**

- **5c. Strategic Road Network impact**

- **5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**

### 6. Access to services

- **6a. Proximity to public transport**

- **6b. Proximity to medical services**

- **6c. Proximity to shops**

- **6d. Proximity to Primary School**

- **6e. Proximity to Secondary School**

- **6f.(i) Available primary school capacity**

- **6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**

- **6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity**

- **6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**

- **6h. Proximity to employment sites**

### 7. Environmental impact

- **7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**

- **7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**

- **7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers**

- **7d. Agricultural land classification**

- **7e. Public Rights of Way**

- **7e.(i) PROW comments**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name: Land off Station Road</th>
<th>Parish: Soham CP</th>
<th>Site Ref: Site/23/40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7f.(i) Conservation Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7f.(ii) Listed building</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7h. Visual Impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Justification for score:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional criterion 7i. TPOs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

- **Does Parish Council support this site?**

- **Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

- **Form G - Parish Council's view:**

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
## Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**

- **Preferred site**

**Date and time of site visit:**

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and should be retained.

## Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type: Local Plan 2015 allocated site</th>
<th>ID: 233</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Address:</strong> Land off Station Road, Soham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement:</strong> Soham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LP15 Allocation Ref:</strong> SOH2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Description:</strong> Existing mixed-use allocation, land off Station Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brown/Greenfield:</strong> Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Use:</strong> Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Use:</strong> Mixed use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Use info:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Area Net (ha):</strong> 2.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Area Gross (ha):</strong> 3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicative no. of dwellings:</strong> a) Submitted / estimated 90</td>
<td>b) Recommended 90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

- >50% of site area in Zone 1

| Flood Zone 1: 96.97% | Flood Zone 2: 1.77% | Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% | Flood Zone 3b: 1.26% |

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

| Percent (% of site area at risk (uFMISW): |
| 30 Year: 3.07% | 100 Year: 8.15% | 1,000 Year: 26.07% |
**Current Status:** Superseded by SOH.M3  
**Parish:** Soham CP  
**Site Name:** Existing mixed-use allocation, land off Station Road  
**Site Ref:** Site/23/27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Ref:</strong></td>
<td>Site Ref: Site/23/27</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Parish:</strong></td>
<td>Soham CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Name:</strong></td>
<td>Site Name: Existing mixed-use allocation, land off Station Road</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Current Status:</strong></td>
<td>Superseded by SOH.M3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Minor Criteria**

### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</th>
<th>Site located within 50m of contaminated land</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td>Former gas manufacture and distribution site to S boundary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>No objections with minor mitigation measures</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>&quot;Access off Mere Side Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on 90 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Soham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Soham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. A Transport Strategy for Soham would be required should this much development be intended within the town. This would need to model the impact of the combined developments.

### 6. Access to services

| 6a. Proximity to public transport | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) | B |
| 6b. Proximity to medical services | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) | B |
| 6c. Proximity to shops | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) | B |
| 6d. Proximity to Primary School | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) | B |
| 6e. Proximity to Secondary School | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) | B |
| 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity | Spare capacity in some years | B |
| 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment | | |
| 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity | Limited capacity | C |
| 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment | | |

- The school site is currently undersized for this school. The plan is to acquire more playing field land for the school as part of the Eastern Gateway development. Discussions are underway between the CCC and the Town Council regarding a land swap.

### 7. Environmental impact

| 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites | CWS within 500m of site | D |
| 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment | | |
**Current Status:** Superseded by SOH.M3  
**Parish:** Soham CP  
**Site Name:** *Existing mixed-use allocation, land off Station Road*  
**Site Ref:** Site/23/27

### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

### 7d. Agricultural land classification

All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower

### 7e. Public Rights of Way

C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary

### 7e.(i) PROW comments

Provide a link from Spencer Drove to Mere Side.

### 7f.(i) Conservation Area

Site is within CA

### 7f.(ii). Listed building

LB within 500m of site

### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

SAM more than 2km from site

### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

Already allocated - same issues as before

### 7h. Visual Impact

### Justification for score:

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

TPO tree within 15m of the site

### Parish Council support and rank

**Does Parish Council support this site?**

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council's view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Current Status: Superseded by SOH.M3
Parish: Soham CP
Site Name: Land off Station Road
Site Ref: Site/23/21

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment:

Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:

08:50 11 Aug 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:

The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and should be retained. There is no justification to extend site boundary.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)

Site Address: Land off Station Road, Soham, CB7 5EE

Settlement: Soham

LP15 Allocation Ref: SOH2

Planning Perm. Ref: 

Site Description: Land off Station Road, which comprises part of LP2015 allocation SOH2.

Brown/Greenfield: Brownfield

Known Constraints:

Site comprises adopted Local Plan Policy SOH2: Housing Led / Mixed Use Allocation, Land off Station Road (3.6 ha) plus a small parcel of land currently occupied by 2 bungalows and owned by Graham Harvey (0.15 ha). The bungalow land falls outside of the SOH2 allocation occupied and may or may not come forward as part of any future application proposals.

F.J Pistol Holdings Ltd’s interest extends to the south-east part of the allocation. This part of the allocation extends to 1.18 ha. It forms an irregular shaped extent of land comprising a mix of vacant areas of commercial land and buildings, residential properties and rear gardens. The site itself is located on the eastern side of Soham at the western end of Station Road and is loosely sandwiched between Mere Side (east), raised embankment used as a footpath and the Ely to Soham branch line (west), Spencer Drove and Ashley Industrial Estate (north) and field (south).

Following the adoption of the Local Plan F.J Pistol Holdings consultant team held formal Pre-application discussions with officers of the LPA over the development in June 2015 for development of its land interest for 34 units.

The proposals were very well received by officers subject to demonstrating how the site could be delivered in the context of the rest of the SOH 2 allocation. Since then the consultant team has been preparing a master plan for the site as a whole. The master plan, albeit not yet in the public domain, shows how the site can be brought forward in advance of, and without comprising the wider objectives of the SOH 2 allocation, to deliver:

- A new railway station;
- Significantly in excess of the 90 dwellings currently identified as deliverable within the terms of the allocation (final quantum of development to be informed by design led approach based on a detailed assessment of site constraints and opportunities); and
- 0.5 ha of commercial floor space.

Subject to the outcome of continuing discussions with the other landowners the proposals will either be delivered in the form of a single application or as part of a phased development with F.J. Pistol Holding’s interest with or without the Graham Harvey land being delivered as the first phase.

A location plan showing the overall SOH2 allocation in the context of the FJ Pistol Holdings and
## Current Status
Superseded by SOH.M3

## Site Name
Land off Station Road

## Parish
Soham CP

## Site Ref
Site/23/21

---

### Major Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Criteria</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1a. Settlement Hierarchy</strong></td>
<td>Main Settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1b. Site Availability</strong></td>
<td>Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1c. Minerals and Waste assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2a. Flood zone</strong></td>
<td>&gt;50% of site area in Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooding Zone 1: 99.13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooding Zone 2: 0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooding Zone 3a: 0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooding Zone 3b: 0.87%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2b. Surface Water flood risk</strong></td>
<td>Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Year: 6.16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Year: 11.61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 Year: 51.71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation</strong></td>
<td>Site does not intersect Inner Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites</strong></td>
<td>2.01km - 5km from the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</strong></td>
<td>Site located more than 250m from contaminated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5a.(i) Contaminated land profesional assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5b. Local road impact</strong></td>
<td>No objections with minor mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</strong></td>
<td>Site located more than 250m from contaminated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5a.(i) Contaminated land profesional assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5b. Local road impact</strong></td>
<td>No obstructions with minor mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Access off Mere Side Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

Individually this site may not generate severe impact within Soham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, especially considering that it is below the threshold where an assessment is required with 36 dwellings identified, however CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Soham the cumulative impact could be significant. Therefore this site will require a TS to accompany development proposals. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. A Transport Strategy for Soham would be required should this much development be intended within the town. This would need to model the impact...
6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport  
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)  
B

6b. Proximity to medical services  
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)  
B

6c. Proximity to shops  
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)  
B

6d. Proximity to Primary School  
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)  
B

6e. Proximity to Secondary School  
Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)  
C

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity  
Spare capacity in some years  
B

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
The school site is currently undersized for this school. The plan is to acquire more playing field land for the school as part of the Eastern Gateway development. Discussions are underway between the CCC and the Town Council regarding a land swap.

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity  
Limited capacity  
C

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites  
Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)  
C

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites  
CWS within 500m of site  
D

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification  
All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower  
C

7e. Public Rights of Way  
C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PROW within the site boundary  
C

7e.(i) PROW comments
Provide an off road link for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders from Sprencer Drove ath the north of the site and Mere Side to the east.

7f.(i) Conservation Area  
Site is within CA  
E

7f.(ii). Listed building  
LB within 500m of site  
D

7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument  
SAM more than 2km from site  
A

7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
ECDC: Already allocated - same issues as before

HE: 23/21: part of the site is within a conservation area and the rest affects the setting of a conservation area. We would refer you to any comments we made during the 2015 Local Plan process.

7h. Visual Impact

Justification for score:

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs  
TPO tree on site  
C
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td>Fifth or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council's view:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and should be retained.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B) ID: 115
Site Address: Land adjacent A142, Soham
Settlement: Soham
LP15 Allocation Ref: SOH11 Planning Perm. Ref: 
Site Description: Land adjacent A142, Soham
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: Access improvements to A142 required. LP15 existing site allocation SOH 11
Current Use: Agriculture Proposed Use: Employment
Current Use info:
Proposed Use info:
Site Area Net (ha): 6.60 Site Area Gross (ha): 11
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated b) Recommended

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

This site lies within the Mineral Safeguarding Area for Sand and Gravel, designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Core Strategy and shown on Proposals Map C (2011). The overarching policy is CS26 Mineral Safeguarding Areas which states that development will only be permitted when the applicant has demonstrated that the mineral is no longer of any economic value; or can be extracted prior to development; or it will not inhibit extraction; or the development is not incompatible. This policy need to be taken into account when considering whether this site should be allocated.

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies CS26

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 81.09% Flood Zone 2: 1.57% Flood Zone 3a: 17.34% Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):
## Minor Criteria

### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- N/a - employment site

### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 2.01km - 5km from the site (B)

### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

### 5. Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land (A)

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

#### 5b. Local road impact
- Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations (D)

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

*NO access to the A142 will be permitted unless it forms part of a larger scheme e.g. Soham Gateway however this will require major mitigation measures and highways improvements. If bought forward alons there would be VAST mitigation measures needed at the junction/s and on East Fen Road Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.*

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on net area identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Soham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Soham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. A Transport Strategy for Soham would be required should this much development be intended within the town. This would need to model the impact of the combined developments.

### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m) (C)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m) (B)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m) (C)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m) (B)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m) (D)

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- Spare capacity in some years (B)

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Limited capacity (C)

#### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

The school site is currently undersized for this school. The plan is to acquire more playing field land for the school as part of the Eastern Gateway development. Discussions are underway between the CCC and the Town Council regarding a land swap.

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m) (A)

### 7. Environmental impact

---

**Current Status:** Site Allocation SOH.E1  
**Site Name:** *Land adjacent A142, Soham*  
**Parish:** Soham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/23/15
### Current Status: Site Allocation SOH.E1

**Site Name:** Land adjacent A142, Soham

**Parish:** Soham CP

**Site Ref:** Site/23/15

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpath 66 crosses the site. Maintain this link for users. It may require diversion to allow for development to take place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already allocated - same issues as before</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification for score:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional criterion 7f. TPOs</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No TPO within 15m of the site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Parish Council support and rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does Parish Council support this site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td>Fifth or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council's view:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

---
### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**
- Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:**
- 09:20 11 Aug 2016

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is rejected as it has a poor relationship to the built area; the site is not supported by the Parish Council, and other more suitable and favoured sites are available. The site is located within 450m of a hazardous pipeline, therefore advice from the HSE should be sought.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
<th>ID: 102</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Land north of Cherry Tree Lane, Soham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Soham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>Land north of Cherry Tree Lane, Soham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints</td>
<td>New/improved access required. 400 units over sites /02 &amp; /03. Assumed 250/150 split.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current Use info:**

**Proposed Use info:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Area Net (ha)</th>
<th>9.60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicative no. of dwellings:**

- a) Submitted / estimated: 250
- b) Recommended: 0

### Major Criteria

1. **Settlement Hierarchy**
   - Main Settlement: A

2. **Site Availability**
   - Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22): A

3. **Minerals and Waste assessment**

4. **Flood Zone**
   - >50% of site area in Zone 1: A

5. **Surface Water flood risk**
   - Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 Year</th>
<th>100 Year</th>
<th>1,000 Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.51%</td>
<td>1.64%</td>
<td>7.73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</th>
<th>Site located more than 250m from contaminated land</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Mitigations and highways improvements would be required to Cherry Tree Lane Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry."

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on 250 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines and demonstrate how the site can be made accessible on foot, by cycle and by public transport together with identifying any remaining off-site highway implications and required mitigation. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Soham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. A Transport Strategy for Soham would be required should this much development be intended within the town. This would need to model the impact of the combined developments.

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6a. Proximity to public transport</th>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Less than 15 min walk (&lt;1,200m)</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>No spare places but room for expansion</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The school is currently operating above physical capacity of 402 places capacity of 420 places. The site has potential for a significant expansion and the addition of another 210 places. Using the pupil multipliers 600 houses in the catchment area would yield this number of pupils.

| 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity | Limited capacity | C |
| 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment | | |

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

| 6h. Proximity to employment sites | Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m) | D |
| 6i. Proximity to employment sites | | |

#### 7. Environmental impact

| 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites | CWS within 500m of site | D |
| 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment | | |
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**  
**Site Name:** *Land north of Cherry Tree Lane, Soham*  
**Parish:** Soham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/23/02

### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

### 7d. Agricultural land classification
- All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower

### 7e. Public Rights of Way
- C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary

### 7f.(i) PROW comments

Footpath 102 runs adjacent to the north east corner of the site and Byway 103 runs along the south east edge of the route. Provide links across the site to Cherry Tree Lane to the south of the site and Byway 103.

### 7f.(ii) Conservation Area
- CA within 500m of site

### 7f.(iii) Listed building
- LB within 500m of site

### 7f.(iv) Scheduled Ancient Monument
- SAM more than 2km from site

### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

### 7f.(v) Heritage / archaeology comments

ECDC: Conservation area to the east - limited heritage impact

HE: 23/02: adjacent to conservation areas and listed buildings.

### 7h. Visual Impact
- Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views – visually intrusive

Justification for score:

This area clearly part of transition area.

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
- No TPO within 15m of the site

### Parish Council support and rank

**Does Parish Council support this site?** No

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:** Fifth or more

**Form G - Parish Council's view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:** 14:40 28 July 2016

**Supersedes site submission(s)**

**Main findings and recommendations:**
The site is rejected as other more suitable sites are available in locations closer to the town centre; the site is not supported by the Parish Council; the site contributes to the agricultural setting of Soham; and much of the site is located within the safeguarding area of the Waste Water Treatment Works.

**Site Information**

- **Site Type:** New site submission (Form B)  ID: 107
- **Site Address:** Land at the Shade, Soham
- **Settlement:** Soham
- **Site Description:** Land at the Shade, Soham
- **Brown/Greenfield:** Greenfield
- **Known Constraints:** All land in Cambridgeshire County Council's ownership and is thus deliverable. Would provide 20-30% CLD as an alternative to affordable housing and subject to viability. Suggests also including some employment development.
- **Current Use:** Agriculture
- **Proposed Use:** Housing
- **Site Area Net (ha):** 15.06
- **Site Area Gross (ha):** 25.1
- **Indicative no. of dwellings:**
  - a) Submitted / estimated: 600
  - b) Recommended: 0

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
   - Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability
   - Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
   - >50% of site area in Zone 1

   **Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**
   - Flood Zone 1: 100.00%
   - Flood Zone 2: 0.00%
   - Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%
   - Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
   - Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

   **Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMiSW):**
### Minor Criteria

**5. Site Suitability**

5a. Proximity to contaminated land

- Site within 250m of contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

- Old pit 136m to N. Sewage works 153m to S.

5b. Local road impact

- Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

"The purchase of third party land to allow vehicle access to the development from the 4th arm of the existing roundabout and mitigations to the highway infrastructure would be required Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry."

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on 600 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Soham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. A Transport Strategy for Soham would be required should this much development be intended within the town. This would need to model the impact of the combined developments.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport

- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services

- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops

- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School

- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School

- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

- Spare capacity in every year

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

- Limited capacity

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

This new school was designed to be expanded from 1FE to 2FE (210 additional places) to take account of future development in the Northern gateway.

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites

- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

- CWS within 500m of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
### Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

**Site Name:** *Land at the Shade, Soham*

**Parish:** Soham CP

**Site Ref:** Site/23/07

| 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers |  
| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower | D
| 7e. Public Rights of Way | B – Opportunities to connect to multiple nearby PRoW within the site boundary | B

#### 7f. PROW comments

Footpaths 16, 17 & 18 run across and around the site. Ensure that these links are maintained and provide an additional network of links across the site from the A142 to the wider network and adjacent sites 23/05 and 23/25

- **7f.(i) Conservation Area**
  - CA within 500.1 – 1000m of site
  - C

- **7f.(ii). Listed building**
  - LB within 500m of site
  - D

- **7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument**
  - SAM more than 2km from site
  - A

- **7f.(iv) Archaeological asset**
  -

#### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

Listed building to the east - No heritage impact

- **7h. Visual Impact**
  - Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive
  - D

**Justification for score:**

Clearly forms 'open countryisde' and forms part of the agricultural setting of Soham.

**Additional criterion 7i. TPOs**

- No TPO within 15m of the site
  - A

### Parish Council support and rank

- **Does Parish Council support this site?** No

- **Form E - Parish Council site ranking:** Fifth or more

- **Form G - Parish Council's view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Has merit**

Date and time of site visit: 09:45 11 Aug 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site has some merit as it has few constraints and was previously identified as a broad area for future growth by the Local Plan 2015. However, other more suitable sites are available in locations better connected to Soham and the community facilities and services the town offers.

---

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land at Downfields, Wicken Road, Soham, CB7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Soham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Land at Downfields, Wicken Road, Soham, CB7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td>Nursery and agricultural use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>9.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
1b. Site Availability
Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 1: 100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 2: 0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year: 0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Year: 0.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 Year: 2.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact
No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

"Access off Orchard Row OR road to the north of the site. Mitigations and highways upgrades and improvements to the junctions and access on to Military Road will be required Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and geometry

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on 350 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines and demonstrate how the site can be made accessible on foot, by cycle and by public transport together with identifying any remaining off-site highway implications and required mitigation. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Soham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. A Transport Strategy for Soham would be required should this much development be intended within the town. This would need to model the impact of the combined developments.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops
Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
No spare places but room for expansion

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

The school is currently operating above physical capcity of 402 places capacity of 420 places. The site has potential for a significant expansion and the addition of another 210 places. Using the pupil multipliers 600 houses in the catchment area would yield this number of pupils.

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
Limited capacity

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites
Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

7. Environmental impact
## Site Information

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Downfields, Soham  
**Parish:** Soham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/23/11

### Site Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

###-footpath comments

Footpath 105 connects to the highway in the north west corner of the site. Provide a link from this footpath to the Wicken Road.

### Heritage / archaeology comments

Grade II* listed building to the northeast - limited heritage impact.

### Visual Impact

Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive

### Justification for score:

Limited impact; pleasant countryside views, but no more than that.

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

No TPO within 15m of the site

### Parish Council support and rank

**Does Parish Council support this site?** Yes

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:** Fifth or more

**Form G - Parish Council's view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit: 14:20 28 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is physically separate from the main built area of Soham, and therefore access to services and facilities may be poor. Other more suitable sites are available closer to the centre of Soham.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  ID: 116
Site Address: Land off Barcham Road, Soham
Settlement: Soham
LP15 Allocation Ref: 
Planning Perm. Ref: 
Site Description: Land off Barcham Road, Soham, north of The Shade
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: Willing vendor. Site can accommodate up to 40 dwellings and has an existing vehicle access of Barcham Road
Current Use: Agriculture
Proposed Use info: Housing, employment, retail, CLD
Current Use info: Rough ground
Site Area Net (ha): 1.19
Site Area Gross (ha): 1.4
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 40 b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability
Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
30 Year: 4.17%  100 Year: 5.25%  1,000 Year: 24.86%
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

Parish: Soham CP
Site Name: Land to the north of The Shade, Soham

Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
   Site does not intersect Inner Zone

4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
   2.01km - 5km from the site

4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
   Site located on contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
   Partly on old gravel pit.

5b. Local road impact
   Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

"NO access to the A142 will be permitted - Principal Transport Route Major mitigation measures and highways improvements will be required to Barcham Road Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry "

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Statement based on 40 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. Individually this site may not generate severe impact within Soham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Soham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. A Transport Strategy for Soham would be required should this much development be intended within the town. This would need to model the impact of the combined developments.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
   Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
   Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops
   Less than 20 min walk (<800m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
   Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
   Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
   Spare capacity in every year

6f.(ii) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

This new school was designed to be expanded from 1FE to 2FE (210 additional places) to take account of future development in the Northern gateway.

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
   Limited capacity

6g. Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites
   Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
   CWS within 501m – 1km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land to the north of The Shade, Soham  
**Parish:** Soham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/23/16

| 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers |
| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower | C |
| 7e. Public Rights of Way |
| 7f.(i) PROW comments |
| 7f.(i) Conservation Area | CA within 1.01km – 2km of site | B |
| 7f.(ii). Listed building | LB within 500.1 – 1000m of site | C |
| 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument | SAM more than 2km from site | A |
| 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset |

**7g. Heritage / archaeology comments**
Listed building to the southeast - No heritage impact

**7h. Visual Impact**
Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive | D |

**Justiceification for score:**
Would result in further ribbon development along A142, blurring division between countryside and urban Soham.

**Additional criterion 7i. TPOs**
No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

**Parish Council support and rank**

| Does Parish Council support this site? | Yes |
| Form E - Parish Council site ranking: | Fifth or more |

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**
Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
## Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:**
11:00 11 Aug 2016

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**
The site should be rejected as safe highways access is unlikely to be achievable. In addition, the site has a poor relationship to the main built area of Soham, therefore development may result in harm to the built form and have poor access to services and facilities.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Land off Fordham Road, Soham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Soham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>Site adjacent SOH4 allocation, Fordham Road, Soham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints</td>
<td>Site can accommodate up to 40 dwellings and can be accessed off existing SOH4 allocation. Developer of SOH4 is interested in buying as extension to SOH4 and site can be delivered within 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info</td>
<td>Grazing land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha)</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 40  b) Recommended 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Criteria

1a. **Settlement Hierarchy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Settlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1b. **Site Availability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1c. **Minerals and Waste assessment**

#### 1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

- [ ]

#### 1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

- [ ]

2a. **Flood zone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&gt;50% of site area in Zone 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1:</th>
<th>100.00%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2:</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a:</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b:</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2b. **Surface Water flood risk**

Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

#### Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

- [ ]
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Land off Fordham Road, Soham
Parish: Soham CP
Site Ref: Site/23/17

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact
Insurmountable safety issues that cannot be secured in accordance with CIL regulations

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
"NO access or highways frontage NO access to the A142 will be permitted - Principal Transport Route "

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Statement based on 40 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. Individually this site may not generate severe impact within Soham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Soham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. A Transport Strategy for Soham would be required should this much development be intended within the town. This would need to model the impact of the combined developments.

6a. Proximity to public transport
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops
Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
No spare places but room for expansion

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
Limited capacity

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites
Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
CWS within 501m – 1km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7. Environmental impact
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>D – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoWs outside the site boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td>Provide an off road link from Ely Road to Barcham Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 500.1 – 1000m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii) Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td>Grade II* listed building to the southwest - limited heritage impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
<td>Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification for score:</td>
<td>In isolation, detrimental. Could only come forward with other land / access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional criterion 7i. TPOs</td>
<td>No TPO within 15m of the site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

- **Does Parish Council support this site?** No
- **Form E - Parish Council site ranking:** Fifth or more
- **Form G - Parish Council's view:**  

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Site Name: Existing housing allocation, land east of 5 Barway Road
Parish: Soham CP
Site Ref: Site/23/22
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. However the site capacity is expected to be below the 10 unit threshold. The site is therefore rejected.

Site Information

Site Type: Local Plan 2015 allocated site
Site Address: Land east of 5 Barway Road, Barway, Soham
Settlement: Barway
LP15 Allocation Ref: BAR2
Site Description: Existing housing allocation
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints:
Current Use: Agriculture
Proposed Use: Housing
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 11 b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Small Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 Year</th>
<th>100 Year</th>
<th>1,000 Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>9.88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Name: Existing housing allocation, land east of 5 Barway Road

Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

Parish: Soham CP

Site Ref: Site/23/22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
   Site does not intersect Inner Zone

4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
   2.01km - 5km from the site

4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
   Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

Individually this site may not generate severe impact within Soham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, especially considering that it is below the threshold where an assessment is required with 11 dwellings identified, however CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Soham the cumulative impact could be significant. Therefore this site will require a TS to accompany development proposals. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. A Transport Strategy for Soham would be required should this much development be intended within the town. This would need to model the impact of the combined developments.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
   Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
   Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops
   Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
   Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
   Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
   No spare places but room for expansion

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
   Limited capacity

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

An additional 105 places could be provided at the school. This would be sufficient to meet the needs of a development of 300 houses in the catchment area using the Council's standard multipliers

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites
   Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
   CWS within 501m – 1km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers
Site Name: Existing housing allocation, land east of 5 Barway Road  
Parish: Soham CP

Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower | C |
| 7e. Public Rights of Way | E – No PRoW connection opportunities | E |

7f.(i) PROW comments

| 7f.(i) Conservation Area | CA more than 2km from site | A |
| 7f.(ii). Listed building | LB within 500m of site | D |
| 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument | SAM within 500.1 – 1000m of site | C |
| 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset | | |

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

Already allocated - same issues as before

7h. Visual impact

Justification for score:

| Additional criterion 7i. TPOs | No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**  
Parish: **Soham CP**  
Site Name: **Existing employment allocation, land east of The Shade**  
Site Ref: **Site/23/26**

### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**  
Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:**

**Supersedes site submission(s):** Site/23/09

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The Further Draft Local Plan proposed allocation of this site for employment development. Since publication of the Further Draft Local Plan, the southern part of the site has been granted planning permission for residential development - see Site/23/46. This area of the site has highway frontage and it is now uncertain whether the remainder of the site is accessible, calling into question the remainder of the site's suitability for employment development. The decision to change the use of the land from employment to residential was in part based on evidence of a lack of viability for employment development, thereby creating uncertainty regarding the sites deliverability. In conclusion, the site should be rejected as it is likely not suitable or deliverable for employment development.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>Local Plan 2015 allocated site</th>
<th>ID:</th>
<th>223</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land east of The Shade, Soham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Soham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>SOH9</td>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Existing employment allocation, land east of The Shade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicative no. of dwellings:**

- a) Submitted / estimated
- b) Recommended

### Major Criteria

1. **Settlement Hierarchy**
   - Main Settlement

2. **Site Availability**

3. **Minerals and Waste assessment**

   - This site lies partly within the Mineral Safeguarding Area for Sand and Gravel, designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Core Strategy and shown on Proposals Map C (2011). The overarching policy is CS26 Mineral Safeguarding Areas which sets out criteria which must be met in order for development to be permitted. However, in this instance the proposed site is in close proximity to existing development. It is unlikely to be an economic resource therefore no objections would be raised in this context to this site being allocated.

   - 1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies | CS26

   - 1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</th>
<th>Site within 50m of contaminated land</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td>Builder's yard and depot to W boundary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5b. Local road impact</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on net area identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Soham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Soham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. A Transport Strategy for Soham would be required should this much development be intended within the town. This would need to model the impact of the combined developments.

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6a. Proximity to public transport</th>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Less than 20 min walk (&lt;1,600m)</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>Spare capacity in every year</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Site Suitability

#### 2a. Flood Zone

| Flood Zone | >50% of site area in Zone 1 | A |

#### 2b. Surface Water flood risk

Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

| Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening): |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|---|
| Flood Zone 1: 100.00% Flood Zone 2: 0.00% Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% Flood Zone 3b: 0.00% |

| Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW): |
|-------------------------------------------|---|
| 30 Year: 0.75% 100 Year: 0.46% 1,000 Year: 3.90% |

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation

N/a - employment site

Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites

2.01km - 5km from the site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

**B**

#### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

This new school was designed to be expanded from 1FE to 2FE (210 additional places) to take account of future development in the Northern gateway.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Parish:** Soham CP  
**Site Name:** Existing employment allocation, land east of The Shade  
**Site Ref:** Site/23/26

### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td>CWS within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Footpath 21 runs across the site from north to south. This site connects to Site 23/10. Maintain this link. The footpath may need to be diverted to allow for development to take place.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td>Footpath 21 runs across the site from north to south. This site connects to Site 23/10. Maintain this link. The footpath may need to be diverted to allow for development to take place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification for score:**

**Parish Council support and rank**

| Does Parish Council support this site? | | |
| Form E - Parish Council site ranking: | | |
| Form G - Parish Council's view: | | |

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
### Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

**Site Name:** Existing mixed-use allocation, Fountain Lane recreation ground and car park

**Parish:** Soham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/23/28

---

#### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

| Overall recommendation from site assessment: | Rejected |
| Date and time of site visit: |  |
| Supersedes site submission(s): |  |

#### Main findings and recommendations:

The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation, albeit not for significant development. The site is therefore rejected in this plan, because it would be inappropriate to retain allocation.

---

#### Site Information

| Site Type: | Local Plan 2015 allocated site |
| Site Address: | Recreation ground and car park, Fountain Lane, Soham |
| Settlement: | Soham |
| LP15 Allocation Ref: | SOH15 | Planning Perm. Ref: |  |
| Site Description: | Existing mixed-use allocation, Fountain Lane recreation ground and car park |
| Brown/Greenfield: | Greenfield |
| Known Constraints: |  |
| Current Use: | Open space/outdoor recreation | Proposed Use: | Mixed use |
| Current Use info: |  |
| Proposed Use info: |  |
| Site Area Net (ha): | 2.38 | Site Area Gross (ha): | 3.17 |
| Indicative no. of dwellings: | a) Submitted / estimated: 0 | b) Recommended: 0 |

---

#### Major Criteria

| 1a. Settlement Hierarchy | Main Settlement |  |
| 1b. Site Availability |  |
| 1c. Minerals and Waste assessment |  |
| 1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies |  |
| 1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations |  |

| 2a. Flood zone | >50% of site area in Zone 1 |  |
| **Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):** |  |
| Flood Zone 1: | 100.00% | Flood Zone 2: | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3a: | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3b: | 0.00% |

| 2b. Surface Water flood risk | Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA |  |
| **Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):** |  |
| 30 Year: | 1.00% | 100 Year: | 0.88% | 1,000 Year: | 6.07% |
**Site Name:** Existing mixed-use allocation, Fountain Lane recreation ground and car park

**Parish:** Soham CP

**Site Ref:** Site/23/28

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation

- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites

- 2.01km - 5km from the site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

#### 5. Site Suitability

##### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land

- Site within 250m of contaminated land

##### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

- Former gas manufacture and distribution site 120m to E. Former insulated wire and cable works 108m to SW

##### 5b. Local road impact

- No

##### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

- No

##### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

- NOT ENOUGH INFORMATION TO DETERMINE

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on net area identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Soham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Soham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. A Transport Strategy for Soham would be required should this much development be intended within the town. This would need to model the impact of the combined developments.

#### 6. Access to services

##### 6a. Proximity to public transport

- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6b. Proximity to medical services

- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6c. Proximity to shops

- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6d. Proximity to Primary School

- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School

- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6f. Available primary school capacity

- Spare capacity in some years

##### 6g. Available secondary school capacity

- Limited capacity

##### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

- The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

##### 6h. Proximity to employment sites

- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

#### 7. Environmental impact

##### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

- CWS within 500m of site

##### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

- No

---
**Site Name:** Existing mixed-use allocation, Fountain Lane recreation ground and car park

**Parish:** Soham CP

**Site Ref:** Site/23/28

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site is not located on agricultural land</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7d. Agricultural land classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site is not located on agricultural land</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7e. Public Rights of Way

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7e.(i) PROW comments

Footpath 46 connects to the southeast corner of the site. Provide a link from FP46 to Gardeners Lane. As landowner consider registering the whole site as a Village Green which would protect it from further development.

### 7f.(i) Conservation Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site is within CA</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f.(ii) Listed building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

Already allocated - same issues as before

### 7h. Visual Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification for score:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TPO tree on site</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

---

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Parish:** Soham CP  
**Site Name:** Existing mixed-use allocation, town centre, Church hall area  
**Site Ref:** Site/23/29

### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall recommendation from site assessment:</th>
<th>Rejected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Date and time of site visit:**

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation, however the likelihood of the site being developed is now uncertain. The site is therefore rejected.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>Local Plan 2015 allocated site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Church hall, High Street Soham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Soham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>SOH13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Existing mixed-use allocation, town centre, Church hall area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Community facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Indicative no. of dwellings: | a) Submitted / estimated 0  
| | b) Recommended 0 |

### Major Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a. Settlement Hierarchy</th>
<th>Main Settlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b. Site Availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Minerals and Waste assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Flood zone</td>
<td>&gt;50% of site area in Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Flood Zone 1: | 100.00%  
| Flood Zone 2: | 0.00%  
| Flood Zone 3a: | 0.00%  
| Flood Zone 3b: | 0.00%  |
| 2b. Surface Water flood risk | Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr)) |
| **Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):** |  
| 30 Year: | 0.00%  
| 100 Year: | 0.00%  
| 1,000 Year: | 0.00%  |
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Site Name:** Existing mixed-use allocation, town centre, Church hall area

**Parish:** Soham CP

**Site Ref:** Site/23/29

---

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

##### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land

Site located in an area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

---

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No

- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites

- 2.01km - 5km from the site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

---

#### 5. Site Suitability

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

---

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No

- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

---

#### 5b. Local road impact

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

---

#### 6. Access to services

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

---

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No

- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

---

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

#### 6c. Proximity to shops

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

#### 6f. Available primary school capacity

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

#### 6f. Available secondary school capacity

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

#### 6g. Primary education impacts - professional assessment

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

#### 6g. Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

---

#### 7. Environmental impact

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

---

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

---

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

---

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No

- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

---

#### 5b. Local road impact

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

---

#### 6. Access to services

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

---

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

#### 6c. Proximity to shops

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

#### 6f. Available primary school capacity

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

#### 6f. Available secondary school capacity

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

#### 6g. Primary education impacts - professional assessment

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

#### 6g. Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

---

#### 7. Environmental impact

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

---

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

---
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Existing mixed-use allocation, town centre, Church hall area  
**Parish:** Soham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/23/29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</th>
<th>Site is not located on agricultural land</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>Site is not located on agricultural land</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>E – No PRoW connection opportunities</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>Site is within CA</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already allocated - same issues as before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification for score:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional criterion 7i. TPOs</td>
<td>No TPO within 15m of the site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

- Does Parish Council support this site?
- Form E - Parish Council site ranking:
- Form G - Parish Council’s view:

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Rejected**

**Date and time of site visit:**

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation, however the likelihood of the site being developed is now uncertain. The site is therefore rejected.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>Local Plan 2015 allocated site</th>
<th>ID:</th>
<th>236</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Cooperative store, High Street, Soham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Soham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>SOH14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Existing mixed-use allocation, Cooperative store area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated: 0, b) Recommended: 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Settlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1b. Site Availability


1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies


1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations


2a. Flood zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&gt;50% of site area in Zone 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

| Flood Zone 1: | 100.00% |
| Flood Zone 2: | 0.00% |
| Flood Zone 3a: | 0.00% |
| Flood Zone 3b: | 0.00% |

2b. Surface Water flood risk

**Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA**

| 30 Year: | 0.00% |
| 100 Year: | 9.09% |
| 1,000 Year: | 11.84% |
**Site Name:** Existing mixed-use allocation, Cooperative store area  
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Parish:** Soham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/23/30

| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No |

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 2.01km - 5km from the site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

#### 5. Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site within 250m of contaminated land

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
  - Former factory site 161m to E

#### 5b. Local road impact

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

**NOT ENOUGH INFORMATION TO DETERMINE**

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on net area identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Soham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Soham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. A Transport Strategy for Soham would be required should this much development be intended within the town. This would need to model the impact of the combined developments.

#### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- Spare capacity in some years

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Limited capacity

#### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

**The school site is currently undersized for this school. The plan is to acquire more playing field land for the school as part of the Eastern Gateway development. Discussions are underway between the CCC and the Town Council regarding a land swap.**

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

**The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.**

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

#### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 500m of site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
**Site Name:** Existing mixed-use allocation, Cooperative store area

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Parish:** Soham CP

### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers
- Site is not located on agricultural land

### 7d. Agricultural land classification
- Site is not located on agricultural land

### 7e. Public Rights of Way
- E – No PRoW connection opportunities

### 7f.(i) PROW comments

### 7f.(i) Conservation Area
- Site is within CA

### 7f.(ii) Listed building
- LB within 500m of site

### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
- SAM more than 2km from site

### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
- Already allocated - same issues as before

### 7h. Visual Impact

**Justification for score:**

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
- No TPO within 15m of the site

**Parish Council support and rank**

**Does Parish Council support this site?**

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received**

**Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:**
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**  
Parish: **Soham CP**  
Site Name: **Existing mixed-use allocation, Budgens site**  
Site Ref: **Site/23/31**

### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**  
Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:**

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**
The site has recently been redeveloped and is no longer considered available for development.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>Local Plan 2015 allocated site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Budgens site, High Street, Soham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Soham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>SOH12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Existing mixed-use allocation, Budgens site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  - a) Submitted / estimated: 0 |
  - b) Recommended: 0 |

### Major Criteria

1a. **Settlement Hierarchy**  
Main Settlement

1b. **Site Availability**

1c. **Minerals and Waste assessment**

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. **Flood zone**

   >50% of site area in Zone 1

   **Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

   | Flood Zone 1: | 100.00% |
   | Flood Zone 2: | 0.00% |
   | Flood Zone 3a: | 0.00% |
   | Flood Zone 3b: | 0.00% |

2b. **Surface Water flood risk**

   Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

   **Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):**

   | 30 Year: | 0.00% |
   | 100 Year: | 0.00% |
   | 1,000 Year: | 2.77% |
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Parish:** Soham CP  
**Site Name:** Existing mixed-use allocation, Budgens site  
**Site Ref:** Site/23/31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Proximity to Hazardous Installation**  
   Site does not intersect Inner Zone  

4a. **Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites**  
   2.01km - 5km from the site  

4b. **European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Site Suitability</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a. <strong>Proximity to contaminated land</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) <strong>Contaminated land professional assessment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former factory site 163m to NE. Former insulated cable works 214m to SW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. <strong>Local road impact</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. <strong>Strategic Road Network impact</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. <strong>Transport impacts - professional assessment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Has Highways frontage Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry"  
The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan based on net area identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. Individually these sites may not generate severe impact within Soham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, but CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Soham the cumulative impact could be significant. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. A Transport Strategy for Soham would be required should this much development be intended within the town. This would need to model the impact of the combined developments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Access to services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. <strong>Proximity to public transport</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. <strong>Proximity to medical services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. <strong>Proximity to shops</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. <strong>Proximity to Primary School</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. <strong>Proximity to Secondary School</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) <strong>Available primary school capacity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) <strong>Primary education impacts - professional assessment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The school site is currently undersized for this school. The plan is to acquire more playing field land for the school as part of the Eastern Gateway development. Discussions are underway between the CCC and the Town Council regarding a land swap.

| 6f.(ii) **Available secondary school capacity** | Limited capacity |
| 6g.(ii) **Secondary education impacts - professional assessment** |

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

<p>| 6h. <strong>Proximity to employment sites</strong> | Less than 15 min walk (&lt;1,200m) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Environmental impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. <strong>Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. <strong>County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Existing mixed-use allocation, Budgens site  
**Parish:** Soham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/23/31

| 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers |  
| 7d. Agricultural land classification | Site is not located on agricultural land  
| 7e. Public Rights of Way | E – No PRoW connection opportunities  
| 7f.(i) PROW comments |  
| 7f.(i) Conservation Area | Site is within CA  
| 7f.(ii). Listed building | LB on-site  
| 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument | SAM more than 2km from site  
| 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset |  
| 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments |  
|  | Within conservation area and close proximity to listed buildings - care must be taken to ensure no harm caused to the significance of the heritage assets.  
| 7h. Visual impact |  
|  | Justification for score:  
| Additional criterion 7i. TPOs | TPO tree on site  

**Parish Council support and rank**

**Does Parish Council support this site?**  

| Form E - Parish Council site ranking: |  
| Form G - Parish Council's view: |  

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received**

**Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:**
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Site Name:** Land rear of 48-64, Station Road, Soham

**Parish:** Soham CP

**Site Ref:** Site/23/32

### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:**

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The Council's monitoring of development sites indicates that development of the site is now complete. The site is rejected on this basis.

### Site Information

**Site Type:** Site with extant planning permission

**Site Address:** Land rear of 48-64, Station Road, Soham, ELY, CB7 5DY

**Settlement:** Soham

**LP15 Allocation Ref:**

**Planning Perm. Ref:** 14/00745/FUM

**Site Description:** Land rear of 48-64, Station Road, Soham, ELY, CB7 5DY

**Brown/Greenfield:** Greenfield

**Known Constraints:**

**Current Use:** Other (please specify)

**Proposed Use:** Housing

**Current Use info:** Garden land / agriculture

**Proposed Use info:**

**Site Area Net (ha):** 0.34

**Site Area Gross (ha):** 0.34

**Indicative no. of dwellings:**

- a) Submitted / estimated: 14
- b) Recommended: 0

### Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

- >50% of site area in Zone 1

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 Year</th>
<th>100 Year</th>
<th>1,000 Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>11.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Current Status:** **Rejected - not a site allocation**  
**Site Name:** *Land rear of 48-64, Station Road, Soham*  
**Parish:** *Soham CP*  
**Site Ref:** *Site/23/32*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>Individually this site may not generate severe impact within Soham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, especially considering that it is below the threshold where an assessment is required with 14 dwellings identified, however CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Soham the cumulative impact could be significant. Therefore this site will require a TS to accompany development proposals. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. A Transport Strategy for Soham would be required should this much development be intended within the town. This would need to model the impact of the combined developments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6a. Proximity to public transport</th>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>Spare capacity in some years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
The school site is currently undersized for this school. The plan is to acquire more playing field land for the school as part of the Eastern Gateway development. Discussions are underway between the CCC and the Town Council regarding a land swap.

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

| 6h. Proximity to employment sites | Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m) |

#### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</th>
<th>CWS within 500m of site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

| 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers |    |

---

### Additional Notes

- Site located in area benefitting from defences: No
- Site located in area benefitting from defences: No
- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area: No
- Site located in area benefitting from defences: No

---

**MINOR CRITERIA**

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 2.01km - 5km from the site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment
- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area: No
- Site located in area benefitting from defences: No

---

**SITE SUITABILITY**

#### 5. Site Suitability

- 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- 5b. Local road impact
- 5c. Strategic Road Network impact
- 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

---

**ACCESS TO SERVICES**

#### 6. Access to services

- 6a. Proximity to public transport
- 6b. Proximity to medical services
- 6c. Proximity to shops
- 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

---

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT**

#### 7. Environmental impact

- 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
- 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

---

**SITE LOCATION**

- Site Ref: Site/23/32
- Site Name: Land rear of 48-64, Station Road, Soham
- Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
- Parish: Soham CP
### Site Name: Land rear of 48-64, Station Road, Soham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>Site is not located on agricultural land</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>D – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoWs outside the site boundary</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td>Footpath 45 runs along the west boundary of the site. Ensure that the route is no affected by any development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>Site is within CA</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Rejected**

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. However the site capacity is expected to be below the 10 unit threshold. The site is therefore rejected.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>Local Plan 2015 allocated site</th>
<th>ID:</th>
<th>200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land east of The Barn, Randalls Farm, Barway Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Barway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>BAR1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Undeveloped housing allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 11</td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Recommended 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
   Small Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
   >50% of site area in Zone 1
   **A**

   Proportion of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
   Flood Zone 1: 100.00%   Flood Zone 2: 0.00%   Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%   Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
   Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA
   Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMSW):
   30 Year: 0.99%   100 Year: 1.62%   1,000 Year: 3.84%
### Site Name:
Existing housing allocation, land east of The Barn, Randalls Farm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 2.01km - 5km from the site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

#### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

- **5a. Proximity to contaminated land**
  - Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

- **5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment**

- **5b. Local road impact**

- **5c. Strategic Road Network impact**

- **5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**

Individually this site may not generate severe impact within Soham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, especially considering that it is below the threshold where an assessment is required with 11 dwellings identified, however CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Soham the cumulative impact could be significant. Therefore this site will require a TS to accompany development proposals. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. A Transport Strategy for Soham would be required should this much development be intended within the town. This would needed to model the impact of the combined developments.

#### 6. Access to services

- **6a. Proximity to public transport**
  - Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

- **6b. Proximity to medical services**
  - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

- **6c. Proximity to shops**
  - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

- **6d. Proximity to Primary School**
  - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

- **6e. Proximity to Secondary School**
  - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

- **6f.(i) Available primary school capacity**
  - No spare places but room for expansion

- **6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity**
  - Limited capacity

- **6f.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**

An additional 105 places could be provided at the school. This would be sufficient to meet the needs of a development of 300 houses in the catchment area using the Council's standard multipliers

- **6f.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

- **6h. Proximity to employment sites**
  - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 7. Environmental impact

- **7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**
  - CWS within 501m – 1km of site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

- **7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers**
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Existing housing allocation, land east of The Barn, Randalls Farm  
**Parish:** Soham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/23/36

| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower | C |  
| 7e. Public Rights of Way | E – No PRoW connection opportunities | E |  
| 7f.(i) PROW comments |  |  |  
| 7f.(i) Conservation Area | CA more than 2km from site | A |  
| 7f.(ii). Listed building | LB within 500m of site | D |  
| 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument | SAM within 500.1 – 1000m of site | C |  
| 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset |  |  |  
| 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments |  |  |  
| Already allocated - same issues as before |  |  |  
| 7h. Visual impact |  |  |  
| Justification for score: |  |  |  

**Parish Council support and rank**

**Does Parish Council support this site?**

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment:

Rejected

Date and time of site visit:

09:00 02/06/2017

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site overlaps Site/23/41 which is a preferred site (SOH.H16). This site includes an increased site area, which adjoins a County Wildlife Site. This site should be rejected to ensure no adverse harm to the County Wildlife Site.

Site Information

Site Type:  FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17

Site Address:  117 Mereside, Soham

Settlement:  Soham

LP15 Allocation Ref:

Planning Perm. Ref:

Site Description:  Site includes dwelling and garden land and adjoining paddock, proposed for housing development.

Brown/Greenfield:  Greenfield

Known Constraints:  **Submission does not indicate number of proposed dwellings. Dwelling figure is therefore calculated from site area and does not reflect site constraints or characteristics.**

**Net site area estimated**

Current Use:  Mixed use

Proposed Use:  Housing

Current Use info:  Dwelling and garden land and adjacent paddock.

Proposed Use info:

Site Area Net (ha):  0.88

Site Area Gross (ha):  1.04

Indicative no. of dwellings:  a) Submitted / estimated 32  b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone  >50% of site area in Zone 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 1: 100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk  Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))

| Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW): |

Parish:  Soham CP

Site Ref:  Site/23/42

Site Name:  Land at 117 Mereside and paddock

Current Status:  Rejected - not a site allocation
**Site Name:** Land at 117 Mereside and paddock  
**Parish:** Soham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/23/42

### Minor Criteria

**3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation**  
Site does not intersect Inner Zone  

**4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites**  
2.01km - 5km from the site

**4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 Year:</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
<th>100 Year:</th>
<th>6.87%</th>
<th>1,000 Year:</th>
<th>19.62%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

### 5. Site Suitability

**5a. Proximity to contaminated land**  
Site within 50m of contaminated land

**5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment**

Railway line to E, Filled ground to E & S, Factory to N

**5b. Local road impact**  
No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

**5c. Strategic Road Network impact**

Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

**5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**

Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

**5e. Proximity to Primary School**  
No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

**5f.(i) Available primary school capacity**

The additional sites mean a cumulative allocation in Soham of 1839 dwellings. The pupil yield using the CCC multiplier will be 644 primary aged children. While The Shade can be expanded by 1FE (210) places this level of development will require the provision and site for a new 2FE primary school. There is some development potential at St Andrew's but not to accommodate 2FE

**5f.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**

The combined effect of the call for additional sites is to require a further 3.3FE of additional secondary school places (500 places) Coupled with the impacts of sites identified in the earlier round the total number of places required cannot be delivered at Soham VC which already operates at (FE (1350 places) on its current site. Coupled with higher levels of growth elsewhere it would be the County Council's intention to conduct a district wide review of secondary school provision on adoption of the new local plan. A strategic review would need to include the need for a further new secondary school (and site) within East Cambs as a potential option

**6a. Proximity to public transport**  
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

**6b. Proximity to medical services**  
Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

**6c. Proximity to shops**  
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

**6d. Proximity to Primary School**  
Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

**6e. Proximity to Secondary School**  
Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

**6f.(i) Available primary school capacity**  
No spare places but room for expansion

**6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**

**6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity**

No spare places but room for expansion

**6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**

**7. Environmental impact**

**7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**  
CWS located within site

**7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**

**7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers**
| **7d. Agricultural land classification** | All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower | C |
| **7e. Public Rights of Way** | E – No PRoW connection opportunities | E |
| **7f.(i) PROW comments** | | |
| **7f.(i) Conservation Area** | CA within 500m of site | D |
| **7f.(ii). Listed building** | LB within 500m of site | D |
| **7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument** | SAM more than 2km from site | A |
| **7f.(iv) Archaeological asset** | | |
| **7g. Heritage / archaeology comments** | No impact on designated heritage assets. | |
| **7h. Visual impact** | Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views | C |

**Justification for score:**
Site largely enclosed and out of public view

**Additional criterion 7l. TPOs**
No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

**Parish Council support and rank**

Does Parish Council support this site? No

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view: (c) not add this site to the Local Plan

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit: 09:00 02/06/2017

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The southern part of the site is proposed for allocation through SOH.H8. The northern parcel is considered important for the agricultural landscape setting of Soham and should be rejected.

Site Information

Site Type: FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17

Site Address: The Shade, Soham

Settlement: Soham

LP15 Allocation Ref: ID: 423

Site Description: Site is an existing Local Plan 2015 employment allocation (SOH9), also identified for employment use in the emerging Local Plan by draft site allocation SOH.E1. This submissions proposes housing development of the site as an extension to draft site allocation SOH.H8, due to poor viability and lack of market demand for employment development in this location.

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints: **Submission does not indicate number of proposed dwellings. Dwelling figure is therefore calculated from site area and does not reflect site constraints or characteristics.** **Net site area estimated**

Current Use: Agriculture

Proposed Use: Housing

Current Use info: Agricultural land currently allocated for employment development.

Proposed Use info:

Site Area Net (ha): 3.75

Site Area Gross (ha): 5

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 135

b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

Main Settlement

A

1b. Site Availability


1c. Minerals and Waste assessment


1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies


1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations


2a. Flood zone

>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Minor Criteria

### 5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact
- No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- Access off The Shades no access from the A142 will be permitted. Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- The additional sites mean a cumulative allocation in Soham of 1839 dwellings. The pupil yield using the CCC multiplier will be 644 primary aged children. While The Shade can be expanded by 1FE (210) places this level of development will require the provision and site for a new 2FE primary school. There is some development potential at St Andrew's but not to accommodate 2FE

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- The combined effect of the call for additional sites is to require a further 3.3FE of additional secondary school places (500 places) Coupled with the impacts of sites identified in the earlier round the total number of places required cannot be delivered at Soham VC which already operates at (FE (1350 places) on its current site. Coupled with higher levels of growth elsewhere it would eb the County Council's intention to conduct a district wide review of secondary school provision on adoption of the new local plan. A strategic review would need to include the need for a further new secondary school (and site) within East Cambs as a potential option

6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

### 7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 500m of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**  
Site Name: *Land east of The Shade*  
Parish: **Soham CP**  
Site Ref: **Site/23/43**

| 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers |  
|---------------------------------|---|
| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower | D |
| 7e. Public Rights of Way | C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PROW within the site boundary | C |
| 7f.(i) PROW comments |  
| 7f.(i) Conservation Area | CA within 500m of site | D |
| 7f.(ii). Listed building | LB within 500m of site | D |
| 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument | SAM more than 2km from site | A |
| 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset |  
| 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments | No impact on designated heritage assets. |  
| 7h. Visual Impact | Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive | D |

**Justification for score:**  
No impact on S half, though N half has some limited impact on agri setting of Soham.

**Additional criterion 7l. TPOs**  
No TPO within 15m of the site | A

### Parish Council support and rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council's view:</td>
<td>(c) not add this site to the Local Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Rejected**

Date and time of site visit: 09:00 02/06/2017

Supersedes site submission(s):

Main findings and recommendations:

The site is isolated from Soham and would likely have poor access to services and facilities - the site is therefore not a sustainable location. Development of the site would likely be visually intrusive and result in adverse harm to the landscape.

---

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Old Tiger Stables, Northfield Road, Soham, Ely, CB7 5UF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Soham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Proposal seeks housing development of site to facilitate relocation of riding stables business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Site submission indicates site could accommodate circa 10-20 new dwellings. &quot;<strong>Net site area estimated</strong>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td>Equestrian - stables and paddocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy | Main Settlement |
|-------------------------|----------------|
1b. Site Availability | |
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment | |

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies | |
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations | |

2a. Flood zone >50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

- Flood Zone 1: 100.00% |
- Flood Zone 2: 0.00% |
- Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% |
- Flood Zone 3b: 0.00% |

2b. Surface Water flood risk Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

- 30 Year: 1.59% |
- 100 Year: 3.52% |
- 1,000 Year: 10.13%
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Parish:** Soham CP  
**Site Name:** Land at Old Tiger Stables

| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No |

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

| 5a. Proximity to contaminated land | Site located more than 250m from contaminated land | A |
| 5a(i) Contaminated land professional assessment | |

| 5b. Local road impact | No objections with minor mitigation measures | A |
| 5c. Strategic Road Network impact | |
| 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment | Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry. | |

#### 6. Access to services

| 6a. Proximity to public transport | Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m) | C |
| 6b. Proximity to medical services | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |
| 6c. Proximity to shops | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |
| 6d. Proximity to Primary School | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |
| 6e. Proximity to Secondary School | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |
| 6f(i) Available primary school capacity | No spare places but room for expansion | D |
| 6f(ii) Available secondary school capacity | No spare places but room for expansion | D |

#### 6g. Primary education impacts - professional assessment

The additional sites mean a cumulative allocation in Soham of 1839 dwellings. The pupil yield using the CCC multiplier will be 644 primary aged children. While The Shade can be expanded by 1FE (210) places this level of development will require the provision and site for a new 2FE primary school. There is some development potential at St Andrew's but not to accommodate 2FE

| 6g(i) Available primary school capacity | No spare places but room for expansion | D |

#### 6g(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The combined effect of the call for additional sites is to require a further 3.3FE of additional secondary school places (500 places) Coupled with the impacts of sites identified in the earlier round the total number of places required cannot be delivered at Soham VC which already operates at (FE (1350 places) on its current site. Coupled with higher levels of growth elsewhere it would eb the County Council's intention to conduct a district wide review of secondary school provision on adoption of the new local plan. A strategic review would need to include the need for a further new secondary school (and site) within East Cambs as a potential option

| 6h. Proximity to employment sites | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |

#### 7. Environmental impact

| 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites | CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site | B |
| 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment | |

| 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers | |
| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower | D |
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**  
Parish: **Soham CP**  
Site Name: **Land at Old Tiger Stables**  
Site Ref: **Site/23/44**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7e. Public Rights of Way</th>
<th>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td>Public Byway Open to all Traffic 27 runs along the northern boundary of the site. Provide a safe off road link between the Public Byway and Northfield road to the south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA more than 2km from site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td>Listed building to the southwest, likely to have no impact on designated heritage assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
<td>Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification for score:</td>
<td>Housing would have a detrimental visual impact, in what is a predominantly farm / agricultural area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional criterion 7i. TPOs</td>
<td>No TPO within 15m of the site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

- **Does Parish Council support this site?** No
- **Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**
- **Form G - Parish Council’s view:** (c) not add this site to the Local Plan

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Parish: Soham CP
Site Name: Land at Northern Gateway
Site Ref: Site/23/45

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit:
09:00 02/06/2017

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site lacks defensible boundaries and is part of the open countryside. The visual impact of development would likely cause adverse harm to the landscape.

Site Information

Site Type: FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17
ID: 425

Site Address: Northern Gateway, The Shade, Soham

Settlement: Soham

LP15 Allocation Ref: 
Planning Perm. Ref: 

Site Description: The site is offered as an employment allocation as an alternative to the requirement for employment development as part of a mixed-use scheme at site SOH.M2.

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints: **Net site area estimated**

Current Use: Agriculture

Proposed Use: Employment

Current Use info:

Proposed Use info:

Site Area Net (ha): 0.65
Site Area Gross (ha): 0.77

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 0 b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Main Settlement

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone >50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00% Flood Zone 2: 0.00% Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW): 30 Year: 3.72% 100 Year: 3.50% 1,000 Year: 60.72%
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land at Northern Gateway  
**Parish:** Soham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/23/45

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

##### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land

Site located more than 250m from contaminated land - A

##### 5b. Local road impact

No objections with Moderate mitigation measures - B

##### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

No objections with Moderate mitigation measures - B

##### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

No direct access from the A142 will be permitted. Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6a. Proximity to public transport</th>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m) - A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m) - E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Less than 15 min walk (&lt;1,200m) - C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m) - A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m) - E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</th>
<th>CWS within 501m – 1km of site - C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower - C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PROW within the site boundary - C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 7f.(i) Conservation Area |
| 7f.(ii) Conservation Area |
| 7g.(i) Conservation Area |
| 7g.(ii) Conservation Area |

Public Footpath 18 runs diagonally across the site. This link to be retained within the site to provide a link to the wider network.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name:</th>
<th>Land at Northern Gateway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Status:</td>
<td>Rejected - not a site allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish:</td>
<td>Soham CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref:</td>
<td>Site/23/45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Site Ref: | Site/23/45 |
| Parish: | Soham CP |

| 7f.(i) Conservation Area | CA within 500.1 – 1000m of site | C |
| 7f.(ii). Listed building | LB within 500m of site | D |
| 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument | SAM more than 2km from site | A |
| 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset | | |

**7g. Heritage / archaeology comments**

Listed building to the east, likely limited impact on designated heritage assets.

| 7h. Visual Impact | Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive | D |

**Additional criterion 7i. TPOs**

No TPO within 15m of the site

**Parish Council support and rank**

Does Parish Council support this site? | Yes |
--- | --- |
Form E - Parish Council site ranking: |
Form G - Parish Council’s view: | (c) not add this site to the Local Plan |

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**
Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:**
26/7/2016 at 12:00pm

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**
The site is rejected as it has a poor relationship to the main built area of the village. Development may therefore result in harm to the built form of the village and experience poor access to services and facilities. In addition, development of the site may harm the setting of heritage assets (inc. listed building(s) and SAM).

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID:</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Stetchworth Park Stud, Church Lane, stetchworth, Newmarket, Cambridgeshire, CB8 9TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Stetchworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Stetchworth Park Stud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>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. The site has vehicular access off Church Lane and has additional footpath links to the village. Form indicates approx 10% CLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td>Housing, employment CLD, Tourism, Leisure, Equestrian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>9.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  a) Submitted / estimated | 40  
  b) Recommended | 0 |

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy | Medium Village |
1b. Site Availability | Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22) |
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone | >50% of site area in Zone 1 |

| Flood Zone 1: | 100.00% |
| Flood Zone 2: | 0.00%    |
| Flood Zone 3a: | 0.00%   |
| Flood Zone 3b: | 0.00%   |

2b. Surface Water flood risk |
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA |

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW): |  

Date and time of site visit:
26/7/2016 at 12:00pm

Supersedes site submission(s)
**Site Name:** Stetchworth Park Stud

**Parish:** Stetchworth CP

**Site Ref:** Site/24/01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 Year:</th>
<th>0.23%</th>
<th>100 Year:</th>
<th>0.10%</th>
<th>1,000 Year:</th>
<th>7.40%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 2.01km - 5km from the site

### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</th>
<th>Site located more than 250m from contaminated land</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5b. Local road impact</th>
<th>Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Accessed off Church Lane
- Extensive mitigations measures and highways improvements would be required as well as the purchase of land to facilitate this development
- Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

Individually this site may not generate severe impact within Soham and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, especially considering that it is below the threshold where an assessment is required with 11 dwellings identified, however CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Soham the cumulative impact could be significant. Therefore this site will require a TS to accompany development proposals. Should significant development across a number of sites be proposed then the developers will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment as part of the assessment of proposals to demonstrate that significant cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. A Transport Strategy for Soham would be required should this much development be intended within the town. This would need to model the impact of the combined developments.

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6a. Proximity to public transport</th>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Less than 15 min walk (&lt;1,200m)</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>No spare places but room for expansion</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>The site has the potential to add a further 70 places at the school. Using the standard pupil multiplier this would be the expected demand arising from a development of around 200 homes in the catchment area.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>No spare places but room for expansion</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>The school is being expanded to 10 FE - 1500 places 11-16. This is to address the forecast demand for places and makes no allowance for any further housing development. The pupils are already in the primary feeder schools for Bottisham VC. The VC will NOT expand beyond 10FE even if the site allows it.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7. Environmental impact
**Site Name:** Stetchworth Park Stud  
**Site Ref:** Site/24/01  

| **7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites** | CWS within 501m – 1km of site | C |
| **7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment** |  |
| **7c. Groundwater P2 and aquifers** |  |
| **7d. Agricultural land classification** | All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower | D |
| **7e. Public Rights of Way** | E – No PRoW connection opportunities | E |
| **7e.(i) PROW comments** |  |
| **7f.(i) Conservation Area** | CA within 1.01km – 2km of site | B |
| **7f.(ii). Listed building** | LB within 500m of site | D |
| **7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument** | SAM on-site | E |
| **7f.(iv) Archaeological asset** |  |

**7g. Heritage / archaeology comments**

ECDC: Number of listed buildings - including Grade II* church - depending on use could cause harm to the character and setting of the heritage assets.

HE: 24/01: the site is bordered by the Devil’s Ditch scheduled monument. It affects the setting of the grade II* Church of St Peter which is adjacent to the site. It also affects the setting of a number of grade II listed buildings along the High Street and nearby Stetchworth House and its Park. This site should not be taken forward owing to the impact on the designated assets.

| **7h. Visual Impact** | Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views | C |

**Justification for score:**

| **Additional criterion 7i. TPOs** | No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

**Parish Council support and rank**

**Does Parish Council support this site?**  
No

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council's view:**

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment:
- Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s):
Site/25/02; Site/25/04; Site/25/05; Site/25/06

Main findings and recommendations:
The site provides a single, coherent boundary and should be allocated to enable continued development (and extension of) the Manor Farm Community-Land Trust development. Supersedes Site/25/02, Site/25/04, Site/25/05, Site/25/06

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)
ID: 369
Site Address: Land at Manor Farm, Stretham
Settlement: Stretham

LP15 Allocation Ref:
Planning Perm. Ref:

Site Description: Supersedes Site/25/02, Site/25/04, Site/25/05, Site/25/06

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints:
Current Use: Agriculture
Proposed Use: Housing

Current Use info: Housing development under construction
Proposed Use info:

Site Area Net (ha): 6.50
Site Area Gross (ha): 4.88

Indicative no. of dwellings:
a) Submitted / estimated 100
b) Recommended 100

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Large Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>-50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
30 Year: 0.00%  100 Year: 0.00%  1,000 Year: 0.94%
**Site Ref:** Site/25/07  
**Parish:** Stretham CP  
**Site Name:** Land at Manor Farm, Stretham  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Site Suitability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Access to services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6h. Proximity to employment sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Environmental impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Southern half of site lies in Safeguarding Area for Stretham Waste Water Treatment Works – but already has planning permission.
- Plans for primary school expansion in place.
- No residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off. Surface water should be managed on-site.
- Site is located east of Stretham Conservation Area. Development of the site should conserve, and where opportunities exist, enhance the conservation area and its setting.
- Site promoter supports allocation of site for 100 dwellings (of which 75 benefit from planning permission, with phases under construction), and confirms site is suitable, available and deliverable, contributing to five year supply of housing.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit: 12:20 29 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site provides a logical extension to the Manor Farm community-land trust development, with good access to village facilities, and should therefore be allocated for housing development as a single allocation covering both sites. Land contamination at southern boundary may require further investigation.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B) ID: 123
Site Address: Land at Manor Farm, Stretham, CB6 3JY
Settlement: Stretham
LP15 Allocation Ref: Planning Perm. Ref:
Site Description: Land at Manor Farm, Stretham
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: Site forms part of the Manor Farm Community Land Trust proposals. A planning application for this phase of development is likely to be submitted within the next 12 months. No known constraints.

Current Use: Agriculture Proposed Use: Housing
Current Use info:
Proposed Use info:
Site Area Net (ha): 1.08 Site Area Gross (ha): 1.27
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 25 b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Large Village
1b. Site Availability Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone >50% of site area in Zone 1
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00% Flood Zone 2: 0.00% Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
Current Status: Superseded by STR.H1
Site Name: Reserve land, Manor Farm, Stretham
Parish: Stretham CP
Site Ref: Site/25/02

| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No |

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

##### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
Site located on contaminated land

##### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
Old landfill site on S boundary. Part of site on landfill site.

##### 5b. Local road impact
Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

##### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

##### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
"NO access to highway or highways frontage Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry "
This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

##### 6. Access to services

##### 6a. Proximity to public transport
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6b. Proximity to medical services
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6c. Proximity to shops
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
Spare capacity in some years

##### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
Only limited expansion possible on present site for a 60 place increase overall. Using our standard multiplier a development of approx 165 homes in the catchment area would yield that number of pupils

##### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
Limited capacity

##### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area.

##### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 7. Environmental impact

##### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
CWS within 501m – 1km of site

##### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

##### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

##### 7d. Agricultural land classification
All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

##### 7e. Public Rights of Way

##### 7f.(i) PROW comments
Site Name: Reserve land, Manor Farm, Stretham

Current Status: Superseded by STR.H1
Parish: Stretham CP
Site Ref: Site/25/02

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>CA within 500m of site</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii). Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
Listed building and conservation area to the west - limited heritage impact

| 7h. Visual Impact | Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views | C |

Justification for score:
Some dwellings may lose view of open fields. But no major impacts.

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

Parish Council support and rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td>First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council's view:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received
Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**  
Preferred site

**Date and time of site visit:**

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**  
The site has extant planning permission and forms part of the Manor Farm community-land trust development. The site should therefore be allocated for housing development to retain this decision.

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>Site with extant planning permission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land Parcel to East of Meadowcroft, Stretham, ELY, CB6 3JX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Stretham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td>14/00013/FUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Land Parcel to East of Meadowcroft, Stretham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 50 b) Recommended 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  
Large Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment  
This site lies almost entirely within the Safeguarding Area Stretham Waste Water Treatment Works (Policy W7AP) designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012). The overarching policy for this designation is Policy CS31 of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011). This policy places a presumption against allowing development which would be occupied by people (residential, industrial, commercial, sport and recreation); and where new development is proposed an odour assessment report should accompany any planning application. Permission should only be granted when it has been demonstrated that the proposed development would not be adversely affected by the continued operation of the existing waste water treatment works. It is suggested that consideration should be given to these policies prior to allocation in the interests of deliverability.

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations  
W7AP

2a. Flood zone  
>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

**5a. Proximity to contaminated land**

- **5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment**

**5b. Local road impact**

**5c. Strategic Road Network impact**

**5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Statement based on 50 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area.

#### 6. Access to services

**6a. Proximity to public transport**

- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

**6b. Proximity to medical services**

- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

**6c. Proximity to shops**

- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

**6d. Proximity to Primary School**

- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

**6e. Proximity to Secondary School**

- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

**6f.(i) Available primary school capacity**

- Spare capacity in some years

**6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity**

- Limited capacity

**6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**

- The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area.

**6h. Proximity to employment sites**

- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 7. Environmental impact

**7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**

- CWS within 501m – 1km of site

**7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**

**7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers**

---

**Flood Zone 1:** 100.00%  
**Flood Zone 2:** 0.00%  
**Flood Zone 3a:** 0.00%  
**Flood Zone 3b:** 0.00%

**2b. Surface Water flood risk**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMSW):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):** No

**Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):** No

---

**3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation**

- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

**4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites**

- 2.01km - 5km from the site

**4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment**

---

**5a. Proximity to contaminated land**

- **5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment**

**5b. Local road impact**

**5c. Strategic Road Network impact**

**5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**

---

**6. Access to services**

**6a. Proximity to public transport**

- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

**6b. Proximity to medical services**

- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

**6c. Proximity to shops**

- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

**6d. Proximity to Primary School**

- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

**6e. Proximity to Secondary School**

- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

**6f.(i) Available primary school capacity**

- Spare capacity in some years

**6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity**

- Limited capacity

**6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**

- The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area.

**6h. Proximity to employment sites**

- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

---

**7. Environmental impact**

**7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**

- CWS within 501m – 1km of site

**7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**

**7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers**
## FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name: Land Parcel to East of Meadowcroft, Stretham</th>
<th>Current Status: Superseded by STR.H1</th>
<th>Parish: Stretham CP</th>
<th>Site Ref: Site/25/04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parish Council support and rank</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Parish Council support this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council's view:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7d. Agricultural land classification
- All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower
- Score: D

### 7e. Public Rights of Way
- Score: D

### 7f.(i) PROW comments
- Score: D

### 7f.(i) Conservation Area
- CA within 500m of site
- Score: D

### 7f.(ii). Listed building
- LB within 500m of site
- Score: D

### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
- SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site
- Score: B

### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset
- Score: B

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
- n/a

### 7h. Visual impact
- Justification for score:

### Additional criterion 7l. TPOs
- No TPO within 15m of the site
- Score: A
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Main findings and recommendations:
The site has extant planning permission and forms part of the Manor Farm community-land trust development. The site should therefore be allocated for housing development to retain this decision.

Site Information

Site Type: Site with extant planning permission
Site Address: Land Formerly 21 Road, Newmarket, Cambridgeshire
Settlement: Stretham

LP15 Allocation Ref: ID: 252
Planning Perm. Ref: 10/00174/FUM

Site Description: Land Formerly 21 Road, Newmarket
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints: Erection of 5no. one & two bed. flats within the village envelope and the erection of 3no. one bed. flats, 2no. two bed. houses and 4no. three bed. houses under the exceptions policy for affordable housing. Together with associated landscaping, car parking and access arrangements

Current Use: Agriculture
Proposed Use: Housing

Site Area Net (ha): 0.21
Site Area Gross (ha): 0.2124

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 14
b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Large Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment
This site lies almost entirely within the Safeguarding Area Stretham Waste Water Treatment Works (Policy W7AP) designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012). The overarching policy for this designation is Policy CS31 of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011). This policy places a presumption against allowing development which would be occupied by people (residential, industrial, commercial, sport and recreation); and where new development is proposed an odour assessment report should accompany any planning application. Permission should only be granted when it has been demonstrated that the proposed development would not be adversely affected by the continued operation of the existing waste water treatment works. It is suggested that consideration should be given to these policies prior to allocation in the interests of deliverability.

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations W7AP

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1
Current Status: Superseded by STR.H1  
Site Name: Land Formerly 21 Road, Newmarket  
Parish: Stretham CP  
Site Ref: Site/25/05

**Minor Criteria**

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land profession assessment

5b. Local road impact

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport  
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services  
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6c. Proximity to shops  
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School  
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity  
Spare capacity in some years

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity  
Limited capacity

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

Only limited expansion possible on present site for a 60 place increase overall. Using our standard multiplier a development of approx 165 homes in the catchment area would yield that number of pupils

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites  
CWS within 501m – 1km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers
### Site Name: Land Formerly 21 Road, Newmarket

#### Current Status: Superseded by STR.H1

#### Site Ref: Site/25/05

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7d. Agricultural land classification</th>
<th>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification for score:**

### Parish Council support and rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council’s view:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

Overall recommendation from site assessment:  
Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s):

Main findings and recommendations:

The site has extant planning permission and forms part of the Manor Farm community-land trust development. The site should therefore be allocated for housing development to retain this decision.

---

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>Site with extant planning permission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID:</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land Formerly 21 Newmarket Road Streatham Cambridgeshire CB6 3JF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Streatham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td>15/00986/FUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Land Formerly 21 Newmarket Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Proposed erection of 25 residential dwellings, public open space and associated landscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>0.9203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  
Large Village  

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

This site lies almost entirely within the Safeguarding Area Streatham Waste Water Treatment Works (Policy W7AP) designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012). The overarching policy for this designation is Policy CS31 of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011). This policy places a presumption against allowing development which would be occupied by people (residential, industrial, commercial, sport and recreation); and where new development is proposed an odour assessment report should accompany any planning application. Permission should only be granted when it has been demonstrated that the proposed development would not be adversely affected by the continued operation of the existing waste water treatment works. It is suggested that consideration should be given to these policies prior to allocation in the interests of deliverability.

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations  
W7AP

2a. Flood zone  
>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1:</th>
<th>100.00%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2:</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a:</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b:</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (% of site area at risk (uFMISW)):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year: 0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
Site does not intersect Inner Zone

4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
2.01km - 5km from the site

4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6c. Proximity to shops
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
Spare capacity in some years

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
Limited capacity

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
Only limited expansion possible on present site for a 60 place increase overall. Using our standard multiplier a development of approx 165 homes in the catchment area would yield that number of pupils

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
CWS within 501m – 1km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification
All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower
**Site Name:** Land formerly 21 Newmarket Road, Stretham  
**Parish:** Stretham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/25/06  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7e. Public Rights of Way</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7e.(i) PROW comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>CA within 500m of site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(ii) Listed building</th>
<th>LB within 500m of site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</th>
<th>SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7h. Visual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification for score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional criterion 7i. TPOs</th>
<th>No TPO within 15m of the site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form G - Parish Council’s view:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Land to the north of Berry Close, Stretham
Parish: Stretham CP
Site Ref: Site/25/01

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Has merit

Date and time of site visit: 12:35 29 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site has few constraints and has some merit as a development site. The site was not supported by the Parish Council due to possible highways impacts on the village. In addition, development may be visually intrusive to the open countryside, particularly for users of the adjacent PROW and may impact on distant Cathedral views. Other suitable, available and more favoured sites are available elsewhere in the village.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
<th>ID: 122</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Land to the north of Berry Close, Stretham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Stretham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>Land to the north of Berry Close, Stretham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints</td>
<td>No known constraints. CLD to be agreed at planning application stage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha)</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Indicative no. of dwellings:  
  a) Submitted / estimated | 50                          |
|                          | b) Recommended              | 0       |

Major Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a. Settlement Hierarchy</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. Site Availability</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Minerals and Waste assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Flood zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 1: 100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 2: 0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Surface Water flood risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Year: 0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Year: 1.29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 Year: 4.46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation</td>
<td>Site does not intersect Inner Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites</td>
<td>More than 5km from site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

| 5a. Proximity to contaminated land | Site located more than 250m from contaminated land | A |
| 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment | |
| 5b. Local road impact | No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations | C |
| 5c. Strategic Road Network impact | |
| 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment | |

"Access off Berry Close Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry. Reasonable mitigation measures and highways improvements needed on Barry Lane / Wood lane to improve access and geometry & junctions lead to / from the site. NO access to A10 will be permitted - Principal Transport Route"

#### 6. Access to services

| 6a. Proximity to public transport | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) | A |
| 6b. Proximity to medical services | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) | B |
| 6c. Proximity to shops | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) | B |
| 6d. Proximity to Primary School | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) | A |
| 6e. Proximity to Secondary School | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |
| 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity | Spare capacity in some years | B |
| 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity | Limited capacity | C |
| 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment | |
| 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment | The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area. |
| 6h. Proximity to employment sites | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |

#### 7. Environmental impact

| 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites | CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site | B |
| 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment | |
| 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers | |
| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower | D |
| 7e. Public Rights of Way | C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PROW within the site boundary | C |
| 7e.(i) PROW comments | | |
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land to the north of Berry Close, Stretham  
**Parish:** Stretham CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/25/01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>CA within 500m of site</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) - Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

Conservation area to south - No heritage impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7h. Visual Impact</th>
<th>Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Justification for score:**

Some loss of views / users of track (if PROW) probably largely unaffected as visual interest in opposite direction. However, there are distant views of Cathedral to north, poking above trees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional criterion 7i. TPOs</th>
<th>No TPO within 15m of the site</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td>Second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council’s view:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Site promoter objects to non-inclusion of site.
- Site Assessment Evidence Report acknowledges that site has merit as a development site – site promoter suggests site has significant development potential.
- Stretham is a Large Village and offers a wide range of services and facilities, and is therefore a sustainable location to accommodate development.
- Village services and facilities are within walking/cycling distance of the site.
- Impact on primary school capacity likely to be limited.
- Parish Council raised concerns about local road impact. However local highways authority did not object to the site, subject to reasonable mitigation measures.
- Site is of negligible ecological value.
- Development would not cause undue harm on views of wider countryside, Ely Cathedral, Stretham Conservation Area, listed buildings or scheduled monuments.
- Landscape buffer on northern boundary would reduce visual impact on countryside.
- PROW adjacent to site would be largely unaffected by development.
- Site suitable and available for development, and will contribute to increasing supply of housing within five years.
- Site would deliver public benefits in terms of public open space, additional market and affordable housing, and enhanced PROW.
- Site should be allocated for approximately 50 dwellings and associated public open spac
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**

Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:**

11:50 29 July 2016

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is rejected as safe highway access is unlikely to be achievable. The site is not well related to the settlement.

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
<th>ID:</th>
<th>124</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Wilburton Road, Stretham</td>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Stretham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Land at Wilburton Road, Stretham</td>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Application for residential development of part of site in course of preparation. To be submitted Spring 2016.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 50</td>
<td>b) Recommended</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

- Large Village

1b. Site Availability

- Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

- -

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

- -

2a. Flood zone

- >50% of site area in Zone 1

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

| Flood Zone 1: | 100.00% | Flood Zone 2: | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3a: | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3b: | 0.00% |

2b. Surface Water flood risk

- Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):**

<p>| 30 Year: | 0.07% | 100 Year: | 0.12% | 1,000 Year: | 2.16% |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>5. Site Suitability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
<td>Site located more than 250m from contaminated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>Insurmountable safety issues that cannot be secured in accordance with CIL regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>Spare capacity in some years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6h. Proximity to employment sites</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6i. Proximity to medial sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6j. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td>CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>B – Opportunities to connect to multiple nearby PROW within the site boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Statement based on 50 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area.
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Wilburton Road, Stretham
Parish: Stretham CP
Site Ref: Site/25/03

Sections of FPs 6, 7 & 8 are within the site. Ensure that these routes are retained as they provide a link for pedestrians from High Street to the east of the site and Wilburton Road to the south of the site. These routes are likely to require diversion by the developer to accommodate the proposed development. Also whilst the development takes place the developer must ensure that the route is still available and safe for the public or arrange for a temporary closure.

7f.(i) Conservation Area
CA within 500m of site

7f.(ii) Listed building
LB within 500m of site

7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site

7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

ECDC: Conservation area and listed buildings to east - Limited heritage impact

HE: 25/03: affects the setting of the conservation area and the setting of grade II* and II buildings including the Rectory and the Church of St James.

7h. Visual Impact
Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views

Justification for score:
Unlikely to cause significant harm, but may impact on views from existing dwellings.

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
No TPO within 15m of the site

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site? No

Form E - Parish Council site ranking: Third

Form G - Parish Council's view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

• Site promoter objects to rejection of site.
• Site would provide an attractive new development well-related to the existing settlement. Vehicular access can be achieved from Wilburton Road.
Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Rejected**

Date and time of site visit: 
11:40 15 May 2017

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
Safe, suitable vehicular access is unlikely to be achievable. The site is isolated - physically separate from any settlement, the site would likely have poor access to services and facilities.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17</th>
<th>ID:</th>
<th>426</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>A10, Stretham, Ely</td>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Stretham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Agricultural land proposed for housing development.</td>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Known Constraints: | **Submission does not indicate number of proposed dwellings. Dwelling figure is therefore calculated from site area and does not reflect site constraints or characteristics.** 
**Net site area estimated** | |
| Current Use: | Agriculture | Proposed Use: | Housing |
| Current Use info: | a) Submitted / estimated 113 | Proposed Use info: | |
| Site Area Net (ha): | 3.13 | Site Area Gross (ha): | 4.17 |
| Indicative no. of dwellings: | a) Submitted / estimated 113 | b) Recommended 0 |

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
- Large Village

2a. Flood zone
- >50% of site area in Zone 1
  - Flood Zone 1: 100.00%
  - Flood Zone 2: 0.00%
  - Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%
  - Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
- Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA
- Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW): -

Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Rejected**

Date and time of site visit: 
11:40 15 May 2017

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
Safe, suitable vehicular access is unlikely to be achievable. The site is isolated - physically separate from any settlement, the site would likely have poor access to services and facilities.
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
<td>Site located more than 250m from contaminated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land profesional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>Insurmountable safety issues that cannot be secured in accordance with CIL regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>No direct access from the A10 will be permitted this is a primary distributor road carrying very high numbers of distributor traffic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Less than 20 min walk (&lt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Less than 20 min walk (&lt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Less than 15 min walk (&lt;1,200m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>No spare places but room for expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>No spare places but room for expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total development proposed with the additional site is 213 dwellings. This may create a capacity issue in the village primary school but limited in size following an expansion in the region of 60 places. The Council may manage that impact at the existing school or seek to mitigate the impact at a neighbouring village school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land profesional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>Insurmountable safety issues that cannot be secured in accordance with CIL regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>No direct access from the A10 will be permitted this is a primary distributor road carrying very high numbers of distributor traffic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td>CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is potential to expand Witchford Village College on its current site. However, this latest call for site would result in much higher levels of development within the catchment area of the College if they were all included in the Local Plan. The level of development would generate another 595 secondary aged children or 4FE. This is in addition to the additional pupils identified from the sites included in the consultation draft local plan. At this level of development suitable mitigation could not be provided at Witchford VC. It would be the Council’s intention on adoption of the Local Plan to undertake a strategic review of secondary school provision across the District and the review would include the option of a further new secondary school (and site) in order to provide suitable mitigation. |
Site Name: Land off A10 at Stretham/Lt Thetford

Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

Parish: Stretham CP

Site Ref: Site/25/08

| 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers | |
| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower | C |
| 7e. Public Rights of Way | E – No PRoW connection opportunities | E |
| 7f.(i) PROW comments | |
| 7f.(i) Conservation Area | CA within 1.01km – 2km of site | B |
| 7f.(ii) Listed building | LB within 500.1 – 1000m of site | C |
| 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument | SAM more than 2km from site | A |
| 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset | |
| 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments | No impact on designated heritage assets | |
| 7h. Visual Impact | Significant harm to landscape/townscape or key views - severe visual intrusion | E |
| Justification for score: | Site is located in open countryside, physically separate from any settlement. Development would likely be visually intrusive to open countryside. |
| Additional criterion 7i. TPOs | No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site? No
Form E - Parish Council site ranking: |
Form G - Parish Council’s view: (c) not add this site to the Local Plan |

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit: 11:15 25 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site offers a suitable location for development close to Mepal village centre and should therefore be allocated for housing development. Site access should be via Brick Lane. Mitigation measures will be required to reduce road noise from A142. To ensure the existing tree belt is retained, the boundary of the draft site allocation should be amended to exclude this buffer.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land off Brick Lane, Mepal, Ely, Cambridgeshire, CB6 2AH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Sutton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>规划许可编号</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Land off Brick Lane, Mepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Flood Zone 1. Site benefits from established physical boundaries of the A142, Sutton Road and Brick Lane. Mepal has public transport links, services and amenities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 58 b) Recommended 50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy | Large Village B
1b. Site Availability | Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22) A
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone | >50% of site area in Zone 1 A

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
- Flood Zone 1: 100.00%
- Flood Zone 2: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk | Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA -

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA)
- 30 Year: 2.10%
- 100 Year: 0.84%
- 1,000 Year: 4.99%
### Site Information

- **Current Status:** Site Allocation MEP.H1
- **Site Name:** Land off Brick Lane, Mepal
- **Parish:** Sutton CP
- **Site Ref:** Site/26/01

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</th>
<th>Site within 250m of contaminated land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

- 123m N of RAF Mepal

5b. Local road impact

- No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

- Preferred vehicle access off Brick Lane
- No Vehicle access will be accepted on to or off the A142
- Potential inter-vehicle visibility issue at the junction with Sutton Road
- Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Statement, based on 58 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines; particularly the need to demonstrate that the site can provide adequate mitigation measures and assess and improve connectivity within Sutton. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. Individually these sites may not incur severe impact within and around Sutton and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, however CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Sutton the cumulative impact could be an issue, therefore the TS will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment.

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6a. Proximity to public transport</th>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6b. Proximity to medical services

- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops

- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School

- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School

- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

- Spare capacity in every year

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

- Limited capacity

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

- No expansion potential as the site is already under sized. Although the school has capacity the number of places in each year group are small as it is a small village school with a capacity of 105 places.

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

- The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area.

#### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</th>
<th>CWS within 501m – 1km of site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
### Current Status: Site Allocation MEP.H1
### Site Name: Land off Brick Lane, Mepal
### Parish: Sutton CP
### Site Ref: Site/26/01

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification
All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower
- **C**

#### 7e. Public Rights of Way
C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary
- **C**

#### 7f.(i) PROW comments
FP19 meets Brick Lane just above the north west corner of the site. Provide an off road link from this point to Sutton Road.

#### 7f.(ii) Conservation Area
CA within 1.01km – 2km of site
- **B**

#### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
SAM more than 2km from site
- **A**

#### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

#### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
Listed building to the north - No heritage impact - this site is in Mepal, not Sutton

#### 7h. Visual Impact
Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views
- **C**

**Justification for score:**
Clear boundaries to site, unlikely to result in harm.

#### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
No TPO within 15m of the site
- **A**

### Parish Council support and rank

**Does Parish Council support this site?**
Yes

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**
Second

**Form G - Parish Council's view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Site is located within Sutton’s parish boundary, but adjoins Mepal village. Parish boundary should be amended to bring site into Mepal parish.
- Support for policy requirement to retain the landscape buffer / wooded margin.
- A resident expressed concern their home may be surrounded by taller buildings.
- Proposals should be sympathetic to existing dwellings.
- Development of site will make Sutton and Mepal considerably closer to becoming one settlement.
- Vehicular access from Brick Lane is a key issue. Parish Council received substantial representation from residents on this matter. Narrow access, with junction width constrained by existing dwellings. Inappropriate, unsafe, would create a dangerous environment for existing residents. Brick Lane in poor condition. Traffic noise would be unfair on existing residents.
- Brick Lane/Sutton Road junction has poor visibility due to gradient and road layout, parked vehicles and bus stops. Dangerous for pedestrians.
- Access should be provided from Sutton Road, preferably from a new roundabout at the junction of Sutton Road and Witcham Road which could help restrict speed and reduce traffic volumes on Brick Lane.
- Development would severely impact view from the houses in Brick Lane.
- Bungalows preferable to houses.
- Tall hedge running alongside Brick Lane should be retained.
- Brick Lane is a quiet road, where children play, and is used by walkers, dog-walkers, horse-riders to access bridleway to Sutton Gault.
- Brick Lane has a history of water/sewerage problems, requiring investigation, and may be made worse by additional development. Surface water drainage ditch alongside Brick lane should be retained.
- Site currently absorbs substantial run-off and often lay wet.
- Property at west end of Brick Lane suffers from flooding issues, and should be remedied through development.
- No residual capacity in surface water receiving system – necessary surface water accommodation should be put in place.
prior to development.
• New development should install protection from traffic noise – affordable housing should not be used for this purpose. Existing vegetation insufficient at blocking noise.

• Site owner/promoter welcomes allocation of the site. However suggests Policy Mepal4 is reworded so as to give greater flexibility and to not pre-judge how site access and landscaping should be designed
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

- **Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Preferred site
- **Date and time of site visit:**
- **Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site includes an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation and adjoining land to provide a larger housing development scheme. The site is suitable for development, with few constraints, and should therefore be allocated for housing development.

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
<th>ID:</th>
<th>129</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land off Mepal Road, Sutton, CB6 2QA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Sutton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>SUT1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Land off Mepal Road, Sutton, including LP15 site SUT1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>11.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 250 b) Recommended 250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

| Large Village | B |

1b. Site Availability

| Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22) | A |

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

| >50% of site area in Zone 1 | A |

| Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening): |
|-----------------------------|------------------|
| Flood Zone 1: 100.00% | Flood Zone 2: 0.00% | Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% | Flood Zone 3b: 0.00% |

2b. Surface Water flood risk

| Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA |

| Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW): |
|-----------------------------|------------------|
| 30 Year: 0.57% | 100 Year: 0.83% | 1,000 Year: 4.70% |
**Site Name:** Land off Mepal Road, Sutton  
**Parish:** Sutton CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/26/05  

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</th>
<th>Site located on contaminated land</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

- Part of former RAF Mepal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5b. Local road impact</th>
<th>No objections with Moderate mitigation measures</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**ACCESS OF A142 - SCORING CAT E**

- No Vehicle access will be accepted on to or off the A142

**ACCESS VIA MEPAL ROAD - SCORING CAT B**

Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

A Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan would need to accompany the development proposals for this site. This would need to follow the guidance from CCC TA guidelines; particularly the need to demonstrate that the site can provide adequate mitigation measures and assess and improve connectivity to facilities within Sutton. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. The assessment will need to include a cumulative impact assessment as part of the development proposals. Individually these sites may not incur severe impact within Sutton and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, however CCC is concerned that by combinging the impact of all identified sites the cumulative impact could be an issue. The TA will particularly need to look at the impact of the development on the A142, especially around Ely. Earith crossing is intermittenly closed due to flooding, therefore the TA will also need to assess the impact of rerouting.

Combined 26/05 and 26/06 equate to 350 units. The plans currently indicate a single point of access from Mepal Road. Would this be acceptable for a combined development of such a size?

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6a. Proximity to public transport</th>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity | No spare places but room for expansion | D |

| 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity | Limited capacity | C |

**6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**

The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area.

| 6h. Proximity to employment sites | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |
7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

CWS within 501m – 1km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

7d. Agricultural land classification

All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

7e. Public Rights of Way

B – Opportunities to connect to multiple nearby PRoW within the site boundary

7e.(i) Conservation Area

CA within 500m of site

7f.(ii). Listed building

LB within 500m of site

7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

SAM more than 2km from site

7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

Provide a network of links between this site and 26/6 and the existing housing for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

Already allocated - same issues as before

7h. Visual Impact

Justification for score:

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

TPO tree within 15m of the site

7i. Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site? Yes

Form E - Parish Council site ranking: First

Form G - Parish Council's view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Development of site should fund provision of new burial ground.
- Fears that allocation of the site will lead to a much larger-scale development than is set out by the draft policy, as a developer is currently engaging in pre-application consultation in the area.
- Concerns that development of the site will split Sutton into two halves, resulting in village losing its centre.
- Concerns that site will not be delivered sustainably due to shortfall of school places, and limited bus service. Suggestion that development is phased in a manner which reflects school capacity.
- Concerns that transport issues have not been addressed, and development will generate extra traffic volume, pollution, noise, vibration, and speeding.
- Parish Council has proposed amended wording to policy Sutton4, including development should provide: a maximum of 250 dwellings, new multi-functional sports fields, provision towards a multi-use game area along with public open space and areas of play for infant, junior and youths, burial ground at suitable location in village, landscape buffer providing a wildlife corridor joining to green space within the development at northern boundary to frame development.
- Developer requests that indicative dwelling figure is increased from 250 dwellings to 427, as lower figure would be an inefficient use of land.
- Developer confirms site would deliver the policy requirements set out in Sutton4, and that the site is controlled by a housebuilder and is deliverable.
- Technical assessment of site demonstrates that contamination is not a constraint to development.
- Whilst site is located greater than walking distance from some services, public transport provides realistic alternatives,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Current Status:</strong></th>
<th>Site Allocation SUT.H1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Name:</strong></td>
<td>Land off Mepal Road, Sutton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parish:</strong></td>
<td>Sutton CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Ref:</strong></td>
<td>Site/26/05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

with bus stops located at The Brook.

*Previous/other community consultation exercises suggest site is most favoured by local residents*
Current Status: Site Allocation SUT.H2
Parish: Sutton CP
Site Name: Land east of Garden Close, Sutton
Site Ref: Site/26/04

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit: 12.55 25 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is suitable for development, with few constraints, and should therefore be allocated for housing development. Low density development is preferred to reflect the character of neighbouring development.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)
ID: 128

Site Address: Land east of Garden Close, Sutton

Settlement: Sutton

LP15 Allocation Ref: 
Planning Perm. Ref: 

Site Description: Land east of Garden Close, Sutton

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints:

Current Use: Other (please specify)
Proposed Use: Housing

Current Use info: Garden and private amenity land

Proposed Use info: 

Site Area Net (ha): 1.90
Site Area Gross (ha): 3.4

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 50 b) Recommended 25

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy 
Large Village

1b. Site Availability
Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

30 Year: 0.00%  100 Year: 0.45%  1,000 Year: 4.68%

Date and time of site visit: 12.55 25 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is suitable for development, with few constraints, and should therefore be allocated for housing development. Low density development is preferred to reflect the character of neighbouring development.
Site Name: Land east of Garden Close, Sutton

Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land

Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No

3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation

Site does not intersect Inner Zone

4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites

2.01km - 5km from the site

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Statement, based on 58 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines; particularly the need to demonstrate that the site can provide adequate mitigation measures and assess and improve connectivity within Sutton. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. Individually these sites may not incur severe impact within and around Sutton and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, however CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Sutton the cumulative impact could be an issue, therefore the TS will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment.

5b. Local road impact

No objections with minor mitigation measures

5c. Strategic Road Network impact


5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Statement, based on 58 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines; particularly the need to demonstrate that the site can provide adequate mitigation measures and assess and improve connectivity within Sutton. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. Individually these sites may not incur severe impact within and around Sutton and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, however CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Sutton the cumulative impact could be an issue, therefore the TS will need to undertake a cumulative impact assessment.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6c. Proximity to shops

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School

Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f(i) Available primary school capacity

No spare places but room for expansion

6f(ii) Available secondary school capacity

Limited capacity

6g(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

The school is currently operating above its physical capacity and has two mobile classrooms on site. There is space for limited expansion on site by 45 places only. A development of about 120 houses would yield this number of pupils

6g(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers
Current Status: Site Allocation SUT.H2
Site Name: Land east of Garden Close, Sutton
Parish: Sutton CP
Site Ref: Site/26/04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7d. Agricultural land classification</th>
<th>All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>D – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoWs outside the site boundary</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td>Provide a off road link for pedestrians to FP2 which is south of the site. This would involve negotiation with the affected landowner.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td>ECDC: Conservation area and listed buildings to the north - limited heritage impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HE: 26/04: affecting the setting of a conservation area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
<td>Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification for score:</td>
<td>Unlikely to cause harm. No view of countryside due to vegetation height.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional criterion 7i. TPOs</td>
<td>No TPO within 15m of the site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parish Council support and rank

- Does Parish Council support this site? Yes
- Form E - Parish Council site ranking: Third
- Form G - Parish Council's view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Development of the site will have a great visual impact on the village; and will change character of this part of the village, turning it into a noisy estate.
- Site is a ‘green lung’ for village, is a valuable habitat for local wildlife, and is close to the historic village core with its unique isle character.
- Green area that makes Sutton a pleasant place for families to live and to get outdoors. Pleasant and tranquil; one of the last green areas in the village. Provides good rural feel.
- Abundance of biodiversity and wildlife including Sparrow Hawks, Owls, Deer, Great Crested Newts, Woodpeckers, Frogs, Pheasants and more. Presence of newts could be a constraint to development.
- Hedgerows and trees should be retained.
- New habitats and green spaces should be created. Habitat buffer should be provided to protect existing species.
- A scheme of 25 low-density single-storey dwellings preferred, to reflect neighbouring development.
- High-density, 2-3 storey town/urban style development would harm rural feel and character, and block light and views.
- Concerns development of site will lead to increase in traffic, congestion, noise and air pollution, parking issues and that highway access is not suitable to serve development. Safety concerns for Lawn Lane junction with High Street.
- Effect on water management, flood control and water infrastructure. Site susceptible to flooding. Concerns run-off from site will flood the recreation ground, and that water table will rise in Garden Close, affecting neighbouring dwellings. Fear that drainage solution won’t be as good as leaving site undeveloped.
- Fears that allocation of the site will in fact lead to a much larger-scale development than set out by the draft policy, as a developer is currently engaging in pre-application consultation in the area.
- Development would harm residential amenity of neighbouring development, and result in loss of views of open countryside.
- Development would affect views of church and village. Has potential to impact on setting of conservation area.
- Site was rejected from Local Plan 2015 due to high landscape value, lack of local support, and availability of more suitable sites.
- Some suggestions that site could provide accommodation for the elderly. However, some concerns around accessibility for elderly/disabled people due to steep incline of Lawn Lane.
- Suggestion that an agreement is already in place that land east of Garden Close would not be built on for 99 years.
Perception that SUT.H1 is better placed to accommodate development and will deliver more community benefits, and therefore SUT.H2 isn't necessary.
In previous consultation exercises, not popular with community. Many responses of local opposition.
Far from village amenities.

Site promoter supports allocation but considers extent of the allocation and policy wording should be changed, to enable development of up to 60 houses – planning application currently being worked up.
Site boundary should be extended to include land to the south – see additional site suggestion Site/26/14.
Higher level of development would support area's five year land supply.
Development would deliver public benefits, such as public open space.
Site should not be restricted to low density development.
Hedgerows and trees are of no particular value.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s) Site/26/07

Main findings and recommendations:
The Elean Business Park is partly developed and a number of planning consents have been issued. A site submission was received for land within the business park (Site/26/07). Based on the findings of the site assessment, the draft site allocation boundary has been drawn to include the existing business park, site submission and all employment consents issued.

Site Information

Site Type: Existing business park
Site Address:
Settlement: Sutton

LP15 Allocation Ref: Supersedes Site/26/07
Planning Perm. Ref:

Site Description: Supersedes Site/26/07
Brown/Greenfield: Brownfield

Known Constraints:

Current Use: Employment
Proposed Use: Employment

Proposed Use info:

Site Area Net (ha): 20.80
Site Area Gross (ha): 34.7

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated
b) Recommended

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Large Village
1b. Site Availability
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone >50% of site area in Zone 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1: 100.00%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2: 0.00%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

| Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening): |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Flood Zone 1: 100.00% | Flood Zone 2: 0.00% | Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% | Flood Zone 3b: 0.00% |

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 Year: 2.68%</th>
<th>100 Year: 2.54%</th>
<th>1,000 Year: 11.27%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Site Name:** Elean Business Park, Mepal Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>5. Site Suitability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation</td>
<td>Site does not intersect Inner Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>6. Access to services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>6. Access to services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>6. Access to services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6h. Proximity to employment sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>7. Environmental impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii) Listed building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7h. Visual Impact</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council’s view:

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Site boundary should be amended to include Sutton Sale Ground to west (see additional site suggestion Site/26/12).
- Site should have its own bespoke policy. One such requirement should be to prepare a development brief or masterplan for the site.
- There are a number of existing developed areas within the site. The plan implies 35ha of land is available, but is much less and should be clarified.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site
Date and time of site visit: 11:40 25 July 2016
Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site forms part of the existing Elean Business Park, which includes a number of existing industrial buildings and consents for employment developed. To enable continued employment development at the business, the whole business park should be designated as an employment allocation.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B) ID: 131
Site Address: Adjacent to Elean Business Park, Sutton
Settlement: Sutton

LP15 Allocation Ref: Planning Perm. Ref: 
Site Description: Land north of Ely Road adjacent to Elean Business Park, Sutton
Brown/Greenfield: Brownfield

Known Constraints: Form indicates that site could help form a cluster of B1, B2 and B8 uses around Elean Business Park

Current Use: Employment Proposed Use: Employment
Current Use info: 

Proposed Use info: Existing business park
Site Area Net (ha): 0.55 Site Area Gross (ha): 0.65

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated  b) Recommended

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Large Village  B
1b. Site Availability
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone >50% of site area in Zone 1  A
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00% Flood Zone 2: 0.00% Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA -
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
30 Year: 2.16% 100 Year: 1.76% 1,000 Year: 10.98%
Current Status: Superseded by SUT.E1
Parish: Sutton CP
Site Name: Land north of Ely Road
Site Ref: Site/26/07

## Minor Criteria

### 5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located on contaminated land

5b. Local road impact
- Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- No access will be permitted off the A142 and must be off existing roundabout

A Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan would need to accompany the development proposals for this site. This would need to follow the guidance from CCC TA guidelines; particularly the need to demonstrate that the site can provide adequate mitigation measures and assess and improve connectivity to facilities within Sutton. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. The assessment will need to include a cumulative impact assessment as part of the development proposals. Individually these sites may not incur severe impact within Sutton and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, however CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites the cumulative impact could be an issue. The TA will particularly need to look at the impact of the development on the A142, especially around Ely. Earith crossing is intermittently closed due to flooding, therefore the TA will also need to assess the impact of rerouting.

### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

6f(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Limited capacity

6g(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
The school is currently operating above its physical capacity and has two mobile classrooms on site. There is space for limited expansion on site by 45 places only. A development of about 120 houses would yield this number of pupils

6g(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

### 7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
### Site Name: Land north of Ely Road

**Current Status:** Superseded by SUT.E1  
**Parish:** Sutton CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/26/07

### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

| |  
|---|---|
| |  
| |  
| |  

### 7d. Agricultural land classification

| All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower |  
|---|---|
| |  
| |  
| |  

### 7e. Public Rights of Way

| E – No PRoW connection opportunities |  
|---|---|
| |  
| |  
| |  

### 7e.(i) PROW comments

|  
|---|
|  

### 7f.(i) Conservation Area

| CA within 500m of site |  
|---|---|
| |  
| |  
| |  

### 7f.(ii) Listed building

| LB within 500m of site |  
|---|---|
| |  
| |  
| |  

### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

| SAM more than 2km from site |  
|---|---|
| |  
| |  
| |  

### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

|  
|---|
|  

### 7f. Heritage / archaeology comments

- ECDC: Conservation area to the south - No heritage impact
- HE: 26/07: affecting the setting of a conservation area.

### 7h. Visual Impact

| Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views |  
|---|---|
| |  
| |  
| |  

Justification for score:

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

| No TPO within 15m of the site |  
|---|---|
| |  
| |  
| |  

### Parish Council support and rank

- **Does Parish Council support this site?** Yes

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit: 13:20 25 July 2016

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is rejected as it is physically separate from the main built area of the village, which could result in harm to the built form. In addition, the site was not supported by the Parish Council. Other more suitable and favoured sites are available closer to the village centre.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  ID: 126

Site Address: Land off Station Road, Sutton, CB6 2RL

Settlement: Sutton

LP15 Allocation Ref:  Planning Perm. Ref: 

Site Description: Land off Station Road, Sutton

Brown/Greenfield: Brownfield

Known Constraints: Land off Station Road, Sutton, CB6 2RL

Current Use: Other (please specify)  Proposed Use: Housing

Current Use info: Vacant car park

Proposed Use info: 

Site Area Net (ha): 0.40  Site Area Gross (ha): 0.4

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 12  b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Large Village

1b. Site Availability
Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 Year</th>
<th>100 Year</th>
<th>1,000 Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3.14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Parish:** Sutton CP  
**Site Name:** Land off Station Road, Sutton  
**Site Ref:** Site/26/02

| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No |

**3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation**  
Site does not intersect Inner Zone

**4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites**  
2.01km - 5km from the site

**4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment**

---

### Minor Criteria

**5. Site Suitability**

**5a. Proximity to contaminated land**  
Site within 50m of contaminated land  
**5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment**  
Former road haulage depot on E boundary. Former engine works 25m to S.

**5b. Local road impact**  
Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations  
**5c. Strategic Road Network impact**  
**5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**  
Potential inter-vehicle visibility splay issue at the junction of Station Road & Church Street  
This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

**6. Access to services**

**6a. Proximity to public transport**  
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)  
**6b. Proximity to medical services**  
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)  
**6c. Proximity to shops**  
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)  
**6d. Proximity to Primary School**  
Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)  
**6e. Proximity to Secondary School**  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)  
**6f.(i) Available primary school capacity**  
No spare places but room for expansion  
**6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity**  
Limited capacity  
**6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**  
The school is currently operating above its physical capacity and has two mobile classrooms on site. There is space for limited expansion on site by 45 places only. A development of about 120 houses would yield this number of pupils  
**6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**  
The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area.

**6h. Proximity to employment sites**  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)  
**6i. PROW comments**

---

**7. Environmental impact**

**7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**  
CWS within 2.01km – 5km of site  
**7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**

**7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers**

**7d. Agricultural land classification**  
All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower  
**7e. Public Rights of Way**  
E – No PRoW connection opportunities  
**7e.(i) PROW comments**
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**

**Site Name:** Land off Station Road, Sutton

**Parish:** Sutton CP

**Site Ref:** Site/26/02

### 7f. Conservation Area

- **7f.(i) Conservation Area**
  - CA within 500m of site: **D**

- **7f.(ii) Listed building**
  - LB within 500m of site: **D**

- **7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument**
  - SAM more than 2km from site: **A**

- **7f.(iv) Archaeological asset**

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

- **ECDC:** Conservation area to north - No heritage impact

- **HE:** 26/02: affecting the setting of a conservation area.

### 7h. Visual Impact

- **Justification for score:**
  - Some improvement to landscape/townscape or key views: **B**

- **Additional criterion 7f. TPOs**
  - No TPO within 15m of the site: **A**

### Parish Council support and rank

- **Does Parish Council support this site?** No

- **Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

- **Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Site promoter objects to reasons for rejection of site.
- Indicates site has safe, convenient access to village services, and cycling and public transport opportunities.
- Site is available now and deliverable within five years.
- Additional traffic movements arising from development and impact on school capacity likely to be negligible.
- Careful design will ensure setting of Conservation Area is not unduly affected.
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Parish: Sutton CP
Site Name: Land off The Row/The America
Site Ref: Site/26/03

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Rejected**

Date and time of site visit: 12:30 25 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is rejected as it is beyond the natural edge of the village; is not supported by the Parish Council and is some distance from the village centre. Other more suitable and favoured sites are available.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  
ID: 127
Site Address: Land off The Row/The America
Settlement: Sutton

LP15 Allocation Ref:  
Planning Perm. Ref: 

Site Description: Land off The Row/The America
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints:

Current Use: Agriculture  
Proposed Use: Housing

Current Use info: Vacant. Former orchard.

Proposed Use info:

Site Area Net (ha): 0.68  
Site Area Gross (ha): 0.8

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 20  
b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  
Large Village

1b. Site Availability  
Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone  
>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  
Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  
Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  
Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk  
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

30 Year: 0.00%  
100 Year: 0.00%  
1,000 Year: 1.82%
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a(i) Contaminated land assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former road haulage depot to SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefered vehicle access via The Row</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential inter-vehicle visibility splay issues on The Americas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No vehicle access from The Americas will be permitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable mitigation measures and highways improvements needed on The Row &amp;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>junction with The Americas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adequate visibility and junction geometry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to services</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school is currently operating above its physical capacity and has two</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mobile classrooms on site. There is space for limited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expansion on site by 45 places only. A development of about 120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>houses would yield this number of pupils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g(ii) Secondary school capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>houses in the catchment area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6h. Proximity to employment sites</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental impact</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Land off The Row/The America
Parish: Sutton CP
Site Ref: Site/26/03

7e. Public Rights of Way
E – No PRoW connection opportunities

7f.(i) Conservation Area
CA within 500.1 – 1000m of site
C

7f.(ii). Listed building
LB within 500m of site
D

7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site
B

7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
Listed building to the east - No heritage impact

7h. Visual Impact
Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive
D

Justification for score:
Very green, but loss unlikely to cause significant harm.

Additional criterion 7l. TPOs
No TPO within 15m of the site
A

Parish Council support and rank
Does Parish Council support this site? No

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council’s view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received
Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

• Objects to the rejection of the site and to findings of the site assessment process.
• Site is enclosed and can be readily assimilated into landscape and will not have significant impacts on village character.
• Positive market conditions.
• Hedgerow and specimen trees will be retained/replanted.
• Site is within walking distance of village services and facilities.
• Surface water run-off from site will be managed.
• Vehicular access will be taken from The Row.
• Site is in a sustainable location and will come forward rapidly, contributing to five year housing land supply.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit: 11:25 25 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is rejected on the basis that it is physically separate from the village, and therefore access to village services is likely to be poor. Due to the elevated topography, the site may have adverse visual impacts upon the landscape.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  ID: 130
Site Address: Land off A142, Sutton
Settlement: Sutton
LP15 Allocation Ref:  Planning Perm. Ref: 
Site Description: Land off A142, Sutton
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: If access to A142 is not possible, then site would be dependent on land to the south coming forward.
Current Use: Agriculture  Proposed Use: Housing
Current Use info: 
Proposed Use info: 
Site Area Net (ha): 7.26  Site Area Gross (ha): 12.1
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 100  b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  Large Village
B
1b. Site Availability  Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

This site lies largely within the Waste Consultation Area for the waste management site at Former Mepal Airfield, Sutton (Policy W8W) designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012). This site is currently being restored through inert landfill, and inert waste recycling. The overarching policy for this designation is Policy CS30 of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011). This policy seeks to safeguard waste management facilities which make a significant contribution to managing Cambridgeshire's waste; and the policy states that development will only be permitted where it is demonstrated that this will not prejudice existing or future planned waste management operations. It is suggested that consideration should be given to these policies in the interests of deliverability.

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations  W8W

2a. Flood zone  >50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%
**Minor Criteria**

### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</th>
<th>Site located on contaminated land</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td>Part of former RAF Mepal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>No objections with Moderate mitigation measures</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>Access must be off Mepal Road. This is adopted highway with what appears to be the correct infrastructure. No vehicle access will be accepted on to or off the A142. Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry. A Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan would need to accompany the development proposals for this site. This would need to follow the guidance from CCC TA guidelines; particularly the need to demonstrate that the site can provide adequate mitigation measures and assess and improve connectivity to facilities within Sutton. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. The assessment will need to include a cumulative impact assessment as part of the development proposals. Individually these sites may not incur severe impact within Sutton and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, however, CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites the cumulative impact could be an issue. The TA will particularly need to look at the impact of the development on the A142, especially around Ely. Earith crossing is intermittently closed due to flooding, therefore the TA will also need to assess the impact of rerouting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Access to services

| 6a. Proximity to public transport | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) | B |
| 6b. Proximity to medical services | Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m) | C |
| 6c. Proximity to shops | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) | B |
| 6d. Proximity to Primary School | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) | B |
| 6e. Proximity to Secondary School | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |
| 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity | No spare places but room for expansion | D |
| 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity | Limited capacity | C |
| 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment | The school is currently operating above its physical capacity and has two mobile classrooms on site. There is space for limited expansion on site by 45 places only. A development of about 120 houses would yield this number of pupils | |
| 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment | The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area. | |
| 6h. Proximity to employment sites | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |
## 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</th>
<th>CWS within 501m – 1km of site</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>B – Opportunities to connect to multiple nearby PRoW within the site boundary</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7e.(i) PROW comments</strong></td>
<td>Provide a network of links between this site and 26/6 and the existing housing for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 500.1 – 1000m of site</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500.1 – 1000m of site</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conservation area to the south - No heritage impact

| 7h. Visual impact                     | Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive | D |

Justification for score:

May have impact due to elevated nature of site - particularly from Sutton village.

**Additional criterion 7i. TPOs**

No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

---

### Parish Council support and rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council's view:**

---

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**  
Parish: **Sutton CP**  
Site Name: **East of Bury Lane, Sutton**

### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

| Overall recommendation from site assessment: | **Rejected** |
| Date and time of site visit: | 12:05 25 July 2016 |
| Supersedes site submission(s): |  |

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is rejected as it would likely result in adverse visual impacts upon the landscape; and would require major highway works to secure safe vehicular access. Furthermore, the site is not supported by Sutton Parish Council who favour retention of the site as green space. Other more suitable sites are available closer to the village centre.

### Site Information

| Site Type: | New site submission (Form B) |
| Site Address: | East of Bury Lane, Sutton |
| Settlement: | Sutton |
| LP15 Allocation Ref: |  |
| Planning Perm. Ref: |  |
| Site Description: | East of Bury Lane, Sutton |
| Brown/Greenfield: | Greenfield |
| Current Use: | Agriculture |
| Proposed Use info: |  |
| Proposed Use: | Housing |
| Site Area Net (ha): | 4.88 |
| Site Area Gross (ha): | 6.5 |
| Indicative no. of dwellings: |  |
| a) Submitted / estimated | 195 |
| b) Recommended | 0 |

### Major Criteria

| 1a. Settlement Hierarchy | Large Village |
| 1b. Site Availability |  |
| 1c. Minerals and Waste assessment |  |
| 1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies |  |
| 1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations |  |

| 2a. Flood zone | >50% of site area in Zone 1 |
| Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening): |  |
| Flood Zone 1: | 100.00% |
| Flood Zone 2: | 0.00% |
| Flood Zone 3a: | 0.00% |
| Flood Zone 3b: | 0.00% |

| 2b. Surface Water flood risk | Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA |
| Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW): |  |
| 30 Year: | 3.14% |
| 100 Year: | 0.27% |
| 1,000 Year: | 5.14% |
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** East of Bury Lane, Sutton  
**Parish:** Sutton CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/26/08

| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No |

3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation  
Site does not intersect Inner Zone  

4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites  
501m - 2km from the site  

4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

---

**Minor Criteria**

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land  
Site within 50m of contaminated land  

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact  
Major infrastructure required to offset safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations  

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment  
Footway on East side of road only and under 1m in width narrow carriageway  
Adopted highways frontage on narrow road  
Berry Lane would need extensive highways improvements to mitigate the impact of the proposed development  

A Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan would need to accompany the development proposals for this site. This would need to follow the guidance from CCC TA guidelines; particularly the need to demonstrate that the site can provide adequate mitigation measures and assess and improve connectivity to facilities within Sutton. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. The assessment will need to include a cumulative impact assessment as part of the development proposals. Individually these sites may not incur severe impact within Sutton and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, however CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites the cumulative impact could be an issue. The TA will particularly need to look at the impact of the development on the A142, especially around Ely. Earith crossing is intermittently closed due to flooding, therefore the TA will also need to assess the impact of rerouting.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport  
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)  

6b. Proximity to medical services  
Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)  

6c. Proximity to shops  
Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)  

6d. Proximity to Primary School  
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)  

6e. Proximity to Secondary School  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)  

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity  
No spare places but room for expansion  

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity  
Limited capacity  

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment  
The school is currently operating above its physical capacity and has two mobile classrooms on site. There is space for limited expansion on site by 45 places only. A development of about 120 houses would yield this number of pupils  

6g.(ii) Available secondary school capacity  
Limited capacity  

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment  
The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)  

7. Environmental impact
## Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

### Site Name: East of Bury Lane, Sutton

### Parish Council support and rank

| Does Parish Council support this site? | No |
| Form E - Parish Council site ranking: | |
| Form G - Parish Council's view: | |

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Site promoter objects to the reasons for rejection of the site, and suggests that development of the site, along with Site/26/09, would complement the existing development and form a natural extension of Sutton.
- No formal landscape designations covering site, and visual impact will affect only as small number of dwellings. Improvements to highway network can be readily achieved through planning application process. Option of vehicular access from York Road has not been considered by the Council.
- Site is a sustainable location, with access to local services and facilities, and would make a valuable contribution to the housing land requirement.

### Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td>CWS within 501m – 1km of site</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PROW within the site boundary</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td>Provide a network of links between this site and 26/9 and the existing housing for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td>Grade I listed property to the east - limited heritage impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
<td>Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification for score:</td>
<td>Likely to impact on neighbouring dwellings which overlook the site. May harm the transitional landscape nature of the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional criterion 7i. TPOs</td>
<td>TPO tree on site</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit: 12:15 25 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is rejected as it would likely result in adverse visual impacts upon the landscape. Furthermore the site is not supported by Sutton Parish Council who favour retention of the site as green space. Other more suitable sites are available closer to the village centre.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  ID: 133
Site Address: West of Bury Lane, Sutton
Settlement: Sutton
LP15 Allocation Ref:  Planning Perm. Ref: 
Site Description: West of Bury Lane, Sutton
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: Form indicates site could deliver 156 - 182 dwellings
Current Use: Agriculture  Proposed Use: Housing
Current Use info: Pasture
Proposed Use info:
Site Area Net (ha): 4.68  Site Area Gross (ha): 6.24
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 182  b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
   Large Village
   B
1b. Site Availability
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment
1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
   >50% of site area in Zone 1
   A
   Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
   Flood Zone 1: 99.38%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.62%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
   Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA
   Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
   30 Year: 0.27%  100 Year: 2.01%  1,000 Year: 10.11%
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</th>
<th>Site within 250m of contaminated land</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td>245m SW of RAF Mepal, 100m N of former road haulage depot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>Access to site via The Americas would be acceptable but access via Berry Lane would require extensive highways improvements to mitigate the impact of the proposed development Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan would need to accompany the development proposals for this site. This would need to follow the guidance from CCC TA guidelines; particularly the need to demonstrate that the site can provide adequate mitigation measures and assess and improve connectivity to facilities within Sutton. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. The assessment will need to include a cumulative impact assessment as part of the development proposals. Individually these sites may not incur severe impact within Sutton and the surrounding road network provided adequate mitigation is delivered, however CCC is concerned that by combing the impact of all identified sites the cumulative impact could be an issue. The TA will particularly need to look at the impact of the development on the A142, especially around Ely. Earth crossing is intermittently closed due to flooding, therefore the TA will also need to assess the impact of rerouting.

#### 6. Access to services

| 6a. Proximity to public transport | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) | A |
| 6b. Proximity to medical services | Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m) | C |
| 6c. Proximity to shops | Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m) | C |
| 6d. Proximity to Primary School | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) | B |
| 6e. Proximity to Secondary School | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |
| 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity | No spare places but room for expansion | D |
| 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity | Limited capacity | C |
| 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment | The school is currently operating above its physical capacity and has two mobile classrooms on site. There is space for limited expansion on site by 45 places only. A development of about 120 houses would yield this number of pupils | |
| 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment | The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area. | |
| 6h. Proximity to employment sites | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |

#### 7. Environmental impact

| 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites | CWS within 501m – 1km of site | C |
Site Ref: Site/26/09
Parish: Sutton CP
Site Name: West of Bury Lane, Sutton

Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification
   All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower
   D

7e. Public Rights of Way
   C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary
   C

7e.(i) PROW comments
   Provide a network of links between this site and 26/8 and the existing housing for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians
   C

7f. (i) Conservation Area
   CA within 500.1 – 1000m of site
   C

7f.(ii). Listed building
   LB within 500m of site
   D

7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
   SAM more than 2km from site
   A

7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
   Grade I listed building to the north - concerns depending on the scale, layout and details of any proposal as has potential to cause harm to the setting of the heritage asset.

7h. Visual Impact
   Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive
   D

   Justification for score:
   If developed could feel intrusive into countryside and harm transitional landscape feel.

   Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
   No TPO within 15m of the site
   A

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site? No

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:  

Form G - Parish Council’s view:  

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Site promoter objects to the rejection of the site, and suggests that development of the site, along with Site/26/08, would complement the existing development and form a natural extension of Sutton.
- Development would not have significant impacts on landscape character or visual amenity, limited to those properties which overlook it. The site has no landscape designations.
- Development would create new areas of open space which are accessible and better managed.
- Development would seek to retain mature trees and vegetation pattern, where possible, and would enable improved management of Great Spinney.
- Site is a sustainable location, with access to local services and facilities, and would make a valuable contribution to the housing land requirement.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit:
11.25 08 May 2017

Supersedes site submission(s):

Main findings and recommendations:
Site is physically separate from Sutton village and is in an elevated position so would be visually intrusive to the countryside. The site is isolated from local services and facilities.

Site Information

Site Type: FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17
ID: 427

Site Address: Mepal Road, Sutton, Ely

Settlement: Sutton

LP15 Allocation Ref: Planning Perm. Ref:

Site Description: Agricultural land on site of former airfield, proposed for housing development.

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints:
**Submission does not indicate number of proposed dwellings. Dwelling figure is therefore calculated from site area and does not reflect site constraints or characteristics.**
**Net site area estimated**

Current Use: Agriculture

Proposed Use: Housing

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 349

b) Recommended 0

Site Area Net (ha): 9.70
Site Area Gross (ha): 16.17

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Large Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 501m - 2km from the site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

#### 5. Site Suitability

##### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located on contaminated land

##### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
- Former RAF Mepal

##### 5b. Local road impact
- Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

##### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

##### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- Does not appear to have access to highways frontage OR shown access to highway. Potential problems to access the highway
- Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

### 6. Access to services

##### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

##### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

##### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

##### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

##### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

##### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- The primary school will need to be expanded to provide more places than is possible on its present site. There is an opportunity to acquire more land adjacent to the school. If this is not possible options may include a second school or mitigation within a neighbouring village, although these will also be under pressure to provide additional school places arising from development.

##### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- There is potential to expand Witchford Village College on its current site. However, this latest call for site would result in much higher levels of development within the catchment area of the College if they were all included in the Local Plan. The level of development would generate another 595 secondary aged children or 4FE. This is in addition to the additional pupils identified from the sites included in the consultation draft local plan. At this level of development suitable mitigation could not be provided at Witchford VC. It would be the Council's intention on adoption of the Local Plan to undertake a strategic review of secondary school provision across the District and the review would include the option of a further new secondary school (and site) in order to provide suitable mitigation.

##### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

### 7. Environmental impact

##### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 501m – 1km of site

##### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
**Site Name:** Land at former Mepal Airfield

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Parish:** Sutton CP

**Site Ref:** Site/26/11

### Site Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref:</th>
<th>Site/26/11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parish:</td>
<td>Sutton CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name:</td>
<td>Land at former Mepal Airfield</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Current Status

- Rejected - not a site allocation

### Parish Council Support and Rank

| Does Parish Council support this site? | No |

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.

### Heritage / Archaeology Comments

- **7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers**
  - D

- **7d. Agricultural land classification**
  - All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower
  - D

- **7e. Public Rights of Way**
  - E - No PRoW connection opportunities
  - E

### PROW Comments

- **7f.(i) Conservation Area**
  - CA within 500.1 – 1000m of site
  - C

- **7f.(ii) Listed building**
  - LB within 500m of site
  - D

- **7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument**
  - SAM more than 2km from site
  - A

- **7f.(iv) Archaeological asset**
  - |

### Heritage / Archaeology Comments

- **7g. Heritage / archaeology comments**
  - EDCD - Grade I listed building to the southwest, development could potentially impact wider setting of this designated heritage asset. The site is completely removed from the village and would not relate well to the built form of the area.

  We note that SUT H1 in your Local Plan may also potentially affect the setting of the grade I The Burystead, although we did not flag this in our previous response. However, it is likely to have less impact than Site 26/11, given its location adjacent to the existing settlement and in the sight line of the industrial development to the east.

  HE - Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, there are two listed buildings to the south west including grade I The Burystead, a house incorporating a late C13 - early C14 chapel of former monastic grange, with a south wing built in 1742. Development of this site has the potential to impact upon the setting these heritage assets. In addition, the site is remote from the historic core of Sutton village. The proposed site extends significantly into the countryside and would inevitably alter the character of the settlement at this approach to the village. Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts. It may not be possible to allocate based on these impacts.

- **7h. Visual Impact**
  - Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive
  - D

### Justification for score:

- Site is physically separate from Sutton village, so would not complement the built form of the area. Site is in an elevated position and would be very visible and visually intrusive to the countryside.

### Additional criteria 7i. TPOs

- No TPO within 15m of the site
  - A
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Has merit

Date and time of site visit: 11:40 08 May 2017

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is in existing use as an auction/sale ground. The site is located adjacent the Elean Business Park. The site has merit as a suitable location for development. However, the need for additional employment land is not justified.

Site Information

| Site Type: | FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17 | ID: 428 |
| Site Address: | Cambridge Machinery Sales, Mepal Road, Sutton, Ely |
| Settlement: | Sutton |
| LP15 Allocation Ref: | |
| Planning Perm. Ref: | |
| Site Description: | The site is currently in use as a successful auction complex for the sale of agricultural machinery mainly for international export (sui-generis use). Future economic uncertainties has also cast uncertainty over the long term future of the current auction business. The proposal seeks the allocation of the site for employment uses through extension of draft site allocation SUT.E1. |
| Brown/Greenfield: | Greenfield |
| Known Constraints: | **Net site area estimated** |
| Current Use: | Other (please specify) |
| Proposed Use info: | |
| Current Use info: | Auction site - sui-generis use |
| Proposed Use: | Employment |
| Site Area Net (ha): | 9.60 |
| Site Area Gross (ha): | 16 |
| Indicative no. of dwellings: | a) Submitted / estimated |
| b) Recommended |

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy | Large Village | B
1b. Site Availability | |
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment | |
1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies | |
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations | |
2a. Flood zone | >50% of site area in Zone 1 | A
2b. Surface Water flood risk | Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA | -
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a(i). Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former RAF Mepal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No direct access from the A10 will be permitted this is a primary distributor road carrying very high numbers of distributor traffic Access from Elean sineess Park only Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f(i). Available primary school capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g(i). Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f(ii). Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g(ii). Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6h. Proximity to employment sites</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B – Opportunities to connect to multiple nearby PRoW within the site boundary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Sutton Saleground
Parish: Sutton CP
Site Ref: Site/26/12

7f.(i) PROW comments
Public Footpath 23 runs along the north west boundary of the site. Public Footpath 4 runs alongside the east boundary of the site. Provide a safe off road link between these 2 Public Footpaths within the site boundary.

7f.(i) Conservation Area | CA within 500m of site | B
7f.(ii) Listed building | LB within 500m of site | D
7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument | SAM more than 2km from site | A
7f.(iv) Archaeological asset | | |

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
Conservation area to the south, likely to have limited/no impact on designated heritage assets.

7h. Visual Impact | Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views | C

Justification for score:
Development of the site would likely have no impact, or could potentially have a positive impact.

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs | No TPO within 15m of the site | A

Parish Council support and rank
Does Parish Council support this site? Yes
Form E - Parish Council site ranking:
Form G - Parish Council’s view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received
Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Main findings and recommendations:
The site is located in close proximity to the A142 and therefore noise and air quality are major concerns. It is unlikely that the site could accommodate 10 or more dwellings once mitigation measures have been put in place.
Site Name: Land at Mill Field

**Minor Criteria**

**5. Site Suitability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</th>
<th>Site located on contaminated land</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former RAF Mepal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>No objections with Moderate mitigation measures</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**6. Access to services**

| 6a. Proximity to public transport | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) | A |
| 6b. Proximity to medical services | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) | B |
| 6c. Proximity to shops | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) | B |
| 6d. Proximity to Primary School | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) | B |
| 6e. Proximity to Secondary School | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |
| 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity | No spare places but room for expansion | D |
| 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity | No spare places but room for expansion | D |
| 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment |
| The primary school will need to be expanded to provide more places than is possible on its present site. There is an opportunity to acquire more land adjacent to the school. If this is not possible options may include a second school or mitigation within a neighbouring village, although these will also be under pressure to provide additional school places arising from development. |
| 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment |
| There is potential to expand Witchford Village College on its current site. However, this latest call for site would result in much higher levels of development within the catchment area of the College if they were all included in the Local Plan. The level of development would generate another 595 secondary aged children or 4FE. This is in addition to the additional pupils identified from the sites included in the consultation draft local plan. At this level of development suitable mitigation could not be provided at Witchford VC. It would be the Council’s intention on adoption of the Local Plan to undertake a strategic review of secondary school provision across the District and the review would include the option of a further new secondary school (and site) in order to provide suitable mitigation |
| 6h. Proximity to employment sites | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |

**7. Environmental impact**

<p>| 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites | CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site | B |
| 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment |
| 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7d. Agricultural land classification</th>
<th>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>E – No PRoW connection opportunities</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii) Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td>Conservation area to the southeast, likely to have limited/no impact on designated heritage assets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual impact</td>
<td>Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification for score:</td>
<td>Site would be visible from PROW, but unlikely to cause significant visual harm in this instance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional criterion 7f. TPOs</td>
<td>No TPO within 15m of the site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council's view:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit: 12:30 08 May 2017

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The proposed scheme is a significant extension of draft site allocation SUT.H2. The parish council has expressed its support for SUT.H2, but indicates it does not support a larger scheme. Any development of this site has the potential to impact upon the listed buildings, conservation area and their setting. Sutton’s infrastructure is constrained and it is considered that other more suitable sites are available in the village.

Site Information

Site Type: FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17
Site Address: Garden Close, Sutton, Ely
Settlement: Sutton
LP15 Allocation Ref: Site Area Net (ha): 2.40
Site Area Gross (ha): 3.2
Site Description: The proposal seeks to extend draft site allocation SUT.H2, located east of Garden Close, to include adjoining land on the southern periphery of the site.
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: Submission suggests site has a capacity for 60 dwellings.
Current Use: Agriculture
Proposed Use: Housing
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 60
Proposed Use info:

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
1b. Site Availability
Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00% Flood Zone 2: 0.00% Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>5. Site Suitability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation</td>
<td>Site does not intersect Inner Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites</td>
<td>2.01km - 5km from the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</th>
<th>Site within 250m of contaminated land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory 180m to SE, Depot 205m to E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6a. Proximity to public transport</th>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>No spare places but room for expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The primary school will need to be expanded to provide more places than is possible on its present site. There is an opportunity to acquire more land adjacent to the school. If this is not possible options may include a second school or mitigation within a neighbouring village, although these will also be under pressure to provide additional school places arising from development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>No spare places but room for expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is potential to expand Witchford Village College on its current site. However, this latest call for site would result in much higher levels of development within the catchment area of the College if they were all included in the Local Plan. The level of development would generate another 595 secondary aged children or 4FE. This is in addition to the additional pupils identified from the sites included in the consultation draft local plan. At this level of development suitable mitigation could not be provided at Witchford VC. It would be the Council’s intention on adoption of the Local Plan to undertake a strategic review of secondary school provision across the District and the review would include the option of a further new secondary school (and site) in order to provide suitable mitigation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6h. Proximity to employment sites</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</th>
<th>CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Name: Land east of Garden Close

Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

Site Ref: Site/26/14

Parish: Sutton CP

---

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Parish: Sutton CP
Site Name: Land to the north of Bellairs
Site Ref: Site/26/15

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Main findings and recommendations:
Vehicular access to the site is unlikely to be suitable, requiring major infrastructure investment. Other more suitable sites are available elsewhere in the village.

Site Information

Site Type: FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17
Site Address: Bellairs, Sutton, Ely
Settlement: Sutton
LP15 Allocation Ref: ID: 431
Site Description: Agricultural land with access from Bellairs, proposed for housing development.
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints:
**Submission does not indicate number of proposed dwellings. Dwelling figure is therefore calculated from site area and does not reflect site constraints or characteristics.**
**Net site area estimated**

Current Use: Agriculture
Proposed Use: Housing

Site Area Net (ha): 0.55
Site Area Gross (ha): 0.65
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 20

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Large Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00% Flood Zone 2: 0.00% Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW): -
Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land: Site within 50m of contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

Former RAF Mepal 40m to N

5b. Local road impact: Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

Does not appear to have access to highways frontage OR shown access to highway Potential problems to access the highway

Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport: Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services: Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6c. Proximity to shops: Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School: Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School: Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity: No spare places but room for expansion

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity: No spare places but room for expansion

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

The primary school will need to be expanded to provide more places than is possible on its present site. There is an opportunity to acquire more land adjacent to the school. If this is not possible options may include a second school or mitigation within a neighbouring village, although these will also be under pressure to provide additional school places arising from development.

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

There is potential to expand Witchford Village College on its current site. However, this latest call for site would result in much higher levels of development within the catchment area of the College if they were all included in the Local Plan. The level of development would generate another 595 secondary aged children or 4FE. This is in addition to the additional pupils identified from the sites included in the consultation draft local plan. At this level of development suitable mitigation could not be provided at Witchford VC. It would be the Council's intention on adoption of the Local Plan to undertake a strategic review of secondary school provision across the District and the review would include the option of a further new secondary school (and site) in order to provide suitable mitigation.

6h. Proximity to employment sites: Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites: CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>E – No PRoW connection opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii) Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td>Conservation area and listed building to the southeast, likely to have limited/no impact on designated heritage asset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
<td>Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification for score:**

Overgrown site well screened by hedgerow along boundaries.

**Additional criterion 7i. TPOs**

No TPO within 15m of the site | A

### Parish Council support and rank

**Does Parish Council support this site?** No

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council's view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site
Date and time of site visit: 14:10 21/07/2016
Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is suitable for development, with few constraints, and should therefore be allocated for housing development. Development proposals should have particular regard to the setting of the conservation area which adjoins the site.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  ID: 134
Site Address: Land off Heath Road and Quarry Lane, Swaffham Bulbeck
Settlement: Swaffham Bulbeck
LP15 Allocation Ref:  Planning Perm. Ref: 
Site Description: Land off Heath Road and Quarry Lane, Swaffham Bulbeck
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints:
Current Use: Agriculture  Proposed Use: Housing
Current Use info: Grazing
Proposed Use info: Housing, open space and possible extension to cemetery
Site Area Net (ha): 3.60  Site Area Gross (ha): 4.8
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 38  b) Recommended 38

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Medium Village
1b. Site Availability Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone >50% of site area in Zone 1
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%
2b. Surface Water flood risk Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
30 Year: 0.00%  100 Year: 0.00%  1,000 Year: 2.14%
**Site Ref:** Site/27/01  
**Parish:** Swaffham Bulbeck C  
**Site Name:** Land off Heath Road and Quarry Lane, Swaffham Bulbeck  
**Current Status:** Site Allocation SWB.H1

| **Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):** | No |
| **Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):** | No |

### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

### 4. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 2.01km - 5km from the site

### 5. Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site within 50m of contaminated land

#### 5b. Local road impact
- No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- No access on to the B1102 will be permitted
- Access should be via Quarry Lane on the south of the site
- Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

**Is this site for 38 units or more - the size of the site appears to indicate that the site could cater for more units.**

### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6f(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places, no room for expansion

#### 6f(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

#### 6g(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- Small village school on a very restricted site

#### 6g(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- The school is being expanded to 10 FE - 1500 places 11-16. This is to address the forecast demand for places and makes no allowance for any further housing development. The pupils are already in the primary feeder schools for Bottisham VC. The VC will NOT expand beyond 10FE even if the site allows it.

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 501m – 1km of site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification
- All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower

---

The school is being expanded to 10 FE - 1500 places 11-16. This is to address the forecast demand for places and makes no allowance for any further housing development. The pupils are already in the primary feeder schools for Bottisham VC. The VC will NOT expand beyond 10FE even if the site allows it.
### 7e. Public Rights of Way

C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary

### 7e.(i) PROW comments

Provide links across the site from High Street to Quarry Lane and Swaffham Heath Rd

### 7f.(i) Conservation Area

Site is within CA

### 7f.(ii). Listed building

LB within 500m of site

### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

SAM within 500m of site

### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

HE: 27/01: affecting the setting of a conservation area.

### 7h. Visual Impact

Some improvement to landscape/townscape or key views

### Justification for score:

Residential development would improve the site appearance.

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

TPO tree on site

### Parish Council support and rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td>Second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council’s view:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Development will have impact on green corridor, listed buildings, adjoining Conservation areas, the Denny Scheduled Monument site. Limit to 40 dwellings.
- Not suitable for development as considered as an area of best landscape value, site too large, and development will affect key views of the village.
- Vehicle access via Quarry Lane and protect major open corridor space.
- The site is available for immediate development, will come forward as CLT development, could provide extension to cemetery, additional village car parking and provide affordable housing.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit: 14:50 21/7/2016

Supersedes site submission(s):

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is suitable for development, with few constraints, and therefore should be allocated for housing development. The shape of the site makes it suitable for sub-division into self-build plots.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)

Site Address: Land fronting Heath Road, Swaffham Bulbeck

Settlement: Swaffham Bulbeck

LP15 Allocation Ref: ID: 137

Planning Perm. Ref: Site Area Net (ha): 0.51

Site Area Gross (ha): 0.6

Site Description: Land fronting Heath Road, Swaffham Bulbeck

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints:
Site is quite exposed being on a hill although bounded by maturing hedge and thus only single storey dwellings may be appropriate - perhaps self-build modest bungalows and/or affordable housing

Current Use: Agriculture

Proposed Use: Housing

Indicative no. of dwellings:
a) Submitted / estimated 18

b) Recommended 18

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Medium Village

1b. Site Availability Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone 1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3a</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3b</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yrs))

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):
## Site Information

**Site Name:** Land fronting Heath Road, Swaffham Bulbeck

**Current Status:** Site Allocation SWB.H2

**Parish:** Swaffham Bulbeck C

**Site Ref:** Site/27/04

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 2.01km - 5km from the site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

#### 30 Year: 0.00%

#### 100 Year: 0.00%

#### 1,000 Year: 0.00%

#### Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):
- No

#### Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):
- No

---

## Site Suitability

### 5. Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site within 50m of contaminated land

**5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment**
- Pit 23m to S

#### 5b. Local road impact
- No objections with minor mitigation measures

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

Highways frontage
- Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

---

## Access to Services

### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

**6b. Proximity to medical services**
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

**6c. Proximity to shops**
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

**6d. Proximity to Primary School**
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

**6e. Proximity to Secondary School**
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

**6f.(i) Available primary school capacity**
- No spare places, no room for expansion

**6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**
- Small village school on a very restricted site

**6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity**
- No spare places but room for expansion

**6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**
- The school is being expanded to 10 FE - 1500 places 11-16. This is to address the forecast demand for places and makes no allowance for any further housing development. The pupils are already in the primary feeder schools for Bottisham VC. The VC will NOT expand beyond 10FE even if the site allows it.

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

---

## Environmental Impact

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 501m – 1km of site

**7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification
- All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower

---
### Current Status: Site Allocation SWB.H2
### Site Name: Land fronting Heath Road, Swaffham Bulbeck

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7e. Public Rights of Way</th>
<th>E – No PRoW connection opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7e.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed buildings to the southwest - care would need to be taken in terms of scale/layout/grain of development to ensure no harm to heritage assets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
<td>Some improvement to landscape/townscape or key views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification for score:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of the site, if sensitively done, could improve the appearance of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional criterion 7i. TPOs</td>
<td>No TPO within 15m of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parish Council support and rank
- Does Parish Council support this site? Yes
- Form E - Parish Council site ranking: First
- Form G - Parish Council’s view: 

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received
Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
- Support for development on site, should improve pedestrian and cycle access.
- There are two grade II listed buildings (Hillside Cottage and Hillside House) to the east of the site. Any development of this site will need to conserve and where opportunities arise enhance listed buildings and their settings.
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**
- Preferred site

**Date and time of site visit:**
16/05/2017 at 11:40am

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**
The site is accessible brownfield land, considered suitable for development and is supported by the Parish Council. The boundary should be amended to ensure no development takes place within the greenbelt.

---

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17</th>
<th>ID: 434</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Hillside Mill, Quarry Lane, Swaffham Bulbeck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Swaffham Bulbeck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>The site is brownfield and was formerly occupied by buildings that have been removed. Part of the site currently has an office building. It is the intention that the office will remain, retaining employment on site. The site is proposed for housing development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Submission indicates site could provide 22 dwellings. <strong>Net site area estimated</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 22  b) Recommended 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a. Settlement Hierarchy</th>
<th>Medium Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b. Site Availability</td>
<td>Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Minerals and Waste assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Flood zone</td>
<td>&gt;50% of site area in Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</strong></td>
<td>100.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Surface Water flood risk</td>
<td>Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact

No objections with minor mitigation measures

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

No spare places, no room for expansion

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

Limited capacity

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

This level of development will create a small pressure on places and would require mitigation at a neighbouring primary school where expansion was possible or places were available.

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

Bottisham VC is in the process of being expanded from 7FE to 10FE an additional 450 places 11-16. Future catchment forecasts indicate that there will be some limited capacity available at the school to accommodate growth. In addition, there are plans for a new secondary school to the east of Cambridge to serve that areas development needs. The school will be in part of Bottisham VC current catchment area. If pupils in this area are served by the new school that will free up further capacity to accommodate the growth proposed within the Local Plan and the sites identified in this second round.

6h. Proximity to employment sites

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

CWS within 501m – 1km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification

All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower
### 7e. Public Rights of Way

**E** – No PRoW connection opportunities

### 7e.(i) PROW comments

### 7f.(i) Conservation Area

**D**

### 7f.(ii). Listed building

**D**

### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

**D**

### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

**ECDC** - Listed building immediately to the north, any development would need to be considered very carefully to avoid causing harm to the character, appearance and setting of the designated heritage asset.

**HE** - Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, there are two grade II listed buildings to the north and east of the site. Development of this site has the potential to impact upon the setting these listed buildings. Any development of this site will need to preserve the listed buildings and their setting. Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts. If taken forward for allocation, appropriate development criteria would need to be set. Should the site be allocated, these requirements should be included in the policy and supporting text of the Plan.

### 7h. Visual Impact

**B**

**Justification for score:**

### Additional criterion 7l. TPOs

**A**

### Parish Council support and rank

**Does Parish Council support this site?**

Yes

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council's view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

**Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:**

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

Overall recommendation from site assessment:  **Rejected**

Date and time of site visit:  14:40 21/7/2016

Supersedes site submission(s)  

Main findings and recommendations:

The site is rejected because of its likely detrimental visual impact on the village setting.

---

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land off Heath Road, Swaffham Bulbeck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Swaffham Bulbeck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Land off Heath Road, Swaffham Bulbeck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Form indicates site could provide up to 16 dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 16  b) Recommended 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  
Medium Village  

1b. Site Availability  
Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)  

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment  

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies  

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations  

2a. Flood zone  
>50% of site area in Zone 1  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 1: 100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 2: 0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk  
Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year: 0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Year: 0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 Year: 0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Site Name:** Land off Heath Road, Swaffham Bulbeck  
**Parish:** Swaffham Bulbeck C  
**Site Ref:** Site/27/02  
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

## Minor Criteria

### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 2.01km - 5km from the site

### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment
- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

### 5. Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

#### 5b. Local road impact
- No objections with minor mitigation measures

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

Highways frontage  
Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

#### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places, no room for expansion

#### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- Small village school on a very restricted site

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- The school is being expanded to 10 FE - 1500 places 11-16. This is to address the forecast demand for places and makes no allowance for any further housing development. The pupils are already in the primary feeder schools for Bottisham VC. The VC will NOT expand beyond 10FE even if the site allows it.

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 501m – 1km of site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification
- All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower

#### 7e. Public Rights of Way
- E – No PRoW connection opportunities
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Site Name:** Land off Heath Road, Swaffham Bulbeck

**Parish:** Swaffham Bulbeck C

**Site Ref:** Site/27/02

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) PROW comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>CA within 500m of site</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Conservation area to the west - limited heritage impact built form would need to be considered carefully

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7h. Visual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive

Justification for score:
Linear development would obscure the view to countryside.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional criterion 7i. TPOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

No TPO within 15m of the site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish Council support and rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Does Parish Council support this site? No

Form E - Parish Council site ranking: Fourth

Form G - Parish Council’s view:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Rejected**

Date and time of site visit: 14:35 21/7/2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is rejected as, if developed, would hinder the views of countryside and would also impact on the setting of the conservation area and village.

---

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th><strong>New site submission (Form B)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land off Commercial End, Swaffham Bulbeck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Swaffham Bulbeck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

1b. Site Availability
Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

- >50% of site area in Zone 1

| Flood Zone 1: | 100.00% | Flood Zone 2: | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3a: | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3b: | 0.00% |

2b. Surface Water flood risk

- Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))

| 30 Year: | 0.00% | 100 Year: | 0.00% | 1,000 Year: | 0.00% |
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Parish:** Swaffham Bulbeck C  
**Site Name:** Land off Commercial End, Swaffham Bulbeck  
**Site Ref:** Site/27/03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation** | Site does not intersect Inner Zone  
| **4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites** | 2.01km - 5km from the site  
| **4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment** |  

**Site Suitability**

| 5a. Proximity to contaminated land | Site within 250m of contaminated land  
| 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment |  
| Filled pit 230m to NE  
| 5b. Local road impact | No objections with minor mitigation measures  
| 5c. Strategic Road Network impact |  
| 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment |  

Highways frontage  
Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry  
This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

**Access to services**

| 6a. Proximity to public transport | Less than 5 min walk (<400m)  
| 6b. Proximity to medical services | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)  
| 6c. Proximity to shops | Less than 5 min walk (<400m)  
| 6d. Proximity to Primary School | Less than 10 min walk (<800m)  
| 6e. Proximity to Secondary School | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)  
| 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity | No spare places, no room for expansion  
| 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment |  
| Small village school on a very restricted site  
| 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity | No spare places but room for expansion  
| 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment |  

The school is being expanded to 10 FE - 1500 places 11-16. This is to address the forecast demand for places and makes no allowance for any further housing development. The pupils are already in the primary feeder schools for Bottisham VC. The VC will NOT expand beyond 10FE even if the site allows it.

| 6h. Proximity to employment sites | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)  

**Environmental impact**

| 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites | CWS within 500m of site  
| 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment |  
| 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers |  
| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower  
| 7e. Public Rights of Way | E – No PRoW connection opportunities  

---
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Land off Commercial End, Swaffham Bulbeck
Parish: Swaffham Bulbeck C
Site Ref: Site/27/03

7e.(i) PROW comments

7f.(i) Conservation Area
Site is within CA

7f.(ii) Listed building
LB within 500m of site

7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
SAM within 500m of site

7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
ECDC: On boundary with conservation area and close to listed buildings therefore care would need to be taken in terms of scale/layout/grain of development to ensure no to harm to heritage assets.

HE: 27/03: affecting the setting of a conservation area.

7h. Visual Impact
Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive

Justification for score:
Development would obstruct views of the countryside.

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
TPO tree within 15m of the site

Parish Council support and rank
Does Parish Council support this site? No
Form E - Parish Council site ranking: Third
Form G - Parish Council's view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received
Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit: 13:50 21/7/2016

Supersedes site submission(s):

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is in remote location and not linked to village. The site is not supported by the Parish Council and more sustainable sites are available within the village.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B) ID: 138
Site Address: Adjacent B1102, Swaffham Bulbeck, Cambridge, CB25 0NA
Settlement: Swaffham Bulbeck

LP15 Allocation Ref: Planning Perm. Ref:

Site Description: Land is outside green belt. Access lies within 30mph zone. Land is level and clear. Small area of Flood Zone. Village has school, shop, pub, and sits high in village hierarchy. Adjacent land may be available.

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints:

Current Use: Agriculture Proposed Use: Housing
Current Use info:
Proposed Use info:

Site Area Net (ha): 3.75 Site Area Gross (ha) 5

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 140 b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Medium Village

1b. Site Availability Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone >50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

Flood Zone 1: 62.21% Flood Zone 2: 4.11% Flood Zone 3a: 33.68% Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):
Site Name: Land at Gutter Bridge

Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Parish: Swaffham Bulbeck C
Site Ref: Site/27/05

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 2.01km - 5km from the site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

#### 5. Site Suitability

##### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

##### 5b. Local road impact
- Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

##### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

##### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

Access off Station Road but 215m visibility splays will be required which may cause potential visibility splay issues. Mitigation will be needed at the nearby junction/s to off-set intensification.

Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

A Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan would need to accompany the development proposals for this site. This would need to follow the guidance from CCC TA guidelines; particularly the need to demonstrate that the site can provide adequate mitigation measures and assess and improve connectivity to facilities including schools and to Cambridge by non motorised uses. The site will also need to refer to relevant CCC transport policy documents and appropriate schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. CCC question the sustainability of this site, having very little in the way of local services.

### 6. Access to services

##### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

##### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6f. Available primary school capacity
- No spare places, no room for expansion

##### 6g. Primary education impacts - professional assessment

Small village school on a very restricted site

##### 6f. Available secondary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

##### 6g. Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The school is being expanded to 10 FE - 1500 places 11-16. This is to address the forecast demand for places and makes no allowance for any further housing development. The pupils are already in the primary feeder schools for Bottisham VC. The VC will NOT expand beyond 10FE even if the site allows it.

##### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

### 7. Environmental impact

##### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 500m of site

##### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
**Site Name:** Land at Gutter Bridge  

**Parish:** Swaffham Bulbeck C  

**Site Ref:** Site/27/05  

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

---

| **7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers** |  
| **7d. Agricultural land classification** | All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower **C**  
| **7e. Public Rights of Way** | D – Opportunities to connect to nearby PROWs outside the site boundary **D**  
| **7e.(i) PROW comments** | FP4 is located to the west of the site. Provide a link from the site to FP4. This would involve negotiation with the landowner of the affected land.

| **7f.(i) Conservation Area** | CA within 500m of site **D**  
| **7f.(ii). Listed building** | LB within 500m of site **D**  
| **7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument** | SAM within 500m of site **D**  
| **7f.(iv) Archaeological asset** |  

| **7g. Heritage / archaeology comments** | ECDC: Conservation area to the north and east as well as SAM - removed from the settlement so concerns over views out of the conservation area and from SAM

| **FP4** |  

| **7h. Visual Impact** | Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive **D**  
| **Justification for score:** | Development of the site would have detrimental effect on the countryside.

| **Additional criterion 7i. TPOs** | No TPO within 15m of the site **A**  

---

**Parish Council support and rank**

| **Does Parish Council support this site?** | No  
| **Form E - Parish Council site ranking:** | Fifth or more  
| **Form G - Parish Council's view:** |  

---

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Land north of Station Road
Parish: Swaffham Bulbeck C
Site Ref: Site/27/07

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit:
16/05/2017 at 11:00am

Main findings and recommendations:
The site does not relate well to the built form of the village. Development would be visually intrusive to the open countryside and result in adverse harm to the landscape.

Site Information

Site Type: FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17
ID: 432

Site Address: Station Road, Swaffham Bulbeck
Settlement: Swaffham Bulbeck

LP15 Allocation Ref:
Planning Perm. Ref:

Site Description:
The site is a single arable field, it is open except for its boundary features. To the south is Station Road which leads into Swaffham Bulbeck. Proposal seeks to provide specialist accommodation for older people.

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints:
Submission does not specify number of dwellings. However the indicative site layout supplied as part of the submission shows a care home and 22no. Bungalows.

Current Use:
Proposed Use:

Indicative no. of dwellings:
a) Submitted / estimated
b) Recommended

Site Area Net (ha): 5.39
Site Area Gross (ha): 7.19

Brown/Greenfield:

Proposed Use info:

Current Use info:

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Medium Village

1b. Site Availability
Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

Flood Zone 1: 79.42%  Flood Zone 2: 2.23%  Flood Zone 3a: 18.36%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Land north of Station Road
Parish: Swaffham Bulbeck C
Site Ref: Site/27/07

### Percent (% of site area at risk (uFMSW)):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>30 Year</th>
<th>100 Year</th>
<th>1,000 Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
<td>7.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 2.01km - 5km from the site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

#### Minor Criteria

### 5. Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
Graveyard 320m to SE

#### 5b. Local road impact
Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
Access off Station Road but 215m visibility splays will be required which may cause potential visibility splay issues. Mitigation will be needed at the nearby junction/s to off-set intensification subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that the

### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
No spare places, no room for expansion

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
Limited capacity

#### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
This level of development will create a small pressure on places and would require mitigation at a neighbouring primary school where expansion was possible or places were available.

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
Bottisham VC is in the process of being expanded from 7FE to 10FE an additional 450 places 11-16. Future catchment forecasts indicate that there will be some limited capacity available at the school to accommodate growth. In addition, there are plans for a new secondary school to the east of Cambridge to serve those areas development needs. The school will be in part of Bottisham VC current catchment area. If pupils in this area are served by the new school that will free up further capacity to accommodate the growth proposed within the Local Plan and the sites identified in this second round.

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
CWS within 500m of site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land north of Station Road  
**Parish:** Swaffham Bulbeck C  
**Site Ref:** Site/27/07

### 7d. Agricultural land classification
All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower [C]

### 7e. Public Rights of Way
E – No PRoW connection opportunities [E]

### 7f. PROW comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>Site is within CA</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
ECDC - Immediately adjacent to conservation area and several listed buildings within proximity to the site. Any development would have to be considered very carefully, not sure that this wouldn't have an adverse impact on the character, appearance and setting of the designated heritage assets.

HE - Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, there is a scheduled monument to the immediate south east of the site, two grade II buildings to the south (a farmhouse and associated barn), and two grade II buildings to the north east. The Swaffham Bulbeck Conservation Area also lies to the east of the site. The scheduled monument is the remains of a Medieval moated enclosure. The majority of moated sites were prestigious aristocratic residences. They are a significant class of medieval monument and many examples provide conditions favourable to the survival of organic remains. The importance of Swaffham Bulbeck moated enclosure is increased by its association with a range of contemporary Medieval monuments, including the nearby priory to the north and the other two moats in the group of three. The enclosure is rectangular in shape measuring 110m by 60m inclusive of the surrounding dry moat. The proposed site also extends significantly into the countryside and would inevitably alter the character of the settlement at this approach to the village. Given these various historic assets, the proposed scale of the site and the likely impact, we would suggest that this site should not be taken forward.

### 7h. Visual Impact
Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive [D]

**Justification for score:**

### Additional criterion 7l. TPOs
TPO tree within 15m of the site [B]

### Parish Council support and rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form G - Parish Council’s view:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received
Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**  
Parish: **Swaffham Bulbeck C**  
Site Name: **Land north of Green Bank Road**  
Site Ref: **Site/27/08**

### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**  
Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:**  
16/05/2017 at 11:20am

**Supersedes site submission(s)**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site surrounds a junction which forms a gateway to the village, open and green in character. Development of the site would dramatically alter this, and could result in adverse harm to the landscape. The need for employment in this location is unclear.

### Site Information

**Site Type:**  
FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17  
**ID:** 433

**Site Address:**  
Swaffham Bulbeck

**LP15 Allocation Ref:**  
**Planning Perm. Ref:**

**Site Description:**  
Agricultural land located at the northern edge of the village, proposed for employment development.

**Brown/Greenfield:**  
Greenfield

**Known Constraints:**  
**Net site area estimated**

**Current Use:**  
Agriculture  
**Proposed Use:**  
Employment

**Current Use info:**

**Proposed Use info:**

**Site Area Net (ha):** 0.49  
**Site Area Gross (ha):** 0.58

**Indicative no. of dwellings:**  
a) Submitted / estimated  
b) Recommended

### Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  
Medium Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone  
>50% of site area in Zone 1

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  
Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  
Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  
Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk  
Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):**

30 Year: 0.00%  
100 Year: 0.00%  
1,000 Year: 4.39%
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land north of Green Bank Road  
**Parish:** Swaffham Bulbeck C  
**Site Ref:** Site/27/08

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land  
- Site within 250m of contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment  
- Landfill 236m to NW. Graveyard 158m to SW

5b. Local road impact  
- Insurmountable safety issues that cannot be secured in accordance with CIL regulations

5c. Strategic Road Network impact  
- No

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment  
- No safe access can be provided adjacent to the crossroads junction suitable for use by employment

#### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport  
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services  
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops  
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School  
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School  
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity  
- No

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity  
- No

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment  
- No

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment  
- No

6h. Proximity to employment sites  
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites  
- CWS within 501m – 1km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment  
- No

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers  
- All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower

7d. Agricultural land classification  
- E – No PRoW connection opportunities

7e.(i) PROW comments  
- No
### Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**

### Site Name: **Land north of Green Bank Road**

### Parish: **Swaffham Bulbeck C**

### Site Ref: **Site/27/08**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>Site is within CA</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td>TPO tree on site</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

**ECDC** - Partly within conservation area on eastern side of Green Bank Road, number of listed buildings within close proximity. Would have serious concerns regarding the use of these sites as employment site and the impact that this would have on the designated heritage assets and their setting.

**HE** - Part of this site is within Swaffham Bulbeck conservation area and grade II Lordship Cottage is to the south west of the suggested allocation. The proposed site also extends across a crossroads into the countryside and would inevitably alter the character of the settlement at this approach to the village.

### 7h. Visual Impact

**Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive** | D |

### Justification for score:

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

**TPO tree on site** | C |

### Parish Council support and rank

**Does Parish Council support this site?**

**No**

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council's view:**

(c) not add this site to the Local Plan

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Date and time of site visit: 16/05/2017

Supersedes site submission(s) Site/28/01

Main findings and recommendations:

Vehicular access to the site should be from Lower End Road, and would require major improvement to ensure suitable visibility. Subject to overcoming access constraints, the site offers a suitable location for development with defensible boundaries. It has been raised that a parcel of land within the boundary is not currently available for development. The draft site allocation should be drawn to reflect the extent of available land.

Site Information

Site Type: FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17  ID: 435

Site Address: High Street, Swaffham Prior

Settlement: Swaffham Prior

LP15 Allocation Ref:  Planning Perm. Ref: 

Site Description: The proposal is a site submission combining two areas previously assessed as development envelope changes (DE/28/01 & DE/28/05). The proposal is for housing development.

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints: Submission indicates site could deliver 11 to 55 dwellings.

**Net site area estimated**

Current Use: Agriculture  Proposed Use: Housing

Proposed Use info:

Site Area Net (ha): 1.30  Site Area Gross (ha): 1.54

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 55  b) Recommended 20

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  Medium Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone  >50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk  Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):
### Site Name: Land south of High Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref: Site/28/06</th>
<th>Parish: Swaffham Prior CP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Status: Site Allocation SWP.H1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Minor Criteria

##### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

##### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 501m - 2km from the site

##### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 Year:</th>
<th>100 Year:</th>
<th>1,000 Year:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5. Site Suitability

##### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

##### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
- Graveyard on N boundary

##### 5b. Local road impact
- Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

##### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

##### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

- No Access will be permitted on to the B1102. The site would therefore need to be access from Lower End Road however it does not appear that the required inter-vehicle visibility splays can be achieved to the south due to the road geometry and existing obstructions. This access would be within the 30mph speed limit but visibility is unachievable.

#### 6. Access to services

##### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

##### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places, no room for expansion

##### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Limited capacity

##### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- Future catchment forecasts suggest that the impact of this level of development can be accommodated within the Swaffham Prior primary school

##### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- Bottisham VC is in the process of being expanded from 7FE to 10FE an additional 450 places 11-16. Future catchment forecasts indicate that there will be some limited capacity available at the school to accommodate growth. In addition, there are plans for a new secondary school to the east of Cambridge to serve that areas development needs. The school will be in part of Bottisham VC current catchment area. If pupils in this area are served by the new school that will free up further capacity to accommodate the growth proposed within the Local Plan and the sites identified in this second round.

##### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

#### 7. Environmental impact

##### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 501m – 1km of site

##### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

##### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7d. Agricultural land classification</th>
<th>All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>B – Opportunities to connect to multiple nearby PRoW within the site boundary</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 7f.(i) PROW comments
Public Footpath 13 runs through the south west corner of the site. Public Footpath 12 runs alongside the north west corner of the site. Public Footpath 13 to be taken account of in the layout of the site. Provide a link from Public Footpath 13 to Public Footpath 12. |
| 7f.(i) Conservation Area            | Site is within CA | E |
| 7f.(ii). Listed building             | LB on-site | E |
| 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument | SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site | B |
| 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset        |                                               |   |
| 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments |
ECDC - Immediately adjacent to conservation area and several listed buildings within proximity to the site, including the Grade I and Grade II* churches. I would have serious concerns regarding the potential impact of any development on the wider setting of the listed buildings and conservation area.

HE - This site is partly within the conservation area and includes the grade II Priory Cottage (early C16. Timber-framed plaster rendered with left hand gable end cased in gault brick in C19). To the west of the site is Swaffham Prior House grade II registered park and garden and to the north grade II* Church of St Cyriac and St Julitta and neighbouring grade I St Mary’s. Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts. It may not be possible to allocate based on these impacts.

| 7h. Visual Impact                   | Some improvement to landscape/townscape or key views | B |
|                                    | Justification for score:                             |   |

| Additional criterion 7i. TPOs       | No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

Parish Council support and rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council's view:</td>
<td>(c) not add this site to the Local Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Summation of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit: 16:25 21/7/2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is rejected as its capacity is below the 10 unit threshold. Site access is also heavily constrained.

Site Information

| Site Type: | New site submission (Form B) | ID: 139 |
| Site Address: | Land at Swaffham Prior (accessed from High Street) |
| Settlement: | Swaffham Prior |
| LP15 Allocation Ref: | |
| Planning Perm. Ref: | |
| Site Description: | Part of Dale Field paddock |
| Brown/Greenfield: | Greenfield |
| Known Constraints: | Accessed via a shared private lane. A cemetery and allotments adjoin the site to the north-east, there are residential properties and their gardens to the west and the B1102 runs along the south-eastern boundary. The site adjoins the development and Swaffham Prior Conservation Area to the west. There are several listed buildings in close proximity to the site including the Grade I Listed Church of St Mary and the Grade II* Listed Church of St Cyriac and Julitta. Site is below allocation size threshold with 3 proposed units only, however site area could potentially accommodate a greater number of dwellings, subject to suitability. |

| Current Use: | Agriculture | Proposed Use: | Housing |
| Current Use info: | |
| Proposed Use info: | |
| Site Area Net (ha): 0.76 | Site Area Gross (ha): 0.892 |
| Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 3 | b) Recommended 0 |

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Medium Village C
1b. Site Availability Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22) A
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone >50% of site area in Zone 1 A

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Site Name: Part of Dale Field

**Minor Criteria**

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site within 50m of contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
- Laundry or dry cleaners on SW boundary

5b. Local road impact
- Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- No Access will be permitted on to the B1102. The site would therefore need to be access from Lower End Road however it does not appear that the required inter-vehicle visibility splays can be achieved to the south due to the road geometry and existing obstructions. This access would be within the 30mph speed limit but visibility is unachievable.

This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places, no room for expansion

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- Small village school on a very restricted site

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- The school is being expanded to 10 FE - 1500 places 11-16. This is to address the forecast demand for places and makes no allowance for any further housing development. The pupils are already in the primary feeder schools for Bottisham VC. The VC will NOT expand beyond 10FE even if the site allows it.

6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 501m – 1km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>B – Opportunities to connect to multiple nearby PRoW within the site boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP12 is within the site and FP13 is within the adjacent site 28/05. Provide a link between these 2 FPs across both sites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>Site is within CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECDC: Part of site in conservation area and proximity to several listed buildings - concerns over development in this location and impact on the setting of the two churches. Quite disjointed from the rest of the settlement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE: 28/01: adjacent to conservation area and affecting the setting of a number of listed buildings and a registered park and garden including the grade II* Church of St Cyriac and St Julitta. It may not be possible to allocate based on these impacts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
<td>Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification for score:</td>
<td>well screened from main road and so no impact onto the streetscene.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional criterion 7i. TPOs</td>
<td>No TPO within 15m of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Council support and rank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Parish Council support this site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td>Fifth or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council's view:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: 
Has merit

Date and time of site visit: 
16:00 21/7/2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site has some merit. However safe vehicular access is probably difficult to achieve, requiring major infrastructure.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  ID: 143

Site Address: Land between High Street and B1102, Swaffham Prior

Settlement: Swaffham Prior

LP15 Allocation Ref: Planning Perm. Ref: 

Site Description: Land between High Street and B1102

Brown/Greenfield: Mixed

Known Constraints:

Current Use: Housing  Proposed Use: Housing

Current Use info: Residential and scrub land

Proposed Use info:

Site Area Net (ha): 0.40  Site Area Gross (ha): 0.4

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 15  b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  Medium Village

1b. Site Availability  Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone  >50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk  Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):

30 Year: 0.00%  100 Year: 0.00%  1,000 Year: 7.20%
Current Status: Superseded by SWP.H1

Parish: Swaffham Prior CP

Site Name: Land between High Street and B1102, Swaffham Prior

Site Ref: Site/28/05

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located on contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
- Laundry or dry cleaners on site

5b. Local road impact
- Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- No Access will be permitted on to the B1102. The site would therefore need to be access from Lower End Road however it does not appear that the required inter-vehicle visibility splays can be achieved to the north due to the road geometry and existing obstructions. This access would be within the 60mph speed limit

#### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places, no room for expansion

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- Small village school on a very restricted site

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- The school is being expanded to 10 FE - 1500 places 11-16. This is to address the forecast demand for places and makes no allowance for any further housing development. The pupils are already in the primary feeder schools for Bottisham VC. The VC will NOT expand beyond 10FE even if the site allows it.

6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

#### 7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 501m – 1km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification
- All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

7e. Public Rights of Way
- B – Opportunities to connect to multiple nearby PROW within the site boundary

7e.(i) PROW comments
FP13 is within the site and FP12 is within the adjacent site 28/01. Provide a link between these 2 FPs across both sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>Site is within CA</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii) Listed building</td>
<td>LB on-site</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

ECDC: On boundary of conservation area and listed buildings nearby - consideration to setting needs to be given as well as scale/layout/grain of development to ensure no harm to heritage assets

HE: 28/05: affecting the setting of a conservation area.

### 7h. Visual Impact

| Justification for score: | Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views | C    |

Site well screened from the roads.

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

No TPO within 15m of the site

### Parish Council support and rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council’s view:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
**Site Name:** Land at Goodwin Farm fronting Heath Road, Swaffham Prior

**Current Status:** Site Allocation SWP.E1

**Parish:** Swaffham Prior CP

**Site Ref:** Site/28/02

### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**
- Preferred site

**Date and time of site visit:**
16:50 21/07/2016

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and should be retained.

### Site Information

- **Site Type:** New site submission (Form B)
- **ID:** 140
- **Site Address:** Land at Goodwin Farm fronting Heath Road, Swaffham Prior
- **Settlement:** Swaffham Prior
- **LP15 Allocation Ref:** SWP2
- **Planning Perm. Ref:**
- **Site Description:** Land at Goodwin Farm fronting Heath Road, Swaffham Prior. Formerly allocated by LP15 as site SWP 2
- **Brown/Greenfield:** Greenfield
- **Known Constraints:** The County Council is actively promoting this land for employment uses. Site also promoted by Swaffham Prior Parish Council.
- **Current Use:** Agriculture
- **Proposed Use:** Employment
- **Current Use info:**
- **Proposed Use info:**
- **Site Area Net (ha):** 0.85
- **Site Area Gross (ha):** 1
- **Indicative no. of dwellings:**
  - a) Submitted / estimated
  - b) Recommended

### Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
- Medium Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

- **Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**
  - Flood Zone 1: 100.00%
  - Flood Zone 2: 0.00%
  - Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%
  - Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk

- **Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA**
- **Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):**
**Site Name:** Land at Goodwin Farm fronting Heath Road, Swaffham Prior

**Parish:** Swaffham Prior CP

**Site Ref:** Site/28/02

**Current Status:** Site Allocation SWP.E1

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

**5a. Proximity to contaminated land**
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

**5a.(i) Contaminated land profesional assessment**
- A

**5b. Local road impact**
- No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

**5c. Strategic Road Network impact**
- B

**5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**

Access to site via Heath Road
- 60mph road speed limit

Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Statement. This should follow CCC TA guidelines; particularly the need to demonstrate that the site can provide adequate mitigation measures and assess and improve connectivity in and around Swaffham Prior. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and appropriate schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area.

#### 6. Access to services

**6a. Proximity to public transport**
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

**6b. Proximity to medical services**
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

**6c. Proximity to shops**
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

**6d. Proximity to Primary School**
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

**6e. Proximity to Secondary School**
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

**6f.(i) Available primary school capacity**
- No spare places, no room for expansion

**6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**
- The school is being expanded to 10 FE - 1500 places 11-16. This is to address the forecast demand for places and makes no allowance for any further housing development. The pupils are already in the primary feeder schools for Bottisham VC. The VC will NOT expand beyond 10FE even if the site allows it.

**6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity**
- No spare places but room for expansion

**6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**

#### 7. Environmental impact

**7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**
- CWS within 501m – 1km of site

**7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**

### Technical Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Risk Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Year</td>
<td>28.82%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 Year</td>
<td>37.91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No
- 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation: N/a - employment site
- 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites: 2.01km - 5km from the site
- 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment
- 5a. Proximity to contaminated land: Site located more than 250m from contaminated land
- 5b. Local road impact: No objections with Moderate mitigation measures
- 5c. Strategic Road Network impact: B
- 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- 6h. Proximity to employment sites: Less than 5 min walk (<400m)
- 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites: CWS within 501m – 1km of site
- 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
### Site Ref:
Site/28/02

### Site Name:
Land at Goodwin Farm fronting Heath Road, Swaffham Prior

### Current Status:
Site Allocation SWP.E1

### Parish:
Swaffham Prior CP

### Parish Council support and rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td>Second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council's view:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

---

### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

### 7d. Agricultural land classification

All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

### 7e. Public Rights of Way

E – No PRoW connection opportunities

### 7f.(i) PROW comments

### 7f.(i) Conservation Area

CA within 500m of site

### 7f.(ii). Listed building

LB within 500m of site

### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

Already allocated - same issues as before

### 7h. Visual Impact

Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive

Justification for score:

### Additional criterion 7f. TPOs

No TPO within 15m of the site

---

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Rejected**

Date and time of site visit: 15:50 21/7/2016

Supersedes site submission(s):

Main findings and recommendations:
The site was allocated for housing development in the Local Plan 2015. Development of the site has since been completed and the allocation should therefore be removed.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Rogers Road, Swaffham Prior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Swaffham Prior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>SWP 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Rogers Road, Swaffham Prior. Site formerly allocated by LP15 as SWP1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Swaffham Prior Parish Council indicate that 40% of the site should be CLD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>0.9749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 1:</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 2:</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3a:</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3b:</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Year:</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Year:</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 Year:</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy | Medium Village
1b. Site Availability | Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
- Flood Zone 1: 100.00%
- Flood Zone 2: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))

Date and time of site visit: 15:50 21/7/2016

Supersedes site submission(s):
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Site Name:** Rogers Road

**Site Ref:** Site/28/03

**Parish:** Swaffham Prior CP

**Site Ref:** Site/28/03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>5. Site Suitability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation</td>
<td>Site does not intersect Inner Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites</td>
<td>2.01km - 5km from the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Minor Criteria**

**5. Site Suitability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</th>
<th>Site located more than 250m from contaminated land</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land profesion assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>No objections with minor mitigation measures</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>Access to the site would be off Rogers Road Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**6. Access to services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6a. Proximity to public transport</th>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>No spare places, no room for expansion</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>No spare places but room for expansion</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**

Small village school on a very restricted site

**6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**

The school is being expanded to 10 FE - 1500 places 11-16. This is to address the forecast demand for places and makes no allowance for any further housing development. The pupils are already in the primary feeder schools for Bottisham VC. The VC will NOT expand beyond 10FE even if the site allows it.

| 6h. Proximity to employment sites | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) | B |

**7. Environmental impact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</th>
<th>CWS within 500m of site</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>E – No PRoW connection opportunities</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7e.(i) PROW comments**
Site Ref: Site/28/03
Parish: Swaffham Prior CP
Site Name: Rogers Road
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

7f.(i) Conservation Area
CA within 500m of site
D

7f.(ii) Listed building
LB within 500m of site
D

7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
SAM within 500.1 – 1000m of site
C

7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
Already allocated - same issues as before

7h. Visual Impact

Justification for score:

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
TPO tree within 15m of the site
B

Parish Council support and rank
Does Parish Council support this site? Yes
Form E - Parish Council site ranking: First
Form G - Parish Council’s view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received
Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Site Ref: Site/28/04

Parish: Swaffham Prior CP
Site Name: Land at Lower End, Swaffham Prior

Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit: 15:10 21/7/2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is rejected as development would result in the loss of key views of the countryside. The site capacity is also likely to fall below the 10 unit threshold.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B) ID: 142
Site Address: Land at Lower End, Swaffham Prior CB25
Settlement: Swaffham Prior

LP15 Allocation Ref: Planning Perm. Ref:

Site Description: Land at Lower End, Swaffham Prior
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints:
Current Use: Agriculture Proposed Use: Housing

Current Use info: Proposed Use info:

Site Area Net (ha): 0.30 Site Area Gross (ha): 0.3
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 9 b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Medium Village
1b. Site Availability Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone >50% of site area in Zone 1
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00% Flood Zone 2: 0.00% Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW): 30 Year: 0.00% 100 Year: 0.00% 1,000 Year: 0.00%
**Site Name:** Land at Lower End, Swaffham Prior

**Parish:** Swaffham Prior CP

**Site Ref:** Site/28/04

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No |

### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 2.01km - 5km from the site

### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

| 5a. Proximity to contaminated land | Site within 250m of contaminated land |
| 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment | |
| Pit or quarry 220 m to S. |

| 5b. Local road impact | No objections with minor mitigation measures |

| 5c. Strategic Road Network impact | |

| 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment | |

Access to the site would be off Lower End
Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

#### 6. Access to services

| 6a. Proximity to public transport | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) |
| 6b. Proximity to medical services | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) |
| 6c. Proximity to shops | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) |

| 6d. Proximity to Primary School | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) |
| 6e. Proximity to Secondary School | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) |

| 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity | No spare places, no room for expansion |

**6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**

Small village school on a very restricted site

| 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity | No spare places but room for expansion |

**6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**

The school is being expanded to 10 FE - 1500 places 11-16. This is to address the forecast demand for places and makes no allowance for any further housing development. The pupils are already in the primary feeder schools for Bottisham VC. The VC will NOT expand beyond 10FE even if the site allows it.

| 6h. Proximity to employment sites | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) |

#### 7. Environmental impact

| 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites | CWS within 500m of site |

**7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**

| 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers | |

| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower |

| 7e. Public Rights of Way | E – No PRoW connection opportunities |

**7e.(i) PROW comments**
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**

Site Name: *Land at Lower End, Swaffham Prior*

Parish: **Swaffham Prior CP**

Site Ref: **Site/28/04**

### 7f.7g Heritage / archaeology comments

Conservation area and listed buildings to the southwest - consideration would need to be given to scale/layout/grain of development to ensure no harm to heritage assets

**Justification for score:**

A good view of open countryside would be lost.

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

No TPO within 15m of the site

**Parish Council support and rank**

**Does Parish Council support this site?** Yes

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:** Third

**Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Parish: Swaffham Prior CP
Site Name: Land adjacent to 38 Mill Hill
Site Ref: Site/28/07

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit: 16/05/2017 at 12:15pm

Site Information

Site Type: FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17
Site Address: 38 Mill Hill, Swaffham Prior
Settlement: Swaffham Prior
LP15 Allocation Ref: Planning Perm. Ref:
Site Description: Agricultural land adjacent to 38 Mill Hill, proposed for housing development.
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints: Submission indicates site could deliver up to 10 dwellings.
*Net site area estimated*

Current Use: Agriculture
Proposed Use: Housing

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 10, b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Medium Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 Year</th>
<th>100 Year</th>
<th>1,000 Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is located in open countryside and development would likely be visually intrusive and result in adverse harm to the landscape. Development risks affecting a nearby listed building and its setting - namely historic windmills. It is understood that the mill continues to be operational, the parish council raised concerns regarding the impact of development on the ability of the mill to operate.
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Parish:** Swaffham Prior CP  
**Site Name:** Land adjacent to 38 Mill Hill  
**Site Ref:** Site/28/07

| **Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):** | No |
| **Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):** | No |

### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation

- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites

- 501m - 2km from the site

### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land

- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact

- No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

- Highways improvements needed e.g. footwaysSubject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

#### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport

- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services

- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops

- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School

- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School

- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

- No spare places, no room for expansion

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

- Limited capacity

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

- Future catchment forecasts suggest that the impact of this level of development can be accommodated within the Swaffham Prior primary school

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

- Bottisham VC is in the process of being expanded from 7FE to 10FE an additional 450 places 11-16. Future catchment forecasts indicate that there will be some limited capacity available at the school to accommodate growth. In addition, there are plans for a new secondary school to the east of Cambridge to serve that areas development needs. The school will be in part of Bottisham VC current catchment area. If pupils in this area are served by the new school that will free up further capacity to accommodate the growth proposed within the Local Plan and the sites identified in this second round.

6h. Proximity to employment sites

- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

- CWS within 500m of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification

- All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower

7e. Public Rights of Way

- E – No PRoW connection opportunities
Parish: Swaffham Prior CP
Site Name: Land adjacent to 38 Mill Hill
Site Ref: Site/28/07

Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site? No

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view: (c) not add this site to the Local Plan

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit: 09.20 29 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is rejected as its capacity is below the 10 unit threshold.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  ID: 144
Site Address: Land north side of Main Street, Wentworth
Settlement: Wentworth
LP15 Allocation Ref:  Planning Perm. Ref: 
Site Description: Land north side of Main Street, Wentworth
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: No known constraints. Proposed units below site allocation size threshold.
Current Use: Agriculture  Proposed Use: Housing
Current Use info: 
Proposed Use info: 
Site Area Net (ha): 0.51  Site Area Gross (ha): 0.6
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 6  b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  Small Village
1b. Site Availability  Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone >50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
30 Year: 0.00%  100 Year: 0.00%  1,000 Year: 2.33%
### Current Status
Rejected - not a site allocation

### Site Name
Main Street, Wentworth

### Parish
Wentworth CP

### Site Ref
Site/29/01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
Site does not intersect Inner Zone

4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
2.01km - 5km from the site

4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

#### Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact
No objections with minor mitigation measures

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

"Access off Main Street Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry"
This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
No spare places, no room for expansion

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
Limited capacity

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
The site would accommodate another 15 pupils only using DfE recommended site area guidelines hence an E rather than a D classification

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area

6h. Proximity to employment sites
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
CWS within 501m – 1km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification
All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

7e. Public Rights of Way
E – No PRoW connection opportunities

7e.(i) PROW comments

---

**Note:** The ratings (A, B, C, D, E) are based on the criteria and professional assessments provided in the document. The document outlines various environmental and spatial considerations for the site, including proximity to hazard zones, wildlife sites, access to services, and environmental impacts.
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Parish:** Wentworth CP  
**Site Name:** Main Street, Wentworth  
**Site Ref:** Site/29/01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>CA within 1.01km – 2km of site</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

No heritage impact

7h. Visual Impact

Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive

Justification for score:

If developed would result in play area feeling less open and natural.

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

TPO tree on site

C

**Parish Council support and rank**

Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Development boundary should be amended to include land to the rear of No 3 Main Street, which is developable and deliverable.
- Housing development of site would provide infrastructure and community facilities.
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Parish: Wentworth CP
Site Name: Existing housing allocation, land opposite the Old Red Lion, Main Street
Site Ref: Site/29/02

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected
Date and time of site visit:
Supersedes site submission(s):

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. However the site capacity is expected to be below the 10 unit threshold. The site is therefore rejected.

Site Information

Site Type: Local Plan 2015 allocated site
ID: 207
Site Address: Land opposite the Old Red Lion, Main Street
Settlement: Wentworth
LP15 Allocation Ref: WEN1
Site Description: Land opposite the Old Red Lion, Main Street
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints:
Current Use: Agriculture
Proposed Use: Housing
Proposed Use info:
Site Area Net (ha): 0.15
Site Area Gross (ha): 0.15
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 5 b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Small Village
1b. Site Availability
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment
1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone >50% of site area in Zone 1
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00% Flood Zone 2: 0.00% Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW): 30 Year: 0.00% 100 Year: 0.00% 1,000 Year: 0.00%
## Site Name: Existing housing allocation, land opposite the Old Red Lion, Main Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</th>
<th>Site located more than 250m from contaminated land</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>No objections with minor mitigation measures</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Has Highways frontage Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry" This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6a. Proximity to public transport</th>
<th>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m)</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>No spare places, no room for expansion</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The site would accommodate another 15 pupils only using DfE recommended site area guidelines hence an E rather than a D classification
| 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity |
| 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment |

The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area
| 6h. Proximity to employment sites | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |

### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</th>
<th>CWS within 501m – 1km of site</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>E – No PRoW connection opportunities</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Site Name:** Existing housing allocation, land opposite the Old Red Lion, Main Street

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Parish:** Wentworth CP

**Site Ref:** Site/29/02

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>CA within 1.01km – 2km of site</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7g. Heritage / archaeology comments**

Already allocated - same issues as before

**7h. Visual Impact**

**Justification for score:**

**Additional criterion 7i. TPOs**

TPO tree on site

**Parish Council support and rank**

Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council’s view:

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**  
Parish: **Wentworth CP**  
Site Name: **Existing housing allocation, land east of 1 Main Street**  
Site Ref: **Site/29/03**

### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**  
Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:**  

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. However the site capacity is expected to be below the 10 unit threshold. The site is therefore rejected.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>Local Plan 2015 allocated site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land east of 1 Main Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Wentworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>WEN2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Existing housing allocation, land east of 1 Main Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Indicative no. of dwellings: | a) Submitted / estimated 4  
| Site Area Net (ha): | 0.12  
| Site Area Gross (ha): | 0.12  
| b) Recommended 0 |

### Major Criteria

1. **Settlement Hierarchy**  
   Small Village

1b. **Site Availability**  

1c. **Minerals and Waste assessment**  

1c.(i) **Site affected by M+W Policies**  

1c.(ii) **Site affected by M+W Allocations**  

2a. **Flood zone**  
   >50% of site area in Zone 1

   **Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

   - Flood Zone 1: 100.00%
   - Flood Zone 2: 0.00%
   - Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%
   - Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. **Surface Water flood risk**  
   Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

   **Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):**

   - 30 Year: 17.46%
   - 100 Year: 6.98%
   - 1,000 Year: 36.26%
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Existing housing allocation, land east of 1 Main Street  
**Parish:** Wentworth CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/29/03

| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No |
| 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation | Site does not intersect Inner Zone |
| 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites | 2.01km - 5km from the site |
| 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment | |

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land | Site located more than 250m from contaminated land | A
5b. Local road impact | No objections with minor mitigation measures | A
5c. Strategic Road Network impact | |
5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment | “Has Highways frontage Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry” This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required. |

#### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) | B
6b. Proximity to medical services | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E
6c. Proximity to shops | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E
6d. Proximity to Primary School | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E
6e. Proximity to Secondary School | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E
6f.(i) Available primary school capacity | No spare places, no room for expansion | E
6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity | Limited capacity | C
6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment | |
6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment | |

#### 7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites | CWS within 501m – 1km of site | C
7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment | |
7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers | |
7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower | C
7e. Public Rights of Way | E – No PRoW connection opportunities | E
7e.(i) PROW comments | |
Site Name: Existing housing allocation, land east of 1 Main Street

Parish: Wentworth CP

Site Ref: Site/29/03

Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

7f.(i) Conservation Area
CA within 1.01km – 2km of site

7f.(ii). Listed building
LB within 500m of site

7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
SAM more than 2km from site

7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

Already allocated - same issues as before

7h. Visual Impact

Justification for score:

Additional criterion 7l. TPOs
TPO tree on site

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
## Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**
Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:**
15:00 08 May 2017

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

- Safe, suitable vehicular access is unlikely to be achievable. Noise and air quality issues from the A142 are likely to affect residential amenity. The site is in the open countryside, isolated from any settlement, and would likely have poor access to services and facilities.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Witcham Toll, Wentworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Wentworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>Agricultural land proposed for housing development, located south of Witcham Toll, between A142 and Haddenham Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints</td>
<td><strong>Submission does not indicate number of proposed dwellings. Dwelling figure is therefore calculated from site area and does not reflect site constraints or characteristics.</strong> <strong>Net site area estimated</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha)</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha)</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 74, b) Recommended 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a. Settlement Hierarchy</th>
<th>Small Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b. Site Availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Minerals and Waste assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Flood zone</td>
<td>&gt;50% of site area in Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 1:</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 2:</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3a:</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3b:</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Surface Water flood risk</td>
<td>Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):</strong></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**
Rejected
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Parish:** Wentworth CP  
**Site Name:** Land south of Witcham Toll  
**Site Ref:** Site/29/04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>30 Year:</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
<th>100 Year:</th>
<th>0.48%</th>
<th>1,000 Year:</th>
<th>5.64%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone  

### 4. Proximity to Internationally / Nationally Important Wildlife Sites
- 2.01km - 5km from the site  

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- **B**

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

##### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site within 50m of contaminated land  
- **D**

##### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment
- Former RAF Mepal to N of A142  

##### 5b. Local road impact
- Insurmountable safety issues that cannot be secured in accordance with CIL regulations  
- **E**

##### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

##### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- No direct access from the A142 will be permitted this is a primary distributor road carrying very high numbers of distributor trafficThis is an accident cluster site and the addition of a third T junction in to the geometry would be anticipated would mak

#### 6. Access to services

##### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)  
- **A**

##### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)  
- **D**

##### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)  
- **D**

##### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)  
- **E**

##### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)  
- **E**

##### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places, no room for expansion  
- **E**

##### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion  
- **D**

##### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- The level of development now proposed in Witchford and other villages that feed into Rackham Primary School is in excess of 750 homes. This level of development suggests a need for a significant expansion of primary school provision. The site at Rackham is restricted but with some additional land could be expanded by 0.5 FE to provide an additional 105 places. However, to mitigate the full impact of this development a further form of entry of palces could be rrequired. Options include a new small primary school (with a site) or the relocation and expansion of the existing school onto a much larger site.

##### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- No spare places but room for expansion  
- **D**

#### 7. Environmental impact

##### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site  
- **B**

##### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
### Site Ref: Site/29/04

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Site Name:** Land south of Witcham Toll

**Parish:** Wentworth CP

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.

### Parish Council support and rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td>(c) not add this site to the Local Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Justification for score:

Existing dwellings have been developed as a single row with frontage to A142. This site extends some distance to the rear and therefore would not reflect the pattern of development in the locality. Site is extremely isolated and is effectively located in open countryside.

### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7d. Agricultural land classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7e. Public Rights of Way

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E – No PRoW connection opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f.(i) PROW comments

### 7f.(i) Conservation Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CA within 500.1 – 1000m of site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f.(ii) Listed building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LB within 500.1 – 1000m of site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAM more than 2km from site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

Sutton conservation area to the west. No impact on designated heritage assets.

### 7h. Visual Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional criterion 7f. TPOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No TPO within 15m of the site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**

Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:**

10:10 15 May 2017

**Supersedes site submission(s)**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is located close to the A142, which would likely impact upon residential amenity. In addressing noise, air quality and drainage, such mitigation measures would likely render the site unable to accommodate sufficient dwellings to meet the 10 or more dwelling threshold.

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb'17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID:</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Marroway Lane, Witchford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Wentworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>The site adjoins the village of Witchford, with access from Marroway Lane, but is located within the administrative boundary of Wentworth Parish. The site is broadly triangular in shape and in agricultural use. The A142 forms the northern boundary. Draft site allocations WFD.H1 and WFD.H2 are located immediately to the east of the site. The proposal seeks to extend these allocations to include the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Submission indicates the site could provide 12 dwellings. <strong>Net site area estimated</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 12 b) Recommended 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

- Small Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

- >50% of site area in Zone 1

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

- Flood Zone 1: 100.00%
- Flood Zone 2: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**

**Site Name:** Land at Marroway Lane

**Parish:** Wentworth CP

**Site Ref:** Site/29/05

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 2.01km - 5km from the site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

#### 2b. Surface Water flood risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (% of site area at risk (uFMfSW))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year: 4.37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):
- No

#### Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):
- No

### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places, no room for expansion

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

The level of development now proposed in Witchford and other villages that feed into Rackham Primary School is in excess of 750 homes. This level of development suggests a need for a significant expansion of primary school provision. The site at Rackham is restricted but with some additional land could be expanded by 0.5 FE to provide an additional 105 places. However, to mitigate the full impact of this development a further form of entry of places could be required. Options include a new small primary school (with a site) or the relocation and expansion of the existing school onto a much larger site.

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

There is potential to expand Witchford Village College on its current site. However, this latest call for site would result in much higher levels of development within the catchment area of the College if they were all included in the Local Plan. The level of development would generate another 595 secondary aged children or 4FE. This is in addition to the additional pupils identified from the sites included in the consultation draft local plan. At this level of development suitable mitigation could not be provided at Witchford VC. It would be the Council’s intention on adoption of the Local Plan to undertake a strategic review of secondary school provision across the District and the review would include the option of a further new secondary school (and site) in order to provide suitable mitigation.

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site
### Site Name: Land at Marroway Lane

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Parish:** Wentworth CP

**Site Ref:** Site/29/05

---

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

---

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

---

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification

All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

---

#### 7e. Public Rights of Way

B – Opportunities to connect to multiple nearby PRoW within the site boundary

---

#### 7e.(i) PROW comments

Public Byway Open to All Traffic 6 runs alongside the south and east boundaries of the site. Provide a safe off road link within the northern boundary of the site between the 2 ends of Byway Open to All Traffic 6.

---

#### 7e.(ii). Opportunities to connect to multiple nearby PRoW within the site boundary

---

#### 7f.(i) Conservation Area

CA more than 2km from site

---

#### 7f.(ii). Listed building

LB within 500.1 – 1000m of site

---

#### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

SAM more than 2km from site

---

#### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

---

#### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

Listed buildings to southeast and southwest, likely limited/no impact on designated heritage assets.

---

#### 7h. Visual Impact

Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views

---

#### Justification for score:

---

#### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

No TPO within 15m of the site

---

#### Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site? No

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

---

**Form G - Parish Council's view:** (c) not add this site to the Local Plan

---

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**  
Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:**  
10:50 11 Aug 2016

**Supersedes site submission(s)**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

Since the site was originally assessed, it has subsequently been granted planning permission for 8 dwellings. It is therefore considered unlikely that the site will deliver 10 or more dwellings (the minimum threshold for allocation) and should be rejected.

---

**Site Information**

**Site Type:** New site submission (Form B)  
**ID:** 145

**Site Address:** Chapel Lane, Wicken, Ely, Cambridgeshire

**Settlement:** Wicken

**LP15 Allocation Ref:**  
**Planning Perm. Ref:**

**Site Description:** Land south of Chapel Lane, Wicken

**Brown/Greenfield:** Greenfield

**Known Constraints:** No known constraints. Form indicates 0-10% CLD

**Current Use:** Agriculture  
**Proposed Use:** Housing

**Current Use info:**

**Proposed Use info:**

**Site Area Net (ha):** 0.63  
**Site Area Gross (ha):** 0.747

**Indicative no. of dwellings:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Submitted / estimated</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Recommended</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  
Small Village

1b. Site Availability  
Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone  
>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (% of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk  
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (% of site area at risk (uFMfSW):  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 Year</th>
<th>100 Year</th>
<th>1,000 Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.36%</td>
<td>1.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 501m - 2km from the site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

#### 5. Site Suitability

##### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

##### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

##### 5b. Local road impact
- No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations

##### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

##### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- "Access off Chapel Lane. Some highways improvements needed - road widening and junctions. Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry"

This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

#### 6. Access to services

##### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

##### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Limited capacity

##### 6f.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers 600 houses in the catchment area would deliver this number of pupils.

##### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

#### 7. Environmental impact

##### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 501m – 1km of site

##### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

##### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

##### 7d. Agricultural land classification
- All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower

##### 7e. Public Rights of Way
- B – Opportunities to connect to multiple nearby PRoW within the site boundary

##### 7e.(i) PROW comments
Public Footpaths 24 and 25 cross over the site. Ensure that these routes are retained as they provide a link for pedestrians from Drury Lane to the east of the site and Chapel Lane to the north of the site. These routes are likely to require diversion by the developer to accommodate the proposed development. Also whilst the development takes place the developer must ensure that the route is still available and safe for the public or arrange for a temporary closure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>CA within 500m of site</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 500.1 – 1000m of site</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

ECDC: Listed building to east and conservation area to south - limited heritage impact

HE: 31/01: affecting the setting of a conservation area and three grade II buildings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7h. Visual Impact</th>
<th>Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justification for score:</td>
<td>Impact limited to local residents and PROW users.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Additional criterion 7l. TPOs             | No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site? No

Form E - Parish Council site ranking: Fourth

Form G - Parish Council's view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

• Policy and supporting text should refer to need to conserve / enhance nearby conservation area and listed buildings
Site Ref: Site/31/02

Parish: Wicken CP

Site Name: Land off Lower Road, Wicken

Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit: 10:20 11 Aug 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:

Vehicular access to the site may be difficult to achieve. A number of sites have been granted planning permission recently, thereby offering suitable locations for growth in the village.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  ID: 146

Site Address: Land off Lower Road, Wicken

Settlement: Wicken

LP15 Allocation Ref:  Planning Perm. Ref:

Site Description: Back Lane, Wicken

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints:

Current Use: Agriculture  Proposed Use: Housing

Current Use info: Paddock

Proposed Use info:

Site Area Net (ha): 0.72  Site Area Gross (ha): 0.8472

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 10  b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  Small Village

1b. Site Availability  Available for devl in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone  >50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk  Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

30 Year: 0.00%  100 Year: 0.00%  1,000 Year: 5.96%
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Parish:** Wicken CP  
**Site Name:** Land off Lower Road, Wicken  
**Site Ref:** Site/31/02

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- 501m - 2km from the site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 5. Site Suitability

##### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

##### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

##### 5b. Local road impact
- No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

##### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

##### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- "Access off Back Lane. Assumed frontage on to Back Lane through application site 31/04. Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry"
- This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

### 6. Access to services

##### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

##### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Limited capacity

##### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- The school is currently operating above physical capacity of 402 places capacity of 420 places. The site has potential for a significant expansion and the addition of another 210 places. Using the pupil multipliers 600 houses in the catchment area would yield this number of pupils.

##### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

##### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

### 7. Environmental impact

##### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 501m – 1km of site

##### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

##### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

##### 7d. Agricultural land classification
- All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

##### 7e. Public Rights of Way

##### 7e.(i) PROW comments
### Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

**Site Name:** Land off Lower Road, Wicken  
**Parish:** Wicken CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/31/02

#### Site Ref: Site/31/02

| 7f.(i) Conservation Area | CA within 500m of site | D |
| 7f.(ii). Listed building | LB within 500m of site | D |
| 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument | SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site | B |
| 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset | | |

#### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

Conservation area to the southeast and listed buildings to the south - depending on scale/grain of development - limited heritage issues.

#### 7h. Visual Impact

Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views | C

**Justification for score:**

Very limited impact on a few residential dwellings. Not significant.

#### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

No TPO within 15m of the site | A

### Parish Council support and rank

| Does Parish Council support this site? | Yes |
| Form E - Parish Council site ranking: | First |

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit: 11 Aug 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is located at the western-most point of the village, where the built area transitions to countryside. The site is rejected as it is likely to be a visual intrusion to the countryside; and, since the granting of a number of planning permissions for small-scale development, other suitable sites are available.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  ID: 147
Site Address: No. 10 Streatham Road, Wicken, Cambridgeshire CB7 5XH
Settlement: Wicken
LP15 Allocation Ref:  Planning Perm. Ref: 

Site Description: Paddock at Hawes Lane / Streatham Road
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: Abbeygate Properties Ltd hold option agreement dated 31/05/2006
Current Use: Other (please specify)  Proposed Use: Housing
Current Use info: Paddocks

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 20  b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  Small Village
1b. Site Availability  Available for devl in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone  >50% of site area in Zone 1
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
30 Year: 0.00%  100 Year: 0.00%  1,000 Year: 2.61%

Date and time of site visit: 11 Aug 2016

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is located at the western-most point of the village, where the built area transitions to countryside. The site is rejected as it is likely to be a visual intrusion to the countryside; and, since the granting of a number of planning permissions for small-scale development, other suitable sites are available.

Supersedes site submission(s)

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  ID: 147
Site Address: No. 10 Streatham Road, Wicken, Cambridgeshire CB7 5XH
Settlement: Wicken
LP15 Allocation Ref:  Planning Perm. Ref: 

Site Description: Paddock at Hawes Lane / Streatham Road
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: Abbeygate Properties Ltd hold option agreement dated 31/05/2006
Current Use: Other (please specify)  Proposed Use: Housing
Current Use info: Paddocks

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 20  b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  Small Village
1b. Site Availability  Available for devl in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone  >50% of site area in Zone 1
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
30 Year: 0.00%  100 Year: 0.00%  1,000 Year: 2.61%
| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No |
| 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation | Site does not intersect Inner Zone |
| 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites | Within 500m of site |
| 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment | |

**Minor Criteria**

5. Site Suitability

| 5a. Proximity to contaminated land | Site located more than 250m from contaminated land |
| 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment | |
| 5b. Local road impact | No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations |
| 5c. Strategic Road Network impact | |
| 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment | |

"Access should be off Hawes Lane not A1123 / Stretham Road. Some mitigation measures and highways improvements and upgrades to Hawes Lane will be required to facilitate the development site. Subject to the applicant beingd to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry" This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

6. Access to services

| 6a. Proximity to public transport | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) |
| 6b. Proximity to medical services | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) |
| 6c. Proximity to shops | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) |
| 6d. Proximity to Primary School | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) |
| 6e. Proximity to Secondary School | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) |
| 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity | No spare places but room for expansion |
| 6g.(ii) Available secondary school capacity | Limited capacity |
| 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment | |

The school is currently operating above physical capacity of 402 places capacity of 420 places. The site has potential for a significant expansion and the addition of another 210 places. Using the pupil multipliers 600 houses in the catchment area would yield this number of pupils.

| 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity | Limited capacity |
| 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment | |

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

| 6h. Proximity to employment sites | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) |

7. Environmental impact

| 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites | CWS within 501m – 1km of site |
| 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment | |
| 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers | |
| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower |
| 7e. Public Rights of Way | C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary |

Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**  
Site Name: **Land off Hawes Lane, Wicken**  
Parish: **Wicken CP**  
Site Ref: **Site/31/03**
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Parish:** Wicken CP  
**Site Name:** Land off Hawes Lane, Wicken  
**Site Ref:** Site/31/03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7e.(i) PROW comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide an off road link for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders from Stretham Road at the southern end of the site to Lower Road at the northern end of the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>CA within 500m of site</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii) Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>conservation area and listed buildings to the southeast - No heritage impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7h. Visual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council's view:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Site should be reconsidered
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Land at Lower Road, Wicken
Parish: Wicken CP
Site Ref: Site/31/04

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected
Date and time of site visit: 10:50 11 Aug 16
Supersedes site submission(s) Site/31/02

Main findings and recommendations:
Vehicular access to the site may be difficult to achieve. A number of sites have been granted planning permission recently which offer more suitable locations for growth in the village.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  ID: 148
Site Address: Land to the south of Lower Road, Wicken
Settlement: Wicken
LP15 Allocation Ref: Planning Perm. Ref:
Site Description: Land to the south of Lower Road, Wicken
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: No known constraints
Current Use: Agriculture
Proposed Use: Housing
Current Use info: Grassland
Proposed Use info:
Site Area Net (ha): 1.07
Site Area Gross (ha): 1.26
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 40  b) Recommended 24

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Small Village

1b. Site Availability
Available for devl in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
30 Year: 0.00%  100 Year: 0.00%  1,000 Year: 4.22%
### Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

#### Site Name: Land at Lower Road, Wicken

| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No |

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- Within 500m of site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

### 5. Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

#### 5b. Local road impact
- Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- "Access off Back Lane. Assumed frontage on to Back Lane through application site 31/02. Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry"

### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

#### 6f.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- The school is currently operating above physical capacity of 402 places capacity of 420 places. The site has potential for a significant expansion and the addition of another 210 places. Using the pupil multipliers 600 houses in the catchment area would yield this number of pupils.

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Limited capacity

#### 6f.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 501m – 1km of site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification
- All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

#### 7e. Public Rights of Way
- E – No PRoW connection opportunities

#### 7e.(i) PROW comments
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Site Name:** Land at Lower Road, Wicken

**Parish:** Wicken CP

**Site Ref:** Site/31/04

### 7f. Conservation Area
- **CA within 500m of site:** D

### 7f. Listed building
- **LB within 500m of site:** D

### 7f. Scheduled Ancient Monument
- **SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site:** B

### 7f. Archaeological asset

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

#### Extension to WI

#### 7h. Visual Impact

**Justification for score:**

**Additional criterion 7i. TPOs**
- **No TPO within 15m of the site:** A

### Parish Council support and rank

**Does Parish Council support this site?** No

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:** Fourth

**Form G - Parish Council's view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Object due to impact on recreational area, traffic and inadequate sewerage facilities
- Object to phrase ‘urban design solution’ – Wicken is rural not urban
- 24 dwelling estate development scheme is not in-keeping with Wicken character
- Far too dense: should be 8-10 dwellings
- Site should be deleted (poor access / encourage ribbon development), and instead coordinated development within Chapel Lane / Drury Lane area should be promoted.
- (Promoter) – site should be enlarged to south, and increased to 40 dwellings
- (Promoter) – first bullet (groups of dwellings) overly restrictive. Should simply be a need for a ‘masterplan’.
- WIC.H1 policy and supporting text should refer to need to conserve / enhance nearby conservation area and listed buildings
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**

**Site Name:** *Land between 61 & 71 Church Road Wicken*

**Parish:** Wicken CP

**Site Ref:** Site/31/05

---

### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:** 10:58 11 Aug 16

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

Main findings and recommendations:

The site is located at the eastern-most point of the village, where the built area transitions to countryside. The site is rejected as it is likely to be a visual intrusion to the countryside and would result in significant harm to the landscape.

---

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site Type:</strong></th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Address:</strong></td>
<td>Land between 61 &amp; 71 Church Road Wicken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement:</strong></td>
<td>Wicken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LP15 Allocation Ref:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning Perm. Ref:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Description:</strong></td>
<td>Land between 61 &amp; 71 Church Road Wicken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brown/Greenfield:</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Known Constraints:</strong></td>
<td>This site would be well suited to self-build frontage plots as per a previous allocation in the prevailing Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Use:</strong></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Use:</strong></td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Use info:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Use info:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Area Net (ha):</strong></td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Area Gross (ha):</strong></td>
<td>0.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicative no. of dwellings:</strong></td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Major Criteria

| **1a. Settlement Hierarchy** | Small Village |
| **1b. Site Availability** | Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22) |
| **1c. Minerals and Waste assessment** |  |

| **1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies** |  |
| **1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations** |  |

| **2a. Flood zone** | >50% of site area in Zone 1 |

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

| Flood Zone 1: | 100.00% | Flood Zone 2: | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3a: | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3b: | 0.00% |

| **2b. Surface Water flood risk** | Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA |

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):**

| 30 Year: | 0.00% | 100 Year: | 0.00% | 1,000 Year: | 2.98% |

---

---
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**

Site Name: **Land between 61 & 71 Church Road Wicken**

| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No |

3. **Proximity to Hazardous Installation**
   - Site does not intersect Inner Zone: A

4a. **Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites**
   - 501m - 2km from the site: C

4b. **European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment**

### Minor Criteria

5. **Site Suitability**

5a. **Proximity to contaminated land**
   - Site located more than 250m from contaminated land: A

5a.(i) **Contaminated land professional assessment**

5b. **Local road impact**
   - No objections with Moderate mitigation measures: B

5c. **Strategic Road Network impact**

5d. **Transport impacts - professional assessment**
   - "Access off Church Road Potential visibility splay ises Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry" This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

6. **Access to services**

6a. **Proximity to public transport**
   - Less than 5 min walk (<400m): A

6b. **Proximity to medical services**
   - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m): E

6c. **Proximity to shops**
   - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m): E

6d. **Proximity to Primary School**
   - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m): E

6e. **Proximity to Secondary School**
   - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m): E

6f.(i) **Available primary school capacity**
   - No spare places but room for expansion: D

6f.(ii) **Available secondary school capacity**
   - Limited capacity: C

6g.(i) **Primary education impacts - professional assessment**
   - The school is currently operating above physical capacity of 402 places capacity of 420 places. The site has potential for a significant expansion and the addition of another 210 places. Using the pupil multipliers 600 houses in the catchment area would yield this number of pupils.

6g.(ii) **Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**
   - The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

6h. **Proximity to employment sites**
   - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m): E

7. **Environmental impact**

7a. **Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**
   - CWS within 501m – 1km of site: C

7b. **County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**

7c. **Groundwater PZ and aquifers**

7d. **Agricultural land classification**
   - All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower: D

7e. **Public Rights of Way**
   - E – No PRoW connection opportunities: E

7e.(i) **PROW comments**
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**  
Parish: **Wicken CP**  
Site Name: *Land between 61 & 71 Church Road Wicken*  
Site Ref: **Site/31/05**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>CA within 500m of site</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii) Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

ECDC: Conservation area to west and listed building to east - depending on scale/grain of development, limited heritage impact.

HE: 31/05: affecting the setting of grade II* Church of St Lawrence and grade II Wicken Hall.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7h. Visual Impact</th>
<th>Significant harm to landscape/townscape or key views - severe visual intrusion</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Justification for score:

Whilst views limited from public points (due to hedge along road) a fabulous view exists from SE corner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional criterion 7i. TPOs</th>
<th>No TPO within 15m of the site</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Parish Council support and rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td>Third</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council's view:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Site should be reconsidered
Main findings and recommendations:
The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. However the site capacity is expected to be below the 10 unit threshold. Has significant harm on views and the landscape. The site is therefore rejected.

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
   Small Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
   >50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

| Flood Zone 1: | 100.00% | Flood Zone 2: | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3a: | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3b: | 0.00% |

2b. Surface Water flood risk
   Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

| 30 Year: | 0.00% | 100 Year: | 0.00% | 1,000 Year: | 3.74% |

### Site Information

- **Site Type:** New site submission (Form B)
- **ID:** 150
- **Site Address:** Land south of Church Road
- **Settlement:** Wicken
- **LP15 Allocation Ref:** WIC2
- **Planner Perm. Ref:**
- **Site Description:** Existing LP allocation WIC2 at land south of Church Road
- **Brown/Greenfield:** Greenfield
- **Current Use:** Agriculture
- **Proposed Use:** Housing
- **Current Use info:** a) Submitted / estimated 5
- **Proposed Use info:** b) Recommended
- **Site Area Net (ha):** 0.20
- **Site Area Gross (ha):** 0.2
- **Indicative no. of dwellings:** a) Submitted / estimated 5
- **Polygon (ha):** 0.24

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**
Rejected
Site Name: Land south of Church Road

Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Parish: Wicken CP
Site Ref: Site/31/06

Minor Criteria

3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
   Site does not intersect Inner Zone

4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
   Within 500m of site

4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
   Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

5b. Local road impact
   No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
   "Access off Church Lane. Footway in front of the development will be required for pedestrian access. Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry."
   This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
   Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
   Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops
   Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
   Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
   Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
   No spare places but room for expansion

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
   The school is currently operating above physical capacity of 402 places capacity of 420 places. The site has potential for a significant expansion and the addition of another 210 places. Using the pupil multipliers 600 houses in the catchment area would yield this number of pupils.

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
   Limited capacity

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
   The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites
   Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
   CWS within 500m of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification
   All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

7e. Public Rights of Way
   E – No PRoW connection opportunities
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Site Name:** Land south of Church Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>CA within 500m of site</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7g. Heritage / archaeology comments**

Already allocated - same issues as before

**7h. Visual Impact**

Significant harm to landscape/townscape or key views - severe visual intrusion

**Justification for score:**

Excellent views to open countryside would be lost.

**Additional criterion 7i. TPOs**

No TPO within 15m of the site

**Parish Council support and rank**

Does Parish Council support this site? Yes

Form E - Parish Council site ranking: Second

Form G - Parish Council’s view:

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Existing housing allocation, land north-west of The Crescent
Parish: Wicken CP
Site Ref: Site/31/07

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s):

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. However the site capacity is expected to be below the 10 unit threshold. The site is therefore rejected.

Site Information

Site Type: Local Plan 2015 allocated site
Site Address:
Settlement: Wicken
LP15 Allocation Ref: WIC1
Planning Perm. Ref:
Site Description: Existing housing allocation, land north-west of The Crescent
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints:
Current Use: Agriculture
Proposed Use: Housing

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 7 b) Recommended 0

Site Area Net (ha): 0.20 Site Area Gross (ha): 0.2

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Small Village
1b. Site Availability
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone >50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMSW):
30 Year: 0.00%  100 Year: 0.00%  1,000 Year: 6.02%
## Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

### Site Name: Existing housing allocation, land north-west of The Crescent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation

- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites

- Within 500m of site

### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

#### Minor Criteria

### 5. Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land

- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

### 5b. Local road impact

- No objections with minor mitigation measures

### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

- "Has Highways frontage Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry"

This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport

- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services

- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops

- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School

- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School

- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

- No spare places but room for expansion

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

- Limited capacity

#### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

The school is currently operating above physical capacity of 402 places capacity of 420 places. The site has potential for a significant expansion and the addition of another 210 places. Using the pupil multipliers 600 houses in the catchment area would yield this number of pupils.

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

### 6h. Proximity to employment sites

- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

- CWS within 501m – 1km of site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

### 7d. Agricultural land classification

- All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

### 7e. Public Rights of Way

- E – No PRoW connection opportunities

### 7e.(i) PROW comments
Parish: Wicken CP
Site Name: Existing housing allocation, land north-west of The Crescent
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Ref: Site/31/07

7f.(i) Conservation Area
CA within 500m of site

7f.(ii) Listed building
LB within 500m of site

7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site

7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
Already allocated - same issues as before

7h. Visual Impact
Justification for score:

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
No TPO within 15m of the site

Parish Council support and rank
Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council’s view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received
Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

• The 2015 WIC2 allocation should be reinstated
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Rejected**

Date and time of site visit: 11:00 02/06/2017

Supersedes site submission(s):

Main findings and recommendations:

Development of the site may result in adverse landscape impacts. A number of sites have recently been granted planning permission for small-scale development within the village, which offer more suitable locations for development.

---

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb'17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>34 &amp; 36, Chapel Lane, Wicken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Wicken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>The site is currently in agricultural use, located south of Chapel Lane. The site adjoins draft site allocation WIC.H2 and an area of land subject to a current planning application. The proposal seeks to provide an additional or alternative to WIC.H2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td><strong>Submission does not indicate number of proposed dwellings. Dwelling figure is therefore calculated from site area and does not reflect site constraints or characteristics.</strong>  <strong>Net site area estimated</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 31  b) Recommended 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy | Small Village | D
1b. Site Availability | Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22) | A
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment | |
1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies | |
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations | |
2a. Flood zone | >50% of site area in Zone 1 | A

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

| Flood Zone 1: | 100.00% |
| Flood Zone 2: | 0.00% |
| Flood Zone 3a: | 0.00% |
| Flood Zone 3b: | 0.00% |

2b. Surface Water flood risk | Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr)) | A
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</strong></th>
<th>Site located more than 250m from contaminated land</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| **5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment** | | |
|---------------------------------------------------|---|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>5b. Local road impact</strong></th>
<th>Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| **5c. Strategic Road Network Impact** | | |
|------------------------------------|---|

| **5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment** | | |
|-------------------------------------------------|---|

No direct access from the A10 will be permitted this is a primary distributor road carrying very high numbers of distributor trafficAccess from Elean Buiness Park only Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate v

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>6a. Proximity to public transport</strong></th>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>6b. Proximity to medical services</strong></th>
<th>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>6c. Proximity to shops</strong></th>
<th>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>6d. Proximity to Primary School</strong></th>
<th>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</strong></th>
<th>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</strong></th>
<th>No spare places but room for expansion</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| **6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment** | | |
|-------------------------------------------------|---|

The additional sites in Soham mean a cumulative allocation of 1839 dwellings. The allocatoions in Wicken add a further 180 dwellings. The pupil yield using the CCC multiplier will be approx 700 primary aged children. While The Shade can be expanded by 1FE (210) places this level of development will require the provision and site for a new 2/3FE primary school. There is some development potential at St Andrew's but not to accommodate 2FE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</strong></th>
<th>No spare places but room for expansion</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| **6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment** | | |
|-------------------------------------------------|---|

The combined effect of the call for additional sites is to require a further 3.3FE of additional secondary school places (500 places) Coupled with the impacts of sites identified in the earlier round the total number of places required cannot be delivered at Soham VC which already operates at (FE (1350 places) on its current site. Coupled with higher levels of growth elsewhere it would be the County Council’s intention to conduct a district wide review of secondary school provision on adoption of the new local plan.. A strategic review would need to include the need for a further new secondary school (and site) within East Cambs as a potential option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>6h. Proximity to employment sites</strong></th>
<th>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>6j. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</strong></th>
<th>CWS within 501m – 1km of site</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| **7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment** | | |
|-------------------------------------------------|---|
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**  
Site Name: *Land rear of 34 & 36 Chapel Lane*  
Parish: **Wicken CP**  
Site Ref: **Site/31/08**

| 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers |  
| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower  
| 7e. Public Rights of Way | C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary  
| 7f.(i) PROW comments |  
Public Footpath 24 runs along the north east boundary of the site and links to other Public Rights of Way in the area. This route to be taken account of in the site layout  
| 7f.(i) Conservation Area | CA within 500m of site  
| 7f.(ii). Listed building | LB within 500m of site  
| 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument | SAM within 500.1 – 1000m of site  
| 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset |  
| 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments |  
Listed building to the east, likely limited impact on designated heritage assets.  
| 7h. Visual Impact | Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive  
| Justification for score: | The field is a pleasant enough, and clearly visible from public footpaths and a few properties. Potential impact on townscape if high density or high rise buildings.  
| Additional criterion 7i. TPOs | No TPO within 15m of the site  
| Parish Council support and rank |  
Does Parish Council support this site? | No  
Form E - Parish Council site ranking: |  
Form G - Parish Council's view: | (c) not add this site to the Local Plan  

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Rejected**
Date and time of site visit: 11:00 02/06/2017
Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
Vehicular access to the site may be difficult to achieve. A number of sites have been granted planning permission recently which offer more suitable locations for growth in the village.

Site Information

| Site Type: | FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb'17 | ID: 440 |
| Site Address: | Lower Road, Wicken |
| Settlement: | Wicken |
| LP15 Allocation Ref: |  |
| Planning Perm. Ref: |  |
| Site Description: | Much of the site (1.3ha) is identified for housing development in the Further Draft Local Plan, by draft site allocation WIC.H1. The proposal seeks to extend the draft site allocation to include additional land to the south, currently in use as a paddock. |
| Brown/Greenfield: | Greenfield |
| Known Constraints: | Submission indicates site could deliver 40 homes. **Net site area estimated** |
| Current Use: | Agriculture |
| Proposed Use: | Housing |
| Current Use info: | Agricultural land and paddock |
| Proposed Use info: |  |
| Site Area Net (ha): | 1.45 |
| Site Area Gross (ha): | 1.7 |
| Indicative no. of dwellings: | a) Submitted / estimated | 40 | b) Recommended | 0 |

Major Criteria

| 1a. Settlement Hierarchy | Small Village | D |
| 1b. Site Availability | Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22) | A |
| 1c. Minerals and Waste assessment |  |
| 1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies |  |
| 1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations |  |
| 2a. Flood zone | >50% of site area in Zone 1 | A |

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

| Flood Zone 1: | 100.00% |
| Flood Zone 2: | 0.00% |
| Flood Zone 3a: | 0.00% |
| Flood Zone 3b: | 0.00% |

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA | - |

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
**Site Name:** Land at Lower Road

**Parish:** Wicken CP

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Site Ref:** Site/31/09

| Site Located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefiting from defences (Y/N): | No |

### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- Within 500m of site

### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

##### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

##### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

##### 5b. Local road impact
- Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

##### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

##### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- Access off Back Lane
- Assumed frontage on to Back Lane through application site 31/02
- Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

#### 6. Access to services

##### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

##### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

##### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- The additional sites in Soham mean a cumulative allocation of 1839 dwellings. The allocations in Wicken add a further 180 dwellings. The pupil yield using the CCC multiplier will be approx 700 primary aged children. While The Shade can be expanded by 1FE (210) places this level of development will require the provision and site for a new 2/3FE primary school. There is some development potential at St Andrew's but not to accommodate 2FE

##### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- The combined effect of the call for additional sites is to require a further 3.3FE of additional secondary school places (500 places) Coupled with the impacts of sites identified in the earlier round the total number of places required cannot be delivered at Soham VC which already operates at (FE (1350 places) on its current site. Coupled with higher levels of growth elsewhere it would be the County Council's intention to conduct a district wide review of secondary school provision on adoption of the new local plan.. A strategic review would need to include the need for a further new secondary school (and site) within East Cambs as a potential option

##### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 7. Environmental impact

##### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 501m – 1km of site

##### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
**Site Name:** Land at Lower Road

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Parish:** Wicken CP

**Site Ref:** Site/31/09

### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 7d. Agricultural land classification

| All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower | D |

### 7e. Public Rights of Way

| E – No PRoW connection opportunities | E |

### 7e.(i) PROW comments

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 7f.(i) Conservation Area

| CA within 500m of site | D |

### 7f.(ii). Listed building

| LB within 500m of site | D |

### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

| SAM within 1.01km – 2km of site | B |

### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

**ECDC - Nothing further to add from previous consultation**

HE - This includes the draft site allocation HIC.H1. The suggested extension of WIC.H1 now is immediately adjacent to grade II almshouses to the south (not mentioned in the description). Wicken Conservation Area lies to the south east of the site. Any development of this site has the potential to impact these heritage assets and their settings. To that end any development of this site will need to conserve and where opportunities arise enhance the conservation area and listed buildings and their settings. This might be achieved through mitigation measures such as appropriate landscaping/plant and setting the development back from the listed building. These requirements should be included in Policy Wicken 3 and Wicken 4 and the supporting text of the Plan.

### 7h. Visual Impact

| Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive | D |

**Justification for score:**

Forms part of countryside coming up to edge of ‘built’ Wicken. Impact relatively limited to those which surround.

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

| No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

**Parish Council support and rank**

**Does Parish Council support this site?** No

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council’s view:** (c) not add this site to the Local Plan

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Site Name: Land at Chapel Lane

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit: 11:00 02/06/2017

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
Development of the site may result in adverse landscape impacts. A number of sites have recently been granted planning permission for small-scale development within the village which offer more suitable locations for development.

Site Information

Site Type: FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17

Site Address: Chapel Lane, Wicken

Settlement: Wicken

LP15 Allocation Ref:  

Planning Perm. Ref:  

Site Description: The site is agricultural land, bounded by Chapel Lane and existing development. The proposal seeks to extend draft site allocation WIC.H2 to include the whole area of undeveloped land south of Chapel Lane.

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints: **Submission does not indicate number of proposed dwellings. Dwelling figure is therefore calculated from site area and does not reflect site constraints or characteristics.**

**Net site area estimated**

Current Use: Agriculture

Proposed Use: Housing

Proposed Use info:

Site Area Net (ha): 3.31

Site Area Gross (ha): 4.41

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 119  b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

Small Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr)) 

A

A
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Land at Chapel Lane
Parish: Wicken CP
Site Ref: Site/31/10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year: 0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
   Site does not intersect Inner Zone

4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
   Within 500m of site

4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
   Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact
   No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
   Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
   Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
   Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops
   Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
   Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
   Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
   No spare places but room for expansion

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
   No spare places but room for expansion

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

The additional sites in Soham mean a cumulative allocation of 1839 dwellings. The allocations in Wicken add a further 180 dwellings. The pupil yield using the CCC multiplier will be approx 700 primary aged children. While The Shade can be expanded by 1FE (210) places this level of development will require the provision and site for a new 2/3FE primary school. There is some development potential at St Andrew’s but not to accommodate 2FE

6g.(ii) Available primary school capacity
   No spare places but room for expansion

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The combined effect of the call for additional sites is to require a further 3.3FE of additional secondary school places (500 places) Coupled with the impacts of sites identified in the earlier round the total number of places required cannot be delivered at Soham VC which already operates at (FE (1350 places) on its current site. Coupled with higher levels of growth elsewhere it would be the County Council’s intention to conduct a district wide review of secondary school provision on adoption of the new local plan. A strategic review would need to include the need for a further new secondary school (and site) within East Cambs as a potential option

6h. Proximity to employment sites
   Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
   CWS within 501m – 1km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

### Parish Council support and rank

**Does Parish Council support this site?**  No

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council’s view:**  (c) not add this site to the Local Plan

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received

**Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:**

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

Overall recommendation from site assessment:  
Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:  
10:10 29 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s):

Main findings and recommendations:  
The site is suitable for development within the built area of the village, and should therefore be allocated for housing development. Development proposals should deliver pedestrian/cycle access to the village centre, should have regard to adjacent conservation area and heritage assets, and where appropriate retain existing mature trees/hedges.

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
<th>ID: 154</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land to the north of the Bernstead off Station Road, Wilburton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Wilburton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Land to the north of the Bernstead off Station Road, Wilburton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Form indicates 30-35 units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicative no. of dwellings:**  
a) Submitted / estimated 35  
b) Recommended 35

**Major Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a. Settlement Hierarchy</th>
<th>Medium Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b. Site Availability</td>
<td>Available for devl in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1c. Minerals and Waste assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2a. Flood zone</th>
<th>&gt;50% of site area in Zone 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 1: 100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 2: 0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2b. Surface Water flood risk</th>
<th>Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 30 Year: 2.62% |
| 100 Year: 3.64% |
| 1,000 Year: 8.18% |
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</th>
<th>Site located more than 250m from contaminated land</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>No objections with Moderate mitigation measures</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>&quot;Access off Station Road. Mitigation measures and highways improvements will be required to surrounding roads junctions and footways. Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry&quot; This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6a. Proximity to public transport</th>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>Village school on small constrained site no potential for expansion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</th>
<th>CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Status: Site Allocation WIL.H1
Site Name: Land to the north of the Bernstead off Station Road, Wilburton
Parish: Wilburton CP
Site Ref: Site/32/04

Provide an off road link from Station Rd to the east of the site to Carpond Lane or the Firs which would then link to the Primary School.

7f.(i) Conservation Area
Site is within CA

7f.(ii). Listed building
LB within 500m of site

7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
SAM more than 2km from site

7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
Within conservation area and within proximity to listed buildings - depending on boundary treatment to the south (currently heavily tree lined) potentially limited heritage impact

7h. Visual Impact
Significant harm to landscape/townscape or key views - severe visual intrusion

Justification for score:
Loss of some very impressive mature trees would have a significant visual impact.

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
TPO tree on site

Parish Council support and rank
Does Parish Council support this site?
Yes

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received
Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

• Due to constraints, including listed buildings and features, drainage issues, protected trees means the site would be unlikely to accommodate 30 dwellings (NB: site identified for 35 dwellings). Site area should be extended to include adjacent Site/32/06.
• Site is within Conservation Area and there are several listed buildings to the south of the site. Policy should be strengthened to ensure proposals conserve, and where opportunities arise, enhance the conservation area and setting of listed buildings.
• TPO site scoring (A-C) is incorrect.
• Site promoter fully supports proposed allocation.
Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site
Date and time of site visit: 11:25 29 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s):

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is a suitable and accessible location for development with few constraints. The site is supported by the parish council, particularly as the landowner is keen to deliver a community-led scheme. Previously the site was found to have 'merit' - the site promoted addressed specific concerns regarding the suitability of the site (in their representations to the FDLP consultation) and it is recommended the site is allocated.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  ID: 151
Site Address: 13 Clarke's Lane, Wilburton
Settlement: Wilburton
LP15 Allocation Ref: 
Planning Perm. Ref: 
Site Description: Land west of Clarke's Lane and south of Hinton Way, Wilburton
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: No known constraints
Current Use: Agriculture  Proposed Use: Housing
Current Use info: Includes farm and bungalow
Proposed Use info: 
Site Area Net (ha): 1.28  Site Area Gross (ha): 1.5
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 25  b) Recommended 25

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  Medium Village
1b. Site Availability  Available for devl in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment
1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone  >50% of site area in Zone 1
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMIqSW): 
30 Year: 0.00%  100 Year: 0.00%  1,000 Year: 3.33%
**Current Status:** Site Allocation WIL.H2

**Site Name:** Land west of Clarke's Lane and south of Hinton Way, Wilburton

**Site Ref:** Site/32/01

**Parish:** Wilburton CP

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone: **A**

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- More than 5km from site: **A**

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

#### 5. Site Suitability

##### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land: **A**

##### 5a. Contaminated land professional assessment

##### 5b. Local road impact
- Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations: **D**

##### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

##### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

“Access off West End Hinton Way is a byway (3) not adopted highway. Potential visibility issues as limited access width and NO shown landownership boundary. Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.”

This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

#### 6. Access to services

##### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m): **A**

##### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m): **E**

##### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m): **A**

##### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m): **A**

##### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m): **E**

##### 6f. Available primary school capacity
- Limited capacity: **C**

##### 6g. Primary education impacts - professional assessment

Village school on small constrained site no potential for expansion

##### 6f. Available secondary school capacity
- Limited capacity: **C**

##### 6g. Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area.

##### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m): **E**

#### 7. Environmental impact

##### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site: **B**

##### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

##### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

##### 7d. Agricultural land classification
- All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower: **D**

##### 7e. Public Rights of Way
- C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary: **C**

##### 7f. PROW comments
Byway Open to All Traffic 3 runs along the northern boundary of the site. Provide a link from West End at the southern end of the site to BOAT 3 for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.1(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>Site is within CA</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.1(ii) Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.1(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.1(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7g. Heritage / archaeology comments**

ECDC: Part of site within conservation area - consideration needs to be given to views out of it and setting of heritage asset

HE: 32/01: part of the site is within a conservation area, the rest affects the setting of a conservation area and the setting of two grade II listed buildings.

**7h. Visual Impact**

Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views | C

**Justification for score:**

However potential impact on neighbouring dwellings. Existing development unlikely to enjoy wide views due to vegetation height, therefore this may not be an issue.

**Additional criterion 7i. TPOs**

No TPO within 15m of the site | A

**Parish Council support and rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council's view:**

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Site is in a central village location, and not a greenfield site.
- Landowner keen to work with SWCLT.
- Site should be allocated in plan.
- Site promoter objects to site not being selected as a draft site allocation.
- Disused farmyard and orchard, no longer suitable for modern farming.
- Site is available for development in short term.
- Site assessment flawed / inconsistent, as site scores similarly to draft site allocation WIL.H1.
- Local road impact / access requirements less severe than implied by site assessment evidence report. Site can be accessed via a PROW through The Limes, 1 Church Lane and a gated field access off Hinton Way, and via 13 Clarke's Way.
- Site borders settlement boundary, and is therefore considered a logical extension and well related to built form.
- Site can be designed to ensure no detrimental impact on the character of the Conservation Area.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is an existing Local Plan 2015 allocation. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and should be retained.

Site Information

Site Type: Local Plan 2015 allocated site
Site Address: Land at Pony Lodge, Grunty Fen, Wilburton
Settlement: Wilburton
LP15 Allocation Ref: HOU9(ii)
Site Description: Land at Pony Lodge, Grunty Fen, Wilburton
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints:
Current Use: Agriculture
Proposed Use: Gypsy and Traveller Pitches

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 2 b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Medium Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
30 Year: 3.12%  100 Year: 12.06%  1,000 Year: 50.50%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name: Land at Pony Lodge, Grunty Fen, Wilburton</th>
<th>Current Status: Site Allocation see policy LP7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation</th>
<th>Site does not intersect Inner Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites</td>
<td>More than 5km from site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Minor Criteria

### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</th>
<th>Site located more than 250m from contaminated land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5b. Local road impact</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6a. Proximity to public transport</th>
<th>Less than 20 min walk (&lt;1,600m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>No spare places, no room for expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</th>
<th>The site would accommodate another 15 pupils only using DfE recommended site area guidelines hence an E rather than a D classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. Environmental impact

| 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites | CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site |
| 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>E – No PRoW connection opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Site Name:** Land at Pony Lodge, Grunty Fen, Wilburton  
**Parish:** Wilburton CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/32/08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>CA more than 2km from site</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii) Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7g. Heritage / archaeology comments**

Already allocated - same issues as before

**7h. Visual Impact**

Justification for score:

**Additional criterion 7l. TPOs**

No TPO within 15m of the site | A

---

**Parish Council support and rank**

Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:

---

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Land off Townsend Mews, Stretham Road, Wilburton
Parish: Wilburton CP
Site Ref: Site/32/02

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit: 10:35 29 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is rejected as development would be a visual intrusion to the countryside, would not relate well to the built form of the village and safe vehicular access may be difficult to achieve.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land off Townsend Mews, Stretham Road, Wilburton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Wilburton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Land off Townsend Mews, Stretham Road, Wilburton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>No known constraints. Site available with 12 months notice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Medium Village

1b. Site Availability Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone >50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

| Flood Zone 1: | 100.00% |
| Flood Zone 2: | 0.00% |
| Flood Zone 3a: | 0.00% |
| Flood Zone 3b: | 0.00% |

2b. Surface Water flood risk Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

| 30 Year: | 0.00% |
| 100 Year: | 0.00% |
| 1,000 Year: | 0.00% |
| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No |

### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- More than 5km from site

### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

| 5a. Proximity to contaminated land | Site located more than 250m from contaminated land |
| 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment | |

| 5b. Local road impact | Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations |
| 5c. Strategic Road Network impact | |
| 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment | "Access off High Street Potential visibility isses as land ownership and control is not defined AND width of access shown AND extent of highway Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry"

The development proposals for this site would need to be accompanied by a Transport Statement based on 50 units identified. This should follow CCC TA guidelines. The site will also need to refer to relevant local CCC transport policy documents and schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area.

#### 6. Access to services

| 6a. Proximity to public transport | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) |
| 6b. Proximity to medical services | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) |
| 6c. Proximity to shops | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) |

| 6d. Proximity to Primary School | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) |
| 6e. Proximity to Secondary School | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) |

| 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity | Limited capacity |
| 6g.(i) Available secondary school capacity | Limited capacity |
| 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment | |

#### 7. Environmental impact

| 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites | CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site |
| 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment | |

| 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers | |
| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower |
**Site Name:** Land off Townsend Mews, Streatham Road, Wilburton  
**Parish:** Wilburton CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/32/02  

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

### 7e. Public Rights of Way

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E – No PRoW connection opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 7e.(i) PROW comments

### 7f.(i) Conservation Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site is within CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 7f.(ii) Listed building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LB within 500m of site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAM more than 2km from site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

ECDC: Part of site within conservation area - consideration needs to be given to views out of it and setting of heritage asset

HE: 32/02: part of the site is within a conservation area and the rest affects the setting of a conservation area.

### 7h. Visual Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Justification for score:**

May harm views from existing dwellings of open field, but existing high vegetation may mean impacts are limited. Likely to feel intrusive to countryside.

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No TPO within 15m of the site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Parish Council support and rank

**Does Parish Council support this site?** Yes

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Recent planning approvals have set a precedent for ribbon development along Streatham Road.
- Landowner is keen to work with SWCLT to promote a phased housing development.
- Site is sufficiently large to enable development of a mix of house types and tenures.
- If developed, infrastructure improvements would be required, including new footpath on south side of Streatham Road, new zebra crossing and traffic management such as extension of 30mph speed limit.
- Site should be allocated in plan.

- Site promoter objects to rejection of site.
- Site is within walking distance of shops and services.
- Site available for development now.
- Supports CLT development.
- Suitable vehicular access can be achieved.
- Visual impacts on countryside can be mitigated though establishment of landscape buffer at boundaries.
- Careful design and landscaping would ensure development is not detrimental to conservation area.
- Should be allocated for approx. 50 dwellings, supporting retention of facilities and increasing supply of housing.
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**  
Site Name: *Land to the south of School Lane, Wilburton*  
Parish: **Wilburton CP**  
Site Ref: **Site/32/03**

---

**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

Overall recommendation from site assessment:  
**Rejected**

Date and time of site visit:  
10:45 29 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s):  
The site is rejected as development would be a visual intrusion to the countryside and safe vehicular access may be difficult to achieve.

---

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
<th>ID: 153</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land to the south of School Lane, Wilburton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Wilburton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Land to the south of School Lane, Wilburton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>The site is deliverable in terms of its suitability, availability and achievability. Form indicates 13 - 15 units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Area Net (ha): 0.35</th>
<th>Site Area Gross (ha) 0.3469</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Indicative no. of dwellings:  
a) Submitted / estimated 15  
b) Recommended 0

---

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  
Medium Village  
**C**

1b. Site Availability  
Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)  
**A**

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

>50% of site area in Zone 1  
**A**

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

| Flood Zone 1: | 100.00% |
| Flood Zone 2: | 0.00%   |
| Flood Zone 3a:| 0.00%   |
| Flood Zone 3b:| 0.00%   |

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))  
**A**

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

| 30 Year:  | 0.00% |
| 100 Year: | 0.00% |
| 1,000 Year: | 0.00% |
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land to the south of School Lane, Wilburton  
**Parish:** Wilburton CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/32/03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation</strong></th>
<th>Site does not intersect Inner Zone</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites</strong></td>
<td>More than 5km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

**5a. Proximity to contaminated land**  
Site within 250m of contaminated land  
Site within 250m of Old pit 190m to S

**5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment**

Old pit 190m to S

**5b. Local road impact**  
Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations  
Site not located in area benefitting from defences

**5c. Strategic Road Network impact**

**5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**

"No highways frontage Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry"

This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

### 6. Access to services

**6a. Proximity to public transport**  
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)  
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)  
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

**6b. Proximity to medical services**  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

**6c. Proximity to shops**  
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)  
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)  
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

**6d. Proximity to Primary School**  
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)  
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)  
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

**6e. Proximity to Secondary School**  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

**6f.(i) Available primary school capacity**  
Limited capacity  
Limited capacity  
Limited capacity

**6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity**  
Limited capacity  
Limited capacity  
Limited capacity

**6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**

Village school on small constrained site no potential for expansion

**6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**

The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area.

**6h. Proximity to employment sites**  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

**6i. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**  
CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site  
CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site  
CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

**7. Environmental impact**

**7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**  
CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

**7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**

| **7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers** | |
| **7d. Agricultural land classification** | All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower |
| **7e. Public Rights of Way** | E – No PRoW connection opportunities |
| **7f.(i) PROW comments** | |
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Parish: Wilburton CP
Site Name: Land to the south of School Lane, Wilburton
Site Ref: Site/32/03

7f.(i) Conservation Area | CA within 500m of site | D
7f.(ii). Listed building | LB within 500m of site | D
7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument | SAM more than 2km from site | A
7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
ECDC: Conservation area and listed building to the north - likely to have a minimal impact on designated heritage assets.
HE: 32/03: affecting the setting of a conservation area.

7h. Visual Impact
Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views | C

Justification for score:
Potentially some impact on views from existing dwellings.

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
No TPO within 15m of the site | A

Parish Council support and rank
Does Parish Council support this site? | No
Form E - Parish Council site ranking:
Form G - Parish Council's view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received
Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit: 11:10 29 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is located at the west of the village, where development is low density and organic in character. Development of the site could be visually intrusive. The site was not supported by the Parish Council. The site is rejected as other more suitable and more favoured sites are available closer to the village centre.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B)  ID: 155
Site Address: Land to the south of West End Road, Wilburton
Settlement: Wilburton
LP15 Allocation Ref:  Planning Perm. Ref: 
Site Description: Land to the south of West End Road, Wilburton
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints:
Current Use: Agriculture  Proposed Use: Housing
Current Use info: 
Proposed Use info: 
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 25  b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  Medium Village
1b. Site Availability  Available for devl in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone  >50% of site area in Zone 1
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):


Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk  Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):


30 Year: 0.00%  100 Year: 0.00%  1,000 Year: 0.00%
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Parish:** Wilburton CP  
**Site Name:** Land to the south of West End Road, Wilburton  
**Site Ref:** Site/32/05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Minor Criteria**

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land | Site located more than 250m from contaminated land | A

5b. Local road impact | No objections with Moderate mitigation measures | B

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

"Access off West End Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry"  
This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) | A

6b. Proximity to medical services | Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m) | D

6c. Proximity to shops | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) | B

6d. Proximity to Primary School | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) | B

6e. Proximity to Secondary School | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E

6f. Available primary school capacity | Limited capacity | C

6g. Primary education impacts - professional assessment

Village school on small constrained site no potential for expansion  
6f. Available secondary school capacity | Limited capacity | C

6g. Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites | CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site | B

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower | D

7e. Public Rights of Way | E – No PRoW connection opportunities | E

7e. PROW comments
**Site Name:** Land to the south of West End Road, Wilburton

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Parish:** Wilburton CP

**Site Ref:** Site/32/05

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>CA within 500m of site</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7g. Heritage/ archeology comments

Conservation area to the east - limited heritage impact

#### 7h. Visual Impact

Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views C

Justification for score:

Unlikely to cause significant harm. Would impact on character of, and vies from, PROW which runs through middle of site. However PROW appears poorly maintained, with surface water flooding, rutted path almost lost amongst the high vegetation.

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

No TPO within 15m of the site A

---

**Parish Council support and rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

---
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Rejected**

Date and time of site visit: 10:20 29 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s):

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is rejected on the basis that it would likely result in harm to the character and setting of listed buildings. Taking into account these issues, actual site capacity would likely fall below the 10 unit threshold.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
<th>ID:</th>
<th>156</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Berristead, Wilburton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Wilburton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Berristead, Wilburton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Form indicates 12 - 15 units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td>Agricultural land and buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>0.7398</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 15 b) Recommended 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy | Medium Village | [C] |
1b. Site Availability | Available for devl in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22) | [A] |
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment |
1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies |
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations |
2a. Flood zone | >50% of site area in Zone 1 | [A] |
| Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening): |
| Flood Zone 1: | 100.00% | Flood Zone 2: | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3a: | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3b: | 0.00% |
2b. Surface Water flood risk | Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA | - |
| Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW): |
| 30 Year: | 0.00% | 100 Year: | 2.22% | 1,000 Year: | 5.78% |
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land adjacent to Berristead, Wilburton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- More than 5km from site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

#### 5. Site Suitability

##### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

##### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

##### 5b. Local road impact
- No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

##### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

##### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- Access off Station Road. Mitigation measures will be required to surrounding roads junctions and footways. Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

#### 6. Access to services

##### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

##### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

##### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- Limited capacity

##### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Limited capacity

##### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- Village school on small constrained site no potential for expansion

##### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area.

##### 6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

#### 7. Environmental impact

##### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

##### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

##### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

##### 7d. Agricultural land classification
- All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

##### 7e. Public Rights of Way
- E – No PRoW connection opportunities

##### 7e.(i) PROW comments
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land adjacent to Berristead, Wilburton  
**Parish:** Wilburton CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/32/06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>Site is within CA</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB on-site</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

Within conservation area and contains two listed barns as well as being within close proximity to Grade II* listed building - Concern over scale of development that would cause harm to setting of listed buildings. Conversion of barns and 2-3 additional dwellings (net 5 max) would be more appropriate

### 7h. Visual Impact

Some improvement to landscape/townscape or key views | B |

**Justification for score:**

Due to loss of mature trees, would therefore alter landscape/townscape.

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

TPO tree on site | C |

### Parish Council support and rank

**Does Parish Council support this site?** No

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council's view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:** 11:00 29 July 2016

**Supersedes site submission(s)**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is set back from the highway and has a poor relationship to the existing built form. Development of the site could harm the setting of heritage assets. The site was not supported by the Parish Council. The site is rejected as other more suitable and more favoured sites are available. The site is also below the site size threshold.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land adjacent to cemetery, Wilburton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Wilburton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha)</td>
<td>0.1618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed Use info:**

- **Proposed Use:** Housing
- **Current Use info:** Amenity/access

### Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

**Medium Village**

1b. Site Availability

**Available for devl in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)**

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

- **>50% of site area in Zone 1**

- **Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**
  - Flood Zone 1: 100.00%
  - Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%
  - Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk

- **Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA:** -

- **Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):**
  - 30 Year: 0.00%
  - 100 Year: 0.00%
  - 1,000 Year: 5.57%
**Site Name:** Land adjacent to cemetery, Wilburton  
**Parish:** Wilburton CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/32/07  

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land  
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land  

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment  

5b. Local road impact  
- Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations  

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment  

"No highways frontage or highwys accessSubject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry"  
This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

#### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport  
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)  

6b. Proximity to medical services  
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)  

6c. Proximity to shops  
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)  

6d. Proximity to Primary School  
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)  

6e. Proximity to Secondary School  
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)  

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity  
- Limited capacity  

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity  
- Limited capacity  

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment  

Village school on small constrained site no potential for expansion

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment  

The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites  
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)  

#### 7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites  
- CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site  

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment  

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification  
- All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower  

7e. Public Rights of Way  
- E – No PRoW connection opportunities  

7e.(i) PROW comments
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Parish:** Wilburton CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/32/07  
**Site Name:** Land adjacent to cemetery, Wilburton

### 7f.(i) Conservation Area  
Site is within CA  
**Score:** E

### 7f.(ii). Listed building  
LB within 500m of site  
**Score:** D

### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument  
SAM more than 2km from site  
**Score:** A

### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset  

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments  
Within conservation area and close proximity to listed buildings - care must be taken to ensure no harm caused to the significance of the heritage assets.

### 7h. Visual Impact  
Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive  
**Score:** D

**Justification for score:**  
May harm setting of cemetery.

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs  
No TPO within 15m of the site  
**Score:** A

### Parish Council support and rank  
**Does Parish Council support this site?**  
No

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**  

**Form G - Parish Council's view:**  

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received  
Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
# Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**
- Preferred site

**Date and time of site visit:**

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**
The site has extant planning permission for housing development. The principle of development has therefore been accepted through the planning process and should be retained.

---

## Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>Site with extant planning permission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID:</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Kings Of Witcham Ltd, The Slade, Witcham, ELY, CB6 2LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Witcham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td>13/00734/OUUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Kings Of Witcham Ltd, The Slade, Witcham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site Area Net (ha):** 0.37
**Site Area Gross (ha):** 0.43

**Indicative no. of dwellings:**
- a) Submitted / estimated: 10
- b) Recommended: 10

## Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
- Small Village [D]

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
- >50% of site area in Zone 1 [A]

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**
- Flood Zone 1: 100.00%
- Flood Zone 2: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
- Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):**
- 30 Year: 8.71%
- 100 Year: 9.42%
- 1,000 Year: 16.12%
Current Status: Site Allocation WTM.H1  
Site Name: Kings Of Witcham Ltd, The Slade, Witcham  
Parish: Witcham CP  
Site Ref: Site/33/01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation  
Site does not intersect Inner Zone

4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites  
2.01km - 5km from the site

4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment  
This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport  
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity  
No spare places but room for expansion  
D

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity  
Limited capacity

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

The school is currently operating above its physical capacity and has two mobile classrooms on site. There is space for limited expansion on site by 45 places only. A development of about 120 houses would yield this number of pupils  
C

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites  
Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites  
CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification  
All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower

7e. Public Rights of Way  
E – No PRoW connection opportunities

7e.(i) PROW comments

---
### Parish Council support and rank

**Does Parish Council support this site?**

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council's view:**

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Site is located south of the Witcham Conservation Area. The policy should require development of the site to conserve, and where opportunities exist, enhance the conservation area and its setting.
- Surface water receiving system has no residual capacity. Necessary surface water accommodation should be put in place, prior to the development of the site.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit:
10:30 08 May 2017

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is at the fringe edge of the village. Development may not complement the built form, and may result in adverse impact on the landscape / townscape.

Site Information

Site Type: FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17
ID: 442

Site Address: The Slade, Witcham

Settlement: Witcham

LP15 Allocation Ref: Site Area Net (ha): 0.72
Planning Perm. Ref: Site Area Gross (ha): 0.85

Site Description: Agricultural land, characterised by open grassland, with a number of trees and hedgerows found at its boundary. Proposed for housing development.

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints: Submission indicates that site could deliver in the region of 15 dwellings.

Current Use: Agriculture
Proposed Use: Housing

Current Use info:

Proposed Use info:

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 15 b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Small Village

1b. Site Availability
Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00% Flood Zone 2: 0.00% Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
30 Year: 6.80% 100 Year: 19.52% 1,000 Year: 54.62%
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**  
Site Name: *Land east of The Slade*  
Parish: **Witcham CP**  
Site Ref: **Site/33/02**

| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): | No |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): | No |

**3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation**  
Site does not intersect Inner Zone

**4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites**  
2.01km - 5km from the site

**4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**5. Site Suitability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**5a. Proximity to contaminated land**  
Site within 50m of contaminated land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Former RAF Mepal 38m to SW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5b. Local road impact**  
No objections with minor mitigation measures

**5c. Strategic Road Network impact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

**6. Access to services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**6a. Proximity to public transport**  
Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6b. Proximity to medical services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6c. Proximity to shops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6d. Proximity to Primary School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No spare places, no room for expansion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

There is no potential for expansion of the primary school as the site is already below the DfE size guidelines for the number of pupils it can accommodate. Unless additional site area can be obtained or the school relocated within the village mitigation of development may require the expansion of neighbouring village schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No spare places but room for expansion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

There is potential to expand Witchford Village College on its current site. However, this latest call for site would result in much higher levels of development within the catchment area of the College if they were all included in the Local Plan. The level of development would generate another 595 secondary aged children or 4FE. This is in addition to the additional pupils identified from the sites included in the consultation draft local plan. At this level of development suitable mitigation could not be provided at Witchford VC. It would be the Council’s intention on adoption of the Local Plan to undertake a strategic review of secondary school provision across the District and the review would include the option of a further new secondary school (and site) in order to provide suitable mitigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6h. Proximity to employment sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7. Environmental impact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**  
CWS within 501m – 1km of site

**7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**  
CWS within 501m – 1km of site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parish: Witcham CP
Site: Land east of The Slade

Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

Site Ref: Site/33/02

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received
Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Main findings and recommendations:
The site provides a single, coherent site to incorporate Site/34/05 and Site/34/09. Part of the site has extant planning permission for residential development. The site extends this area to provide additional land, thereby enabling a significant landscape and noise buffer to be created to mitigate impacts from the A142.

Site Information

Site Type: Strategic Planning Amended Submission  ID: 503
Site Address: Land north of Field End, Witchford
Settlement: Witchford

LP15 Allocation Ref:  Planning Perm. Ref:  
Site Description: Site supersedes Site/34/05 and Site/34/09
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints:
Current Use: Agriculture  Proposed Use: Housing

Proposed Use info: 

Site Area Net (ha): 5.54  Site Area Gross (ha): 7.38
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 128  b) Recommended 128

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  Large Village
1b. Site Availability
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1:  Flood Zone 2:  Flood Zone 3a:  Flood Zone 3b:

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMI SW):
30 Year:  100 Year:  1,000 Year:  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

- **5a. Proximity to contaminated land**
- **5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment**

- **5b. Local road impact**
- **5c. Strategic Road Network impact**
- **5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**

#### 6. Access to services

- **6a. Proximity to public transport**
- **6b. Proximity to medical services**
- **6c. Proximity to shops**
- **6d. Proximity to Primary School**
- **6e. Proximity to Secondary School**
- **6f.(i) Available primary school capacity**
- **6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**

- **6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity**
- **6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**

- **6h. Proximity to employment sites**

#### 7. Environmental impact

- **7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**
- **7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**

- **7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers**
- **7d. Agricultural land classification**
- **7e. Public Rights of Way**
- **7e.(i) PROW comments**
Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site?

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
## Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**
- Preferred site

**Date and time of site visit:**
- 12:30 15 July 2016

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**
The site lacks vehicular access and is partly constrained by its proximity to the A142. The site has some merit when combined with adjacent Site/34/09 (which has extant planning permission), where the site provides additional land to enable air quality and noise constraints to be addressed.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Marroway Lane, Witchford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Witchford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>Land south of Marroway Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha)</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Recommended</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
- Large Village

1b. Site Availability
- Available for devl in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
- >50% of site area in Zone 1

   **Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**
   - Flood Zone 1: 100.00%
   - Flood Zone 2: 0.00%
   - Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%
   - Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
- Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

   **Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):**
   - 30 Year: 1.14%
   - 100 Year: 1.62%
   - 1,000 Year: 13.66%
## Minor Criteria

### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
<td>Site located within 250m of contaminated land, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road haulage depot 234m to E.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>Insurmountable safety issues that cannot be secured in accordance with CIL regulations, E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>Does not have Highways Frontage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan would need to accompany the development proposals for this site. This would need to follow the guidance from CCC TA guidelines; particularly the need to demonstrate that the site can provide adequate mitigation measures and assess and improve connectivity to facilities particularly into Witchford, Ely and Lancaster Way business park. The site will also need to refer to relevant CCC transport policy documents and appropriate schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Witchford the cumulative impact could be significant, especially on A142 junctions with the A10, Witchford Road and Angel Drove.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to services</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m), A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m), E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m), E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Less than 10 min walk (&lt;800m), B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Less than 15 min walk (&lt;1,200m), C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>No spare places, no room for expansion, E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>Limited capacity, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>The site would accommodate another 15 pupils only using DfE recommended site area guidelines hence an E rather than a D classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6h. Proximity to employment sites</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m), E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental impact</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td>CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Current Status:** Superseded by WFD.H1  
**Site Name:** Land south of Marroway Lane  
**Parish:** Witchford CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/34/05

| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower | D |
| 7e. Public Rights of Way | C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary | C |

**7e.(i) PROW comments**

Byway Open to all Traffic 8 runs along the western boundary of the site and there is a permissive Bridleway PPA 0101 which is within the boundary of the site. Provide a connection to BOAT 8 and provide links across the site to Field End for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. Also provide links to the adjacent site 34/9.

| 7f.(i) Conservation Area | CA more than 2km from site | A |
| 7f.(ii). Listed building | LB within 500m of site | D |
| 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument | SAM more than 2km from site | A |
| 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset | | |

**7g. Heritage / archaeology comments**

No heritage impact

**7h. Visual Impact**

Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views | C |

**Justification for score:**

**Additional criterion 7i. TPOs**

No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

**Parish Council support and rank**

Does Parish Council support this site? | |

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:** Second |

**Form G - Parish Council's view:** |

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Noisy and polluted, therefore risk to health. Proposed green buffer not sufficient to overcome health concerns.
- Will lead to increase in traffic levels.
- Site has longer distant view of Ely Cathedral. Not clear whether site would impact on view, but this should be considered. Council should demonstrate historic environment impacts would be acceptable.

- Site promoter supports draft allocation, and indicates that the site will deliver: approximately 55 dwellings; 0.36ha of public open space; network of footways and cycle paths; and 6m woodland planting landscape along northern boundary.
- Site is deliverable within five years.
### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Preferred site  
**Date and time of site visit:**  
**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**
The site has extant planning permission for housing development. To retain this planning decision, the site should be allocated.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Site with extant planning permission</th>
<th>ID: 251</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Land North Of Field End, Witchford, Cambridgeshire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Witchford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref</td>
<td>14/00248/OUM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>Land North Of Field End, Witchford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha)</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha)</td>
<td>5.1848</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha)</td>
<td>5.1848</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 1: 100.00%</td>
<td>Flood Zone 2: 0.00%</td>
<td>Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Surface Water flood risk</td>
<td>Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Year: 0.60%</td>
<td>100 Year: 1.14%</td>
<td>1,000 Year: 13.11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Large Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>&gt;50% of site area in Zone 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1: 100.00%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2: 0.00%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 Year</th>
<th>0.60%</th>
<th>100 Year</th>
<th>1.14%</th>
<th>1,000 Year</th>
<th>13.11%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Overall site description: Land North Of Field End, Witchford, Cambridgeshire  
- Site address: Land North Of Field End, Witchford, Cambridgeshire  
- Settlement: Witchford  
- Planning Perm. Ref: 14/00248/OUM  
- Site Description: Land North Of Field End, Witchford  
- Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield  
- Current Use: Agriculture  
- Proposed Use: Housing  
- Site Area Net (ha): 3.89  
- Site Area Gross (ha): 5.1848  
- Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated: 128  
- Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening): Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  
- 2b. Surface Water flood risk: Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW): 30 Year: 0.60%  
- Date and time of site visit:  
- Supersedes site submission(s):  
- Main findings and recommendations: The site has extant planning permission for housing development. To retain this planning decision, the site should be allocated.
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

A Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan would need to accompany the development proposals for this site. This would need to follow the guidance from CCC TA guidelines; particularly the need to demonstrate that the site can provide adequate mitigation measures and assess and improve connectivity to facilities particularly into Witchford, Ely and Lancaster Way business park. The site will also need to refer to relevant CCC transport policy documents and appropriate schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Whitchford the cumulative impact could be significant, especially on A142 junctions with the A10, Witchford Road and Angel Drove.

#### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport

Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School

Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School

Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6f. Available primary school capacity

No spare places, no room for expansion

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

6g.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

Limited capacity

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area.

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites

Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification

All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

7e. Public Rights of Way

D – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoWs outside the site boundary
Site Name:  *Land North Of Field End, Witchford*

Parish:  *Witchford CP*

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ‘17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Noisy and polluted, therefore risk to health.
- Will lead to increase in traffic levels.
- Site has longer distant view of Ely Cathedral. Not clear whether site would impact on view, but this should be considered. Council should demonstrate historic environment impacts would be acceptable.

- Site promoter supports draft allocation of the site.
- Site has outline planning permission for up to 128 residential dwellings, including 30% affordable housing.
- Site will be developed in accordance with principles of planning permission within five years (subject to approval of Reserved Matters).
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment:
Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:
09:55 15 May 2017

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site has clear defensible boundaries, has few constraints and is suitable for development. The site was supported by the parish council. The northern boundary of the site is adjacent to the A142, and mitigation will be required to ensure residential amenity is not adversely affected by noise and air quality issues. No direct access to the A142 will be permitted.

Site Information

Site Type: FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17
Site Address: Common Road, Witchford, Ely
Settlement: Witchford
LP15 Allocation Ref: Planning Perm. Ref:
Site Description: Site includes agricultural land and buildings, and some residential dwellings, located between Common Road and Manor Road. Proposed for housing development.
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: **Submission does not indicate number of proposed dwellings. Dwelling figure is therefore calculated from site area and does not reflect site constraints or characteristics.**
**Net site area estimated**
Current Use: Agriculture
Proposed Use: Housing
Current Use info: Mainly agricultural land, with a small number of dwellings in south west of site.
Proposed Use info:
Site Area Net (ha): 6.80
Site Area Gross (ha): 9.07
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 245
b) Recommended 120

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Large Village

1b. Site Availability

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW): -
### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4. Proximity to Internationally / Nationally Important Wildlife Sites
- 2.01km - 5km from the site

#### 4b. European and Nationally Important Wildlife Sites - Professional Assessment

#### 5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to Contaminated Land
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated Land Professional Assessment

5b. Local Road Impact
- No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations

5c. Strategic Road Network Impact

5d. Transport Impacts - Professional Assessment
- No direct access on to the A142 will be permitted. Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

#### 6. Access to Services

6a. Proximity to Public Transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to Medical Services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to Shops
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6f.(i) Available Primary School Capacity
- No spare places, no room for expansion

6f.(i) Primary Education Impacts - Professional Assessment

6f.(ii) Available Secondary School Capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

6g. Secondary Education Impacts - Professional Assessment

#### 7. Environmental Impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional Assessment

### Site Specifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 Year</th>
<th>100 Year</th>
<th>1,000 Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>14.42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): No
- Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): No

### Site Details

- **Site Ref:** Site/34/14
- **Parish:** Witchford CP
- **Site Name:** Land at Common Road
- **Current Status:** Site Allocation WFD.H2

### Development Considerations

- The level of development now proposed in Witchford and other villages that feed into Rackham Primary School is in excess of 750 homes. This level of development suggests a need for a significant expansion of primary school provision. The site at Rackham is restricted but with some additional land could be expanded by 0.5 FE to provide an additional 105 places. However, to mitigate the full impact of this development a further form of entry of places could be required. Options include a new small primary school (with a site) or the relocation and expansion of the existing school onto a much larger site.

- There is potential to expand Witchford Village College on its current site. However, this latest call for site would result in much higher levels of development within the catchment area of the College if they were all included in the Local Plan. The level of development would generate another 595 secondary aged children or 4FE. This is in addition to the additional pupils identified from the sites included in the consultation draft local plan. At this level of development suitable mitigation could not be provided at Witchford VC. It would be the Council’s intention on adoption of the Local Plan to undertake a strategic review of secondary school provision across the District and the review would include the option of a further new secondary school (and site) in order to provide suitable mitigation.
## FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**
- Preferred site

**Date and time of site visit:**
- 12:00 15 July 2016

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

Since publication of the Further Draft Local Plan, the site has been granted planning permission for residential development. The site should be allocated to retain this planning decision.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
<th>ID:</th>
<th>164</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land south of Main Street, Witchford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Witchford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td>17/00261/OUM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Land south of Main Street, Witchford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 60 b) Recommended 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy: Large Village

1b. Site Availability: Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone: >50% of site area in Zone 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 1: 100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 2: 0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk: Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year: 0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Year: 0.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 Year: 4.75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
<td>Site located more than 250m from contaminated land</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>No objections with minor mitigation measures</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>No Vehicle access to west End will be permitted. Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry. A Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan would need to accompany the development proposals for this site. This would need to follow the guidance from CCC TA guidelines; particularly the need to demonstrate that the site can provide adequate mitigation measures and assess and improve connectivity to facilities particularly into Witchford, Ely and Lancaster Way business park. The site will also need to refer to relevant CCC transport policy documents and appropriate schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Whitchford the cumulative impact could be significant, especially on A142 junctions with the A10, Whitchford Road and Angel Drove.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to Services</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Less than 15 min walk (&lt;1,200m)</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Less than 20 min walk (&lt;1,600m)</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>No spare places, no room for expansion</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td>The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental impact</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td>CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Name: Land south of Main Street, Witchford

Current Status: Site Allocation WFD.H3
Parish: Witchford CP
Site Ref: Site/34/07

7d. Agricultural land classification
All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

7e. Public Rights of Way
D – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoWs outside the site boundary

7f.(i) PROW comments
Provide links for pedestrians and cyclists from Barton Close and West End Close to Main Street within the site

7f.(ii) Conservation Area
CA more than 2km from site

7f.(iii) Listed building
LB within 500.1 – 1000m of site

7f.(iv) Scheduled Ancient Monument
SAM more than 2km from site

7f.(v) Archaeological asset

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
No heritage impact

7h. Visual Impact
Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views

Justification for score:
Views of agricultural land - impact limited to a very few dwellings.

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
TPO tree on site

Parish Council support and rank
Does Parish Council support this site? No

Form E - Parish Council site ranking: Fourth

Form G - Parish Council's view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received
Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Site promoter objects to rejection of site, as site scores similarly to other sites which were selected as draft allocations.
- Originally assessed on the basis of 60 dwellings, now promoted for 46 dwellings.
- Suitable and available for development within five years.
- Outline planning application submitted.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment:
- Preferred site

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site has extant planning permission and should be allocated to retain this planning decision.

Site Information

Site Type: Site with extant planning permission

Site Address:

Settlement: Witchford

LP15 Allocation Ref: Site Area Net (ha): 0.44

Planning Perm. Ref: 16/00849/FUM

Site Area Gross (ha): 0.52

Site Description:

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints:

Current Use: Agriculture

Proposed Use: Housing

Indicative no. of dwellings:
a) Submitted / estimated: 13

Proposed Use info:

b) Recommended: 13

Site Area Net (ha):

0.44

Site Area Gross (ha):

0.52

Site Address:

Site Description:

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Current Use info:

a) Submitted / estimated: 13

Proposed Use info:

b) Recommended: 13

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

Large Village

1b. Site Availability


1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

Flood Zone 1: Flood Zone 2: Flood Zone 3a: Flood Zone 3b:

2b. Surface Water flood risk

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

30 Year: 100 Year: 1,000 Year: 
## Current Status: Site Allocation WFD.H4

**Site Name:** Land to the rear of 1 to 7 Sutton Road, Witchford

**Parish:** Witchford CP

**Site Ref:** Site/34/19

| Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N): |  |
| Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N): |  |

3. **Proximity to Hazardous Installation**

4a. **Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites**

4b. **European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Site Suitability</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. <strong>Access to services</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6h. Proximity to employment sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. <strong>Environmental impact</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e.(i) PROW comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Current Status: Site Allocation WFD.H4

**Parish:** Witchford CP  
**Site Name:** Land to the rear of 1 to 7 Sutton Road, Witchford  
**Site Ref:** Site/34/19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Heritage / archaeology comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7h. Visual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justification for score:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

---

## Parish Council support and rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**  

**Form G - Parish Council's view:**

---

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

---
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**

- Preferred site

**Date and time of site visit:**

- [ ]

**Supersedes site submission(s)**

- [ ]

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is an existing business park. To ensure continued employment development, the site should be allocated.

---

**Site Information**

**Site Type:**

- Existing business park

**Site Address:**

- Sedgeway Business Park, Common Road, Witchford

**Settlement:**

- Witchford

**LP15 Allocation Ref:**

- [ ]

**Planning Perm. Ref:**

- [ ]

**Site Description:**

- Existing Sedgeway Business Park

**Brown/Greenfield:**

- Brownfield

**Known Constraints:**

- [ ]

**Current Use:**

- Employment

**Proposed Use:**

- Employment

**Current Use info:**

- [ ]

**Proposed Use info:**

- [ ]

**Site Area Net (ha):**

- 4.60

**Site Area Gross (ha):**

- 5.4

**Indicative no. of dwellings:**

- a) Submitted / estimated

- b) Recommended

---

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy

- Large Village

1b. Site Availability

- [ ]

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

- [ ]

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

- [ ]

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

- [ ]

2a. Flood zone

- >50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

- Flood Zone 1: 100.00%
- Flood Zone 2: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk

- Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

- 30 Year: 0.32%
- 100 Year: 0.37%
- 1,000 Year: 3.34%
**Current Status:** Site Allocation WFD.E1  
**Parish:** Witchford CP  
**Site Name:** Sedgeway Business Park, Common Road  
**Site Ref:** Site/34/10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4. European and nationally important wildlife sites

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

### 5. Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

#### 5b. Local road impact

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services

#### 6c. Proximity to shops

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

#### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

#### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

#### 7d. Agricultural land classification

#### 7e. Public Rights of Way

#### 7e.(i) PROW comments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7g. Heritage / archaeology comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7h. Visual Impact</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Justification for score:**

| Additional criterion 7i. TPOs |   |

### Parish Council support and rank

| Does Parish Council support this site? |   |

| Form E - Parish Council site ranking: |   |

| Form G - Parish Council's view: |   |

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Site has longer distant view of Ely Cathedral. Not clear whether site would impact on view, but this should be considered. Council should demonstrate historic environment impacts would be acceptable.
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Parish:** Witchford CP  
**Site Name:** Land south of Sutton Road, Witchford  
**Site Ref:** Site/34/01

## Summary of Findings and Recommendations

| Overall recommendation from site assessment: | Rejected |
| Date and time of site visit: | 12:05 15 July 2015 |
| Supersedes site submission(s): | |

### Main findings and recommendations:

The site is rejected as development of the site would limit wide open views and be visually intrusive to the countryside. The site was not supported by the Parish Council and other more suitable sites are available in the village.

### Site Information

| Site Type: | New site submission (Form B) |
| Site Address: | Land south of Sutton Road, Witchford |
| Settlement: | Witchford |
| LP15 Allocation Ref: | |
| Planning Perm. Ref: | |
| Site Description: | No known constraints |
| Brown/Greenfield: | Greenfield |
| Known Constraints: | |
| Current Use: | Agriculture |
| Proposed Use: | Housing |
| Current Use info: | |
| Proposed Use info: | |
| Site Area Net (ha): | 1.11 |
| Site Area Gross (ha): | 1.302 |
| Indicative no. of dwellings: | a) Submitted / estimated 40  
b) Recommended 0 |

### Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  
Large Village

1b. Site Availability  
Available for devl in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment  
-  
1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies  
-  
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations  
-  

2a. Flood zone  
>50% of site area in Zone 1  
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):  
| Flood Zone 1: | 100.00% |
| Flood Zone 2: | 0.00% |
| Flood Zone 3a: | 0.00% |
| Flood Zone 3b: | 0.00% |

2b. Surface Water flood risk  
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA  
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):  
| 30 Year: | 7.20% |
| 100 Year: | 6.01% |
| 1,000 Year: | 14.09% |

Date and time of site visit: 12:05 15 July 2015

Supersedes site submission(s)
### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

| **5a. Proximity to contaminated land** | Site located more than 250m from contaminated land | A |
| **5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment** |  |  |

| **5b. Local road impact** | No objections with minor mitigation measures | A |

| **5c. Strategic Road Network impact** |  |  |

| **5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment** | Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry. |  |

#### 6. Access to services

| **6a. Proximity to public transport** | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) | A |
| **6b. Proximity to medical services** | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |
| **6c. Proximity to shops** | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |

| **6d. Proximity to Primary School** | Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m) | C |
| **6e. Proximity to Secondary School** | Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m) | D |

| **6f.(i) Available primary school capacity** | No spare places, no room for expansion | E |
| **6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity** | Limited capacity | C |

| **6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment** |  |  |
| **6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment** |  |  |

#### 7. Environmental impact

| **7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites** | CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site | B |

| **7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment** |  |  |

| **7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers** |  |  |

| **7d. Agricultural land classification** | All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower | D |
| **7e. Public Rights of Way** | D – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoWs outside the site boundary | D |

| **7e.(i) PROW comments** | Byway Open to all Traffic 7 runs along the west side of the site. Provide a link for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders to this right of way from the site |  |
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Land south of Sutton Road, Witchford
Parish: Witchford CP
Site Ref: Site/34/01

7f.(i) Conservation Area
CA more than 2km from site - A

7f.(ii) Listed building
LB within 500.1 – 1000m of site - C

7f.(iii) Listed Ancient Monument
SAM more than 2km from site - A

7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
No heritage impact

7h. Visual Impact
Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views - C

Justification for score:
Enclosed land, limited views in or out

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
No TPO within 15m of the site - A

Parish Council support and rank
Does Parish Council support this site? No
Form E - Parish Council site ranking: Fourth

Form G - Parish Council's view:

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received
Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:** 12:00 15 July 2016

**Supersedes site submission(s)**

**Main findings and recommendations:**
The site is rejected as safe vehicular access is likely to be difficult to achieve, and the site has a poor relationship to the built form of the village.

---

**Site Information**

**Site Type:** New site submission (Form B)  
**ID:** 159

**Site Address:** Swallow Stables, Mills Lane, Witchford

**Settlement:** Witchford

**LP15 Allocation Ref:**  
**Planning Perm. Ref:**

**Site Description:** Land west of Mills Lane, Witchford

**Brown/Greenfield:** Greenfield

**Known Constraints:**

**Current Use:** Other (please specify)  
**Proposed Use:** Mixed use

**Current Use info:** Paddocks / equestrian uses

**Proposed Use info:** Form indicates site available to provide housing, employment, retail and CLD

**Site Area Net (ha):** 3.75  
**Site Area Gross (ha):** 5

**Indicative no. of dwellings:**

- **a) Submitted / estimated:** 135
- **b) Recommended:** 0

---

**Major Criteria**

1. **Settlement Hierarchy**

- **Large Village**

2. **Site Availability**

- Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

3. **Minerals and Waste assessment**

1c(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

4. **Flood zone**

- >50% of site area in Zone 1

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

- Flood Zone 1: 100.00%
- Flood Zone 2: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

5. **Surface Water flood risk**

- Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):**

- 30 Year: 0.40%
- 100 Year: 0.17%
- 1,000 Year: 5.40%
### Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
<td>Site within 250m of contaminated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown filled ground 130m to N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
<td>Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not have Highways Frontage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Visibility Spaly issues at Junction of Mills Lane &amp; Main Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan would need to accompany the development proposals for this site. This would need to follow the guidance from CCC TA guidelines; particularly the need to demonstrate that the site can provide adequate mitigation measures and assess and improve connectivity to facilities particularly into Witchford, Ely and Lancaster Way business park. The site will also need to refer to relevant CCC transport policy documents and appropriate schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Witchford the cumulative impact could be significant, especially on A142 junctions with the A10, Witchford Road and Angel Drive. A masterplan would be required for this site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
<td>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
<td>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
<td>Less than 15 min walk (&lt;1,200m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</td>
<td>No spare places, no room for expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site would accommodate another 15 pupils only using DfE recommended site area guidelines hence an E rather than a D classification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6h. Proximity to employment sites</td>
<td>Less than 20 min walk (&lt;1,600m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td>CWS within 501m – 1km of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**  
Site Name: *Land west of Mills Lane, Witchford*  
Parish: **Witchford CP**  
Site Ref: **Site/34/02**

| 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers |  
| 7d. Agricultural land classification | All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower | D |  
| 7e. Public Rights of Way | C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary | C |  
| 7f.(i) PROW comments | Provide a link for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders from Ward Way at the northern end of the site. Provide a network of routes within the site and the connecting site of 34/3. | A |  
| 7f.(i) Conservation Area | CA more than 2km from site | A |  
| 7f.(ii) Listed building | LB within 500m of site | D |  
| 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument | SAM more than 2km from site | A |  
| 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset |  
| 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments | No heritage impact |  
| 7h. Visual Impact | Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive | D |  
| **Justification for score:** | Impact limited to a few - off Ward Way. |  
| Additional criterion 7i. TPOs | TPO tree within 15m of the site | B |  

**Parish Council support and rank**

- Does Parish Council support this site?  
- Form E - Parish Council site ranking: Third  
- Form G - Parish Council's view:  

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Parish Council objects to rejection of site. Considers site suitable due to its location away from busy, noisy roads; large areas of green space linking to pathways would enhance village’s vitality; good access roads; non-intrusive impact and close proximity to centre of the village; offers 30% community-led development.
### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:**  
Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:**  
11:30 15 July 2016

**Main findings and recommendations:**

The site is rejected as it relates poorly to the built form of the village would be visually intrusive to the countryside; safe vehicular access may be difficult to achieve; and development may cause ecological harm to the County Wildlife Site located on site.

---

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Land at Witchford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Witchford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>Land at Witchford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints</td>
<td>The identified land is separated from the existing built form and so a comprehensive approach involving other land would need to be developed. Potential for CLD but no proportion identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha)</td>
<td>23.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha)</td>
<td>39.6086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated</td>
<td>855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Recommended</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy | Large Village | **B**
1b. Site Availability | Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22) | **A**
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

This site lies partly within the Waste Consultation Area for the Grunty Fen Landfill Site (Policy W12); this site is allocated for waste management uses which may include a stable non-reactive hazardous waste landfill cell, composting, and inert waste recycling (Policies W1M and W4A). The allocations and associated Waste Consultation Area are designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012). The overarching policy for the Waste Consultation Area designation is Policy CS30 of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011). This policy seeks to safeguard waste management facilities which make a significant contribution to managing Cambridgeshire’s waste; and the policy states that development will only be permitted where it is demonstrated that this will not prejudice existing or future planned waste management operations. Residential development may be incompatible and it is suggested that consideration should be given to these policies in the interests of deliverability.

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies |
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations | W8Z |

2a. Flood zone | >50% of site area in Zone 1 | **A**
## Minor Criteria

### 5. Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land  
  - A

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

#### 5b. Local road impact
- Major infrastructure required to offset safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations  
  - D

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network Impact

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- Does not have Highways Frontage. Potential Visibility Splay issues at Junction of Mills Lane & Main Street  
  - A

  Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

A Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan would need to accompany the development proposals for this site. This would need to follow the guidance from CCC TA guidelines; particularly the need to demonstrate that the site can provide adequate mitigation measures and assess and improve connectivity to facilities particularly into Witchford, Ely and Lancaster Way business park. The site will also need to refer to relevant CCC transport policy documents and appropriate schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Whitchford the cumulative impact could be significant, especially on A142 junctions with the A10, Witchford Road and Angel Drove. A masterplan would be required for this site.

### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)  
  - A

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)  
  - E

#### 6c. Proximity to shops
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)  
  - E

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)  
  - A

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)  
  - C

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places, no room for expansion  
  - E

#### 6f.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
- The site would accommodate another 15 pupils only using DfE recommended site area guidelines hence an E rather than a D classification

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- Limited capacity  
  - C

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
- The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area.
### Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

**Site Name:** Land at Witchford

**Parish:** Witchford CP

**Site Ref:** Site/34/03

---

### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6h. Proximity to employment sites</th>
<th>Less than 20 min walk (&lt;1,600m)</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td>CWS located within site</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No heritage impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
<td>Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification for score:**

Whilst limited to a few, impact from properties off Ward Way would be high.

**Additional criterion 7i. TPOs**

| No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

---

### Parish Council support and rank

**Does Parish Council support this site?**

No

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

Fifth or more

**Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

---

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

---
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Has merit**

Date and time of site visit: 11:15 15 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s):

Main findings and recommendations:
The site has some merit but should not be included at this stage as safe vehicular access is likely to be difficult to achieve. More suitable sites are likely to be available elsewhere in the village.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
<th>ID: 161</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Mills Barn, Mills Lane, Witchford, Ely, Cambridgeshire, CB26 2FA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Witchford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Mills Barn, Mills Lane, Witchford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Recommended</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a. Settlement Hierarchy</th>
<th>Large Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b. Site Availability</td>
<td>Available for devl in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Minerals and Waste assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Flood Zone</td>
<td>&gt;50% of site area in Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 1:</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 2:</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3a:</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3b:</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Surface Water flood risk</td>
<td>Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMsfSW):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Year:</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Year:</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 Year:</td>
<td>5.42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date and time of site visit: 11:15 15 July 2016

Supersedes site submission(s)
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Parish:** Witchford CP  
**Site Name:** Land adjacent to Mills Barn, Mills Lane, Witchford, Ely, Cambridgeshire, CB26 2FA  
**Site Ref:** Site/34/04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation** | Site does not intersect Inner Zone  
| **4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites** | More than 5km from site  
| **4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment** |  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>5. Site Suitability</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **5a. Proximity to contaminated land** | Site within 100m of contaminated land  
| **5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment** | Unknown filled ground 86m to N. Road haulage depot 214m to N  
| **5b. Local road impact** | Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations  
| **5c. Strategic Road Network impact** |  
| **5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment** | Does not have Highways Frontage. Potential Visibility Splay issues at Junction of Mills Lane & Main Street. Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.  
| A Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan would need to accompany the development proposals for this site. This would need to follow the guidance from CCC TA guidelines; particularly the need to demonstrate that the site can provide adequate mitigation measures and assess and improve connectivity to facilities particularly into Witchford, Ely and Lancaster Way business park. The site will also need to refer to relevant CCC transport policy documents and appropriate schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Witchford the cumulative impact could be significant, especially on A142 junctions with the A10, Witchford Road and Angel Drove. A masterplan would be required for this site.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>6. Access to services</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **6a. Proximity to public transport** | Less than 5 min walk (<400m)  
| **6b. Proximity to medical services** | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)  
| **6c. Proximity to shops** | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)  
| **6d. Proximity to Primary School** | Less than 5 min walk (<400m)  
| **6e. Proximity to Secondary School** | Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)  
| **6f.(i) Available primary school capacity** | No spare places, no room for expansion  
| **6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity** | Limited capacity  
| **6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment** | The site would accommodate another 15 pupils only using DfE recommended site area guidelines hence an E rather than a D classification  
| **6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment** | The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area.  
| **6h. Proximity to employment sites** | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>7. Environmental impact</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites** | CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site  
| **7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment** |  


Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**  
Site Name: *Land adjacent to Mills Barn, Mills Lane, Witchford, Ely, Cambridgeshire, CB26 2FA*  
Parish: **Witchford CP**  
Site Ref: **Site/34/04**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP6 runs along the eastern boundary of the site. Provide a link from FP6 into the site and also to connect with the rights of way network within the adjoining sites 34/2 and 34/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA more than 2km from site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(v) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed buildings to the northeast - No heritage impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
<td>Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification for score:  
Loss of mature 'green' wooded area.

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs  
TPO tree within 15m of the site | B |

Parish Council support and rank  
Does Parish Council support this site? |  |
Form E - Parish Council site ranking: | First |
Form G - Parish Council's view: |  |

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received  
Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:  

Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**  
Parish: **Witchford CP**  
Site Name: **Main Street, Witchford**  

**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

- **Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Rejected
- **Date and time of site visit:** 13:00 15 July 2016
- **Supersedes site submission(s):**
  The site is rejected as, development of the site would result in the loss of open views of the countryside. Development would also change the character of the PROW crossing the site which provides access to the countryside. Other more suitable sites are available elsewhere in the village.

**Site Information**

- **Site Type:** New site submission (Form B)
- **Site Address:** Land south of Main Street, Witchford, CB6 2HQ
- **Settlement:** Witchford
- **LP15 Allocation Ref:**
- **Planning Perm. Ref:**
- **Site Description:** Land south of Main Street
- **Brown/Greenfield:** Greenfield
- **Known Constraints:** Public rights of way through site. Potential to provide land contribution to the school.
- **Current Use:** Agriculture
- **Proposed Use:** Housing
- **Current Use info:** Paddocks and grazing
- **Proposed Use info:**
- **Site Area Net (ha):** 2.27
- **Site Area Gross (ha):** 3.02
- **Indicative no. of dwellings:**
  - a) Submitted / estimated: 45
  - b) Recommended: 0

**Major Criteria**

1a. **Settlement Hierarchy**
   - Large Village

1b. **Site Availability**
   - Available for devl in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. **Minerals and Waste assessment**

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. **Flood zone**
   - >50% of site area in Zone 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 1: 100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. **Surface Water flood risk**
   - Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year: 2.74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Rejected
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Main Street, Witchford
Parish: Witchford CP
Site Ref: Site/34/06

Minor Criteria

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land  Site within 100m of contaminated land  C

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

Road haulage depot 94m to N.

5b. Local road impact  No objections with minor mitigation measures  A

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

A Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan would need to accompany the development proposals for this site. This would need to follow the guidance from CCC TA guidelines; particularly the need to demonstrate that the site can provide adequate mitigation measures and assess and improve connectivity to facilities particularly into Witchford, Ely and Lancaster Way business park. The site will also need to refer to relevant CCC transport policy documents and appropriate schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Whitchford the cumulative impact could be significant, especially on A142 junctions with the A10, Witchford Road and Angel Drive.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport  Less than 5 min walk (<400m)  A

6b. Proximity to medical services  Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)  E

6c. Proximity to shops  Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)  E

6d. Proximity to Primary School  Less than 5 min walk (<400m)  A

6e. Proximity to Secondary School  Less than 10 min walk (<800m)  B

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity  No spare places, no room for expansion  E

6f.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

The site would accommodate another 15 pupils only using DfE recommended site area guidelines hence an E rather than a D classification

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity  Limited capacity  C

6g.(i) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be extended by 2 forms of entry (300 places). Using the yield multipliers of CCC this would be equivalent to 1200 houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites  Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)  D

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites  CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site  B

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers
### Parish Council support and rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td>Fifth or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Site promoter objects to rejection of site.
- Site rejected reflecting views of Parish Council – not a sound rationale for excluding the site.
- Open aspect and countryside views offered by site could be retained through retention of footpaths/PROW on site.
- Development could facilitate expansion/improvements to Rackham primary School by offering land for a staff car park.
- Excellent access to local services and facilities.
- Better suited for allocation than any other draft site allocation.
- Could provide up to 55 dwellings.
- Would not have severe impacts on highway network.
- Available for development within 3 years.
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Parish:** Witchford CP  
**Site Name:** Land to the east of Witchford  
**Site Ref:** Site/34/08

### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:** 10:45 15 July 2016

**Supersedes site submission(s)**

**Main findings and recommendations:**

Development of the site would likely be visually intrusive to the open countryside. The site was not supported by the Parish Council, and many residents raised a number of concerns, particularly in relation to vehicular access and impacts of additional traffic. Development may also alter the rural character of the PROW which runs adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site.

### Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>New site submission (Form B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Land off Meadow Close, Witchford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Witchford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>Land off Meadow Close, east of Witchford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints</td>
<td>Form indicates 150 - 170 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha)</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha)</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 170  b) Recommended 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Criteria

**1a. Settlement Hierarchy**

Large Village  

**1b. Site Availability**

**1c. Minerals and Waste assessment**

**2a. Flood zone**

>50% of site area in Zone 1

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):**

| Flood Zone 1 | 100.00% |
| Flood Zone 2 | 0.00% |
| Flood Zone 3a | 0.00% |
| Flood Zone 3b | 0.00% |

**2b. Surface Water flood risk**

Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

**Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):**

| 30 Year | 0.00% |
| 100 Year | 0.20% |
| 1,000 Year | 2.50% |

Date and time of site visit: 10:45 15 July 2016
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land to the east of Witchford

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

| 5a. Proximity to contaminated land | Site located more than 250m from contaminated land | A |

| 6a. Proximity to public transport | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) | A |

| 6b. Proximity to medical services | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |

| 6c. Proximity to shops | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |

| 6d. Proximity to Primary School | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) | A |

| 6e. Proximity to Secondary School | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) | A |

| 6f. Available primary school capacity | No spare places, no room for expansion | E |

| 6g. Available secondary school capacity | Limited capacity | C |

| 6h. Proximity to employment sites | Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m) | C |

#### 7. Environmental Impact

| 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites | CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site | B |

| 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment | | |

---

**Access to services**

- **Transport impacts - professional assessment**
  - Access off Meadow Close (adopted highway)
  - Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

- A Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan would need to accompany the development proposals for this site. This would need to follow the guidance from CCC TA guidelines; particularly the need to demonstrate that the site can provide adequate mitigation measures and assess and improve connectivity to facilities particularly into Witchford, Ely and Lancaster Way business park. The site will also need to refer to relevant CCC transport policy documents and appropriate schemes identified by CCC as a requirement for the local area. CCC is concerned that by combining the impact of all identified sites in Witchford the cumulative impact could be significant, especially on A142 junctions with the A10, Witchford Road and Angel Drove.

---

**Environmental impact**

- **Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**
  - CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

---
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

**Site Name:** Land to the east of Witchford

**Parish:** Witchford CP

### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

- **Site Ref:** Site/34/08

**Parish Council support and rank**

Does Parish Council support this site? No

Form E - Parish Council site ranking: Fifth or more

Form G - Parish Council’s view:

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

- Site was ranked low preference by residents and Parish Council - feel they haven’t been listened to.
- More suitable sites available elsewhere in village. Considerable support for removal of site from plan and replacement with site north of Common Road (see Site/34/14) – which, it is suggested, is more suitable for development, could deliver more dwellings, less impact on neighbouring dwellings, and could address a number of key issues – for example, provide a new access to Village College, provide site for new primary school, etc. Other suggestions include replacing site WFD.H3 with land south of Sutton Road (see Site/34/01).
- Village envelope should be redrawn to exclude site.
- Site access main reason for objection - site not appropriate for development due to lack of safe, suitable vehicular access. Meadow Close is narrow and congested due to on-street parking and volume of traffic accessing the Village College (mornings, afternoons, evenings and weekends); often gridlocked and a danger to children crossing; already at crisis point for existing residents.
- Lack of availability of parking it results in parking on-street, reducing the Meadow Close to a single lane.
- Access cannot be achieved via Broadway, as road is narrow and adjacent land is Common Land and cannot be developed.
- Development will also exacerbate traffic problems on Common Road.
- Vehicle access to Main Street difficult at busy times of day due to poor junction visibility.
- Additional traffic a safety risk for road users and pedestrians, namely children accessing primary school and Village College.
- Lack of suitable access a reason for rejecting sites elsewhere – should apply to this site.
- Sloping site down toward Broadway.
- Development could increase flood risk for housing at Broadway which frequently floods and sewerage system becomes blocked, most recently in Dec 16. Risks to structural integrity of existing dwellings (subsidence, etc.).
- Grunty Fen Main Drain passes through the site – this drains Grunty Fen area and is a vital asset that cannot be impacted by any proposed development.
- Site is elevated above housing at Broadway and would therefore result in loss of privacy for housing at Broadway.
- Existing dwellings on Meadow Close with frontage facing the field, loss of open field through development would result in...
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Land to the east of Witchford
Parish: Witchford CP
Site Ref: Site/34/08

loss of character and appeal, and would lead to properties being overlooked, lose privacy, be disturbed by noise and spoil visual amenity.
• Sandpit Drove, located at end of Broadway, is a conservation area managed by the Village Open Space Group – development would harm the recreational value of this amenity.
• Quiet area with views toward Ely over fields.
• Development would cause noise pollution.
• Development of site does not support local development needs and priorities – such as infrastructure improvement, community led development, open space, etc.
• Northern section of site should be reserved for expansion of Village College / development of Sixth Form College.
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Land south of Sutton Road
Parish: Witchford CP
Site Ref: Site/34/11

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit:
10:50 15 May 2017

Supersedes site submission(s):

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is located south of Main Street / Sutton Road. Adjacent development is predominantly frontage development, and therefore a development of this scale is unlikely to complement the built character of this part of the village.

Site Information

Site Type: FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17
ID: 443
Site Address: Sutton Road, Witchford
Settlement: Witchford
LP15 Allocation Ref:
Planning Perm. Ref:
Site Description: Agricultural land proposed for housing development.
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: Submission indicates site could deliver 40-50 dwellings. **Net site area estimated**
Current Use: Agriculture
Proposed Use: Housing
Current Use info:
Proposed Use info:
Site Area Net (ha): 1.10
Site Area Gross (ha): 1.3
Indicative no. of dwellings:

a) Submitted / estimated: 50
b) Recommended: 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Large Village
1b. Site Availability
Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):

30 Year: 7.73%  100 Year: 5.87%  1,000 Year: 13.68%
## Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**

**Site Name:** *Land south of Sutton Road*

**Parish:** *Witchford CP*

**Site Ref:** *Site/34/11*

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- More than 5km from site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

#### 5b. Local road impact
- No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
- Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

#### 6. Access to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>6a. Proximity to public transport</strong></th>
<th>Less than 5 min walk (&lt;400m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>6b. Proximity to medical services</strong></th>
<th>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>6c. Proximity to shops</strong></th>
<th>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>6d. Proximity to Primary School</strong></th>
<th>Less than 15 min walk (&lt;1,200m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</strong></th>
<th>Less than 20 min walk (&lt;1,600m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>6f.(i) Available primary school capacity</strong></th>
<th>No spare places, no room for expansion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity</strong></th>
<th>No spare places but room for expansion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

- The level of development now proposed in Witchford and other villages that feed into Rackham Primary School is in excess of 750 homes. This level of development suggests a need for a significant expansion of primary school provision. The site at Rackham is restricted but with some additional land could be expanded by 0.5 FE to provide an additional 105 places. However, to mitigate the full impact of this development a further form of entry of places could be required. Options include a new small primary school (with a site) or the relocation and expansion of the existing school onto a much larger site.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>6h. Proximity to employment sites</strong></th>
<th>Greater than 20 min walk (&gt;1,600m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 7. Environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</strong></th>
<th>CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Site Name: Land south of Sutton Road

Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Parish: Witchford CP
Site Ref: Site/34/11

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification
All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

D

7e. Public Rights of Way
E – No PRoW connection opportunities

E

7e.(i) PROW comments

7f.(i) Conservation Area
CA more than 2km from site

A

7f.(ii) Listed building
LB within 500.1 – 1000m of site

C

7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
SAM more than 2km from site

A

7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
Nothing further to add from previous consultation

7h. Visual Impact
Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views

C

Justification for score:
Unlikely to cause significant harm. However, where site to be developed, frontage development may be more appropriate to reflect character of the area.

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
TPO tree on site

C

Parish Council support and rank

Does Parish Council support this site?
No

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council’s view:
(c) not add this site to the Local Plan

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received
Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Rejected**

Date and time of site visit: 10:45 15 May 2017

Supersedes site submission(s):

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is unlikely to accommodate 10 dwellings and is therefore considered not suitable for development.

---

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb '17</th>
<th>ID: 444</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>223 Main Street, Witchford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Witchford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Existing house and garden land proposed for residential development and/or to provide access to Site/34/13.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td><strong>Submission does not indicate number of proposed dwellings. Dwelling figure is therefore calculated from site area and does not reflect site constraints or characteristics.</strong> <strong>Net site area estimated</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 11</td>
<td>b) Recommended 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Major Criteria**

| 1a. Settlement Hierarchy | Large Village |
| 1b. Site Availability | |
| 1c. Minerals and Waste assessment | |
| 1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies | |
| 1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations | |
| 2a. Flood zone | >50% of site area in Zone 1 | A |
| Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening): | |
| Flood Zone 1: | 100.00% | Flood Zone 3a: | 0.00% |
| Flood Zone 2: | 0.00% | Flood Zone 3b: | 0.00% |
| 2b. Surface Water flood risk | Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr)) | A |
| Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMSW): | |
Site Name: 223 Main Street

Minor Criteria

3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
   Site does not intersect Inner Zone

4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
   More than 5km from site

4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
   Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact
   Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
   The site has highways frontage and an existing access suitable to serve the dwelling within the plot. However an access layout for a road to serve 11 dwellings within this plot and 295 dwellings on the plot to the south could not be provided. Subject to t

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
   Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
   Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops
   Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
   Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
   Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
   No spare places, no room for expansion

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
   No spare places but room for expansion

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
   The level of development now proposed in Witchford and other villages that feed into Rackham Primary School is in excess of 750 homes. This level of development suggests a need for a significant expansion of primary school provision. The site at Rackham is restricted but with some additional land could be expanded by 0.5 FE to provide an additional 105 places. However, to mitigate the full impact of this development a further form of entry of palces could be rerequired. Options include a new small primary school (with a site) or the relocation and expansion of the existing school onto a much larger site.

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
   There is potential to expand Witchford Village College on its current site. However, this latest call for site would result in much higher levels of development within the catchment area of the College if they were all included in the Local Plan. The level of development would generate another 595 secondary aged children or 4FE. This is in addition to the additional pupils indentified from the sites included in the consultation draft local plan. At this level of development suitable mitigation could not be provided at Witchford VC. It would be the Council's intention on adoption of the Local Plan to undertake a strategic review of secondary school provision across the District and the review would include the option of a further new secondary school (and site) in order to provide suitable mitigation

6h. Proximity to employment sites
   Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
   CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
**Site Name:** 223 Main Street

**Parish:** Witchford CP

**Site Ref:** Site/34/12

**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.

### Parish Council support and rank

- **Does Parish Council support this site?** No
- **Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**
- **Form G - Parish Council's view:** (c) not add this site to the Local Plan

### 7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7d. Agricultural land classification

| All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower | D |

### 7e. Public Rights of Way

| E – No PRoW connection opportunities | E |

### 7f.(i) PROW comments

### 7f.(i) Conservation Area

| CA more than 2km from site | A |

### 7f.(ii). Listed building

| LB within 500.1 – 1000m of site | C |

### 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument

| SAM more than 2km from site | A |

### 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

### 7g. Heritage / archaeology comments

Listed buildings to the east, likely to have limited/no impact on designated heritage assets

### 7h. Visual Impact

| Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views | C |

**Justification for score:**

Site not visible from highway due to hedgerow height.

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

| No TPO within 15m of the site | A |
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Overall recommendation from site assessment:** Rejected

**Date and time of site visit:** 11:00 15 May 2017

**Supersedes site submission(s):**

Main findings and recommendations:

Development of the site would be visually intrusive to the open countryside and result in adverse harm to the landscape.

---

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb'17</th>
<th>ID:</th>
<th>445</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>223 Main Street, Witchford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Witchford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Agricultural land located south of Main Street, with access available through 223 Main Street (Site/34/12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Submission indicates site could provide 295 dwellings. <strong>Net site area estimated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td>Agriculture, Proposed Use: Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 295 b) Recommended 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy | Large Village
---|---
1b. Site Availability |  
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment |  
1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies |  
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations |  
2a. Flood zone | >50% of site area in Zone 1
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
- Flood Zone 1: 100.00%  
- Flood Zone 2: 0.00%  
- Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%  
- Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%  
2b. Surface Water flood risk | Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA
Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMSW):
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**  
Site Name: **Land rear of 223 Main Street**  
Parish: **Witchford CP**  
Site Ref: **Site/34/13**

### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- More than 5km from site

### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

- **5a. Proximity to contaminated land**  
  - Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

- **5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment**

- **5b. Local road impact**  
  - Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land and in accordance with CIL regulations

- **5c. Strategic Road Network impact**

- **5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment**
  - Does not appear to have access to highways frontage OR shown access to highwayPotential problems to access the highway
  - Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry.

#### 6. Access to services

- **6a. Proximity to public transport**  
  - Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

- **6b. Proximity to medical services**  
  - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

- **6c. Proximity to shops**  
  - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

- **6d. Proximity to Primary School**  
  - Less than 15 min walk (<1,200m)

- **6e. Proximity to Secondary School**  
  - Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

- **6f.(i) Available primary school capacity**  
  - No spare places, no room for expansion

- **6f.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**
  - There is potential to expand Witchford Village College on its current site. However, this latest call for site would result in much higher levels of development within the catchment area of the College if they were all included in the Local Plan. The level of development would generate another 595 secondary aged children or 4FE. This is in addition to the additional pupils identified from the sites included in the consultation draft local plan. At this level of development suitable mitigation could not be provided at Witchford VC. It would be the Council's intention on adoption of the Local Plan to undertake a strategic review of secondary school provision across the District and the review would include the option of a further new secondary school (and site) in order to provide suitable mitigation

- **6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity**  
  - No spare places but room for expansion

- **6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**

- **6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**

#### 7. Environmental impact

- **7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**  
  - CWS within 501m – 1km of site

- **7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**
**Current Status:** Rejected - not a site allocation  
**Site Name:** Land rear of 223 Main Street  
**Parish:** Witchford CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/34/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7e.(i) PROW comments**

| 7f.(i) Conservation Area | CA more than 2km from site | A |
| 7f.(ii). Listed building | LB within 500.1 – 1000m of site | C |
| 7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument | SAM more than 2km from site | A |
| 7f.(iv) Archaeological asset |

**7g. Heritage / archaeology comments**

Listed buildings to the east, likely to have limited/no impact on designated heritage assets

**7h. Visual Impact**

Significant harm to landscape/townscape or key views - severe visual intrusion | E |

**Justification for score:**

Development of site would be visually intrusive to open countryside, harming views from PROW and existing dwellings in particular. Site does not relate to existing built form coherently.

**Additional criterion 7i. TPOs**

No TPO within 15m of the site | A |

**Parish Council support and rank**

**Does Parish Council support this site?**

No

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council’s view:**

(c) not add this site to the Local Plan

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Rejected**

Date and time of site visit:
10:30 15 May 2017

Supersedes site submission(s):

Main findings and recommendations:
Site is located at the rear of existing buildings along Main Street. It is an enclosed site and is not visible from the highway. Development of the site may not relate well to the built form of the village.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb'17</th>
<th>ID: 451</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Needham’s Farm Barn, 188 Main Street, Witchford, Ely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Witchford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Garden land with highway frontage to Main Street, proposed for housing development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td><strong>Submission does not indicate number of proposed dwellings. Dwelling figure is therefore calculated from site area and does not reflect site constraints or characteristics.</strong> <strong>Net site area estimated</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 32  b) Recommended 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Large Village

1b. Site Availability
Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone 1:</th>
<th>100.00%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 2:</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3a:</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3b:</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMISW):
### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation

- Site does not intersect Inner Zone

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites

- More than 5 km from site

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

- A

---

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

#### 5a. Proximity to contaminated land

- Site located more than 250 m from contaminated land

#### 5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

- A

#### 5b. Local road impact

- No objections subject to reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with CIL regulations

#### 5c. Strategic Road Network impact

- No

#### 5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

- Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry and access width

#### 6. Access to services

#### 6a. Proximity to public transport

- Less than 5 min walk (<400 m)

#### 6b. Proximity to medical services

- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600 m)

#### 6c. Proximity to shops

- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600 m)

#### 6d. Proximity to Primary School

- Less than 15 min walk (<1,200 m)

#### 6e. Proximity to Secondary School

- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600 m)

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

- No spare places, no room for expansion

#### 6f.(i) Available primary school capacity - professional assessment

- No

#### 6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

- No spare places but room for expansion

#### 6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

- The level of development now proposed in Witchford and other villages that feed into Rackham Primary School is in excess of 750 homes. This level of development suggests a need for a significant expansion of primary school provision. The site at Rackham is restricted but with some additional land could be expanded by 0.5 FE to provide an additional 105 places. However, to mitigate the full impact of this development a further form of entry of places could be required. Options include a new small primary school (with a site) or the relocation and expansion of the existing school onto a much larger site.

#### 6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

- There is potential to expand Witchford Village College on its current site. However, this latest call for site would result in much higher levels of development within the catchment area of the College if they were all included in the Local Plan. The level of development would generate another 595 secondary aged children or 4FE. This is in addition to the additional pupils identified from the sites included in the consultation draft local plan. At this level of development suitable mitigation could not be provided at Witchford VC. It would be the Council’s intention on adoption of the Local Plan to undertake a strategic review of secondary school provision across the District and the review would include the option of a further new secondary school (and site) in order to provide suitable mitigation.

#### 6h. Proximity to employment sites

- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600 m)

---

### 7. Environmental impact

#### 7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

- CWS within 1.01 km – 2 km of site

#### 7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

- No
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Land rear of Needham's Farm Barn
Parish: Witchford CP
Site Ref: Site/34/15

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification
All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower

7e. Public Rights of Way
C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary

7f.(i) PROW comments
Public Byway Open to All Traffic 6 runs alongside the northern boundary of the site. Provide a link within the site boundary to Main Street at the southern end of the site.

7f.(ii) Conservation Area
CA more than 2km from site

7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument
SAM more than 2km from site

7f.(iv) Archaeological asset

7g. Heritage / archaeology comments
Listed buildings to the east, likely to have limited/no impact on designated heritage assets

7h. Visual Impact
Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views

Justification for score:
Impacts somewhat uncertain as site not accessible / visible. Unclear whether site would relate coherently to built form.

Additional criterion 7i. TPOs
No TPO within 15m of the site

Parish Council support and rank
Does Parish Council support this site? No

Form E - Parish Council site ranking:

Form G - Parish Council's view: (c) not add this site to the Local Plan

FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received
Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Land south of Main Street
Parish: Witchford CP
Site Ref: Site/34/16

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected
Date and time of site visit: 11:15 15 May 2017
Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is located south of Main Street, where development is predominantly frontage development. Estate-style development would unlikely complement the built form of the village, resulting in adverse impact on the character of the village. The site provides a break in the line of development, and offers wide open views of the countryside, enhancing the rural character of the village. The loss of views would result in adverse harm to the townscape.

Site Information

Site Type: FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb'17 ID: 449
Site Address: Main Street, Witchford, Ely
Settlement: Witchford
LP15 Allocation Ref: Planning Perm. Ref:
Site Description: Agricultural land located south of Main Street and west of Rackham C of E primary school. Much of the site was previously assessed under reference Site/34/06. However, this submission presents a slightly different site boundary, thereby including a small area of land not subject to the previous assessment.

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints: Submission indicates site could provide up to 55 dwellings. **Net site area estimated**
Current Use: Agriculture Proposed Use: Housing

Site Area Net (ha): 2.43 Site Area Gross (ha) 3.24
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 55 b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Large Village
1b. Site Availability Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone >50% of site area in Zone 1
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 100.00% Flood Zone 2: 0.00% Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%
2b. Surface Water flood risk Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Date and time of site visit: 11:15 15 May 2017
Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is located south of Main Street, where development is predominantly frontage development. Estate-style development would unlikely complement the built form of the village, resulting in adverse impact on the character of the village. The site provides a break in the line of development, and offers wide open views of the countryside, enhancing the rural character of the village. The loss of views would result in adverse harm to the townscape.
Site Name: Land south of Main Street

Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Parish: Witchford CP
Site Ref: Site/34/16

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land
- Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact
- No objections with Moderate mitigation measures

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment
Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry and access width

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6b. Proximity to medical services
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6c. Proximity to shops
- Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6d. Proximity to Primary School
- Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

6e. Proximity to Secondary School
- Less than 10 min walk (<800m)

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity
- No spare places, no room for expansion

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity
- No spare places but room for expansion

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment
The level of development now proposed in Witchford and other villages that feed into Rackham Primary School is in excess of 750 homes. This level of development suggests a need for a significant expansion of primary school provision. The site at Rackham is restricted but with some additional land could be expanded by 0.5 FE to provide an additional 105 places. However, to mitigate the full impact of this development a further form of entry of places could be required. Options include a new small primary school (with a site) or the relocation and expansion of the existing school onto a much larger site.

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment
There is potential to expand Witchford Village College on its current site. However, this latest call for site would result in much higher levels of development within the catchment area of the College if they were all included in the Local Plan. The level of development would generate another 595 secondary aged children or 4FE. This is in addition to the additional pupils identified from the sites included in the consultation draft local plan. At this level of development suitable mitigation could not be provided at Witchford VC. It would be the Council’s intention on adoption of the Local Plan to undertake a strategic review of secondary school provision across the District and the review would include the option of a further new secondary school (and site) in order to provide suitable mitigation.

6h. Proximity to employment sites
- Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites
- CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
<td>All or part of site intersected by ALC3 or lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>B – Opportunities to connect to multiple nearby PRoW within the site boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7e.(i) PROW comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Footpaths 1, 6 and 13 cross the site. These Public Footpaths to be included within the site layout.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7f.(i) Conservation Area</strong></td>
<td>CA more than 2km from site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7f.(ii). Listed building</strong></td>
<td>LB on-site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</strong></td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECDC - Nothing further to add from previous consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE - This site includes a grade II barn. There are also a number of grade II and a grade II* building nearby. We are therefore likely to have significant reservations about allocating this site. Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7h. Visual Impact</strong></td>
<td>Significant harm to landscape/townscape or key views - severe visual intrusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Justification for score:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development would likely result in loss of views of open countryside, which are enjoyed from Main St. Important to retain break in development line - vistas with countryside views enhance character of the village. Large site - most adjacent development is along frontage only. Development od site may therefore not relate oherently to the built form of the village.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional criterion 7i. TPOs</strong></td>
<td>No TPO within 15m of the site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

| Does Parish Council support this site? | No |
| Form E - Parish Council site ranking: |  |
| Form G - Parish Council's view: | (c) not add this site to the Local Plan |

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb ’17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s) Site/10/27; Site/34/08

Main findings and recommendations:
The site combines Site/34/08 and the northern parcel of Site/10/29 to provide a site option for major development. Development would require significant investment in infrastructure, including the provision of a new primary school on-site, open spaces, community facilities and other supporting uses. However, there remains uncertainty on the capacity of the village's infrastructure to accommodate a development of this scale. In addition, the site would adversely impact upon the character and distinct identity of the village, due to its scale and through eroding the open space between Witchford, Ely and Lancaster Way Business Park.

Site Information

Site Type: Strategic Planning Amended Submission
Site Address: Land north east of Witchford
Settlement: Witchford
LP15 Allocation Ref: Site Area Net (ha): 21.32
Planning Perm. Ref: Site Area Gross (ha): 35.53
Site Description: **Amended proposal to include Site/34/08 and northern parcel of Site/10/27**
Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield
Known Constraints:
Current Use: Agriculture
Proposed Use info: Proposed Use: Mixed use
Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated: 720
Proposed Use info:

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy
Large Village
1b. Site Availability
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment
1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations
2a. Flood zone
>50% of site area in Zone 1
Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: 88.00%  Flood Zone 2: 12.00%  Flood Zone 3a: 11.00%  Flood Zone 3b: -
2b. Surface Water flood risk
Proportion of site at some risk of surface water flooding (30yr) - refer to SFRA

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s) Site/10/27; Site/34/08

Main findings and recommendations:
The site combines Site/34/08 and the northern parcel of Site/10/29 to provide a site option for major development. Development would require significant investment in infrastructure, including the provision of a new primary school on-site, open spaces, community facilities and other supporting uses. However, there remains uncertainty on the capacity of the village's infrastructure to accommodate a development of this scale. In addition, the site would adversely impact upon the character and distinct identity of the village, due to its scale and through eroding the open space between Witchford, Ely and Lancaster Way Business Park.
Current Status: Site Allocation
Site Name: Land north east of Witchford
Parish: Witchford CP
Site Ref: Site/34/17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Site Suitability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a. Proximity to contaminated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a. Contaminated land professional assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Local road impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Strategic Road Network impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Access to services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. Proximity to public transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Proximity to medical services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Proximity to shops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Proximity to Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. Proximity to Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f. Available primary school capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g. Primary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f. Available secondary school capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g. Secondary education impacts - professional assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6h. Proximity to employment sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Environmental impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Agricultural land classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. Public Rights of Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f. PROW comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Current Status:** Site Allocation  
**Site Name:** *Land north east of Witchford*  
**Parish:** Witchford CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/34/17

### Heritage / archaeology comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii) Listed building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Justification for score:

### Additional criterion 7i. TPOs

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Parish Council support and rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council's view:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Preferred site

Main findings and recommendations:

The site has planning permission for residential development, and should be allocated to retain this planning decision.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>Site with extant planning permission</th>
<th>ID: 466</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Site Adjacent To 37 St Johns Avenue Newmarket Suffolk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Newmarket Fringe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td>14/01264/FUM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>14/01264/FUM for the construction of 21 affordable dwellings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 21 b) Recommended 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site Area Net (ha): 0.54  Site Area Gross (ha): 0.63

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Medium Village
1b. Site Availability
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):
Flood Zone 1: | Flood Zone 2: | Flood Zone 3a: | Flood Zone 3b: |

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
30 Year: | 100 Year: | 1,000 Year: |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minor Criteria

#### 5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land

5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment

5b. Local road impact

5c. Strategic Road Network impact

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

#### 6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport

6b. Proximity to medical services

6c. Proximity to shops

6d. Proximity to Primary School

6e. Proximity to Secondary School

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

6h. Proximity to employment sites

#### 7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers

7d. Agricultural land classification

7e. Public Rights of Way

7e.(i) PROW comments
### Parish Council support and rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Parish Council support this site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form G - Parish Council's view:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:

```markdown

```
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment:

Rejected

Date and time of site visit:
26 July 2016 at 12:15pm

Supersedes site submission(s):

Main findings and recommendations:

The site is rejected as development of the site would result in the loss of recreation space. The site is understood to have been recently awarded 'Asset of Community Value' status.

Site Information

Site Type: New site submission (Form B) ID: 166

Site Address: Land fronting Peterhouse Drive, Wooditton

Settlement: Newmarket Fringe

LP15 Allocation Ref: Planning Perm. Ref:

Site Description: Land fronting Peterhouse Drive, Wooditton

Brown/Greenfield: Greenfield

Known Constraints: The area is presently leased to Woodditton Parish Council and used for recreation. The County Council would entertain the retention of a proportion of the area for long term recreational use beyond any planning requirement connected with new housing.

Current Use: Open space/outdoor recreation Proposed Use: Housing

Current Use info: The area is presently leased to Woodditton Parish Council and used for recreation.

Proposed Use info:

Site Area Net (ha): 0.39 Site Area Gross (ha): 0.457

Indicative no. of dwellings: a) Submitted / estimated 14 b) Recommended 0

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy Medium Village

1b. Site Availability Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone >50% of site area in Zone 1

Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

- Flood Zone 1: 100.00%
- Flood Zone 2: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3a: 0.00%
- Flood Zone 3b: 0.00%

2b. Surface Water flood risk Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))

Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation

Site Name: Land fronting Peterhouse Drive, Wooditton

Parish: Wooditton CP
Site Ref: Site/35/01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Criteria</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation</td>
<td>Site does not intersect Inner Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites</td>
<td>2.01km - 5km from the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Site Suitability

5a. Proximity to contaminated land | Site within 100m of contaminated land |

5b. Local road impact | No objections with minor mitigation measures |

5c. Strategic Road Network impact | |

5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment

"Access off Peter House Drive Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry"
This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

6. Access to services

6a. Proximity to public transport | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) |

6b. Proximity to medical services | Less than 10 min walk (<800m) |

6c. Proximity to shops | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) |

6d. Proximity to Primary School | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) |

6e. Proximity to Secondary School | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) |

6f.(i) Available primary school capacity | No spare places but room for expansion |

6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity | Limited capacity |

6g.(i) Primary education impacts - professional assessment

Potential to expanded by 1FE or 210 places. Using the Council's standard multiplier this will equate to development of around 600 new homes in the catchment area.

6g.(ii) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

6h. Proximity to employment sites | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) |

7. Environmental impact

7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites | CWS within 1.01km – 2km of site |

7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment | |

7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers | |

7d. Agricultural land classification | Site is not located on agricultural land |

7e. Public Rights of Way | E – No PRoW connection opportunities |

7e.(i) PROW comments | |
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**  
Parish: **Wooditton CP**  
Site Name: *Land fronting Peterhouse Drive, Wooditton*  
Site Ref: **Site/35/01**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>CA more than 2km from site</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii) Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7g. Heritage / archaeology comments**

No heritage impact

**7h. Visual Impact**

Neutral/No impact on landscape/townscape or key views  
Justification for score:

Loss of view and green space. Informal playing area used by children.

**Additional criterion 7h. TPOs**

No TPO within 15m of the site  
A

**Parish Council support and rank**

Does Parish Council support this site?  
No

**Form E - Parish Council site ranking:**

**Form G - Parish Council's view:**

**FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received**

Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:
Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall recommendation from site assessment: Rejected

Date and time of site visit:

Supersedes site submission(s)

Main findings and recommendations:
Sites monitoring indicates development of the site is now complete.

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>Site with extant planning permission</th>
<th>ID: 249</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land Off Cricketfield Road, Woodditton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Newmarket Fringe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>Land off Cricketfield Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Proposed erection of 6 new apartments and 4 new houses, including change of use and all associated external works</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Leisure facility (commercial)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td>Proposed Use: Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Use info:

| Site Area Net (ha): | 0.28 |
| Site Area Gross (ha): | 0.28 |

Indicative no. of dwellings:

| a) Submitted / estimated | 10 |
| b) Recommended | 10 |

Major Criteria

1a. Settlement Hierarchy | Medium Village | C
1b. Site Availability | |
1c. Minerals and Waste assessment | |

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies | |
1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations | |

2a. Flood zone

| Percent (% of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening)): |
| Flood Zone 1: 100.00% |
| Flood Zone 2: 0.00% |
| Flood Zone 3a: 0.00% |
| Flood Zone 3b: 0.00% |

2b. Surface Water flood risk

| Percent (% of site area at risk (uFMfSW)): |
| 30 Year: 0.00% |
| 100 Year: 0.00% |
| 1,000 Year: 4.75% |

30 Year: 0.00% | 100 Year: 0.00% | 1,000 Year: 4.75% |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site Ref:</strong> Site/35/02</th>
<th><strong>Parish:</strong> Wooditton CP</th>
<th><strong>Site Name:</strong> Land off Cricketfield Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation</strong></td>
<td>Site does not intersect Inner Zone</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites</strong></td>
<td>2.01km - 5km from the site</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Minor Criteria**

**5. Site Suitability**

| **5a. Proximity to contaminated land** | |
| **5a.(i) Contaminated land professional assessment** | |
| **5b. Local road impact** | |
| **5c. Strategic Road Network impact** | |
| **5d. Transport impacts - professional assessment** | |

This site is below the threshold where an assessment is required.

**6. Access to services**

| **6a. Proximity to public transport** | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) | A |
| **6b. Proximity to medical services** | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) | A |
| **6c. Proximity to shops** | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |
| **6d. Proximity to Primary School** | Less than 5 min walk (<400m) | A |
| **6e. Proximity to Secondary School** | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |
| **6f.(i) Available primary school capacity** | No spare places but room for expansion | D |
| **6f.(ii) Available secondary school capacity** | Limited capacity | C |

**6g.(I) Primary education impacts - professional assessment**

Potential to expanded by 1FE or 210 places. Using the Council's standard multiplier this will equate to development of around 600 new homes in the catchment area.

**6g.(II) Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**

The College could be expanded by a further 3 forms of entry (450 places 11-16) on its current site. Using standard child yield multipliers for secondary age children this would equate to the impact of 1,800 new houses in the catchment area.

**6h. Proximity to employment sites** | Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m) | E |

**7. Environmental impact**

| **7a. Proximity to County Wildlife Sites** | CWS within 501m – 1km of site | C |
| **7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment** | |

**7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers** | Site is not located on argicultural land | A |
| **7d. Agricultural land classification** | |
| **7e. Public Rights of Way** | E – No PRoW connection opportunities | E |
| **7e.(I) PROW comments** | |

---

**Minor Criteria (continued)**

**7b. County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**

**7c. Groundwater PZ and aquifers**

**7d. Agricultural land classification**

**7e. Public Rights of Way**

**7e.(I) PROW comments**
Current Status: **Rejected - not a site allocation**
Site Name: *Land off Cricketfield Road*
Parish: Wooditton CP
Site Ref: Site/35/02

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7f.(i) Conservation Area</th>
<th>CA more than 2km from site</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 1.01km – 2km of site</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM more than 2km from site</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7h. Visual Impact</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Justification for score:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Parish Council support and rank**

Does Parish Council support this site?  
Form E - Parish Council site ranking: 
Form G - Parish Council's view:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

Overall recommendation from site assessment: **Rejected**

Date and time of site visit:
- 29/06/2017 at 1:40pm

Supersedes site submission(s):

Main findings and recommendations:
The site is located beyond the natural edge of the village. Adjacent development is low-density frontage development, and estate style development would be unlikely to complement the built form of the village. Development of the site would likely be visually intrusive, encroaching into the open countryside resulting in adverse landscape impacts.

**Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>FDLP Additional Site Suggestion Jan-Feb’17</th>
<th>ID: 450</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Stetchworth Road, Woodditton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement:</td>
<td>Woodditton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP15 Allocation Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Perm. Ref:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description:</td>
<td>The site is located to the south of Stetchworth Road, adjacent to the existing development envelope for the village. The site's western boundary corresponds to the extent of built development to the north of Stetchowrth Road. The site is agricultural land proposed for housing development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Greenfield:</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Constraints:</td>
<td>Submission indicates site could provide 17 dwellings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use info:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Net (ha):</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Gross (ha):</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative no. of dwellings:</td>
<td>a) Submitted / estimated 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Recommended 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Criteria**

1a. Settlement Hierarchy  
Small Village  

1b. Site Availability  
Available for devt in short term (0-5 yrs 2016-22)  

1c. Minerals and Waste assessment

1c.(i) Site affected by M+W Policies

1c.(ii) Site affected by M+W Allocations

2a. Flood zone  
>50% of site area in Zone 1  

### Percent (%) of site area at risk (SFRA Level 1 screening):

| Flood Zone 1: | 100.00% |
| Flood Zone 2: | 0.00% |
| Flood Zone 3a: | 0.00% |
| Flood Zone 3b: | 0.00% |

2b. Surface Water flood risk  
Risk of Surface Water Flooding 0% (updated flood map for surface water (30yr))  

### Assessment:

- **D**  
- **A**
**Site Name:** Land south of Stetchworth Road  
**Parish:** Wooditton CP  
**Site Ref:** Site/35/03

- **Site located in Internal Drainage Board Admin. area (Y/N):** No  
- **Site located in area benefitting from defences (Y/N):** No

### Minor Criteria

#### 3. Proximity to Hazardous Installation
- **Site does not intersect Inner Zone**

#### 4a. Proximity to internationally / nationally important wildlife sites
- **Within 500m of site**

#### 4b. European and nationally important wildlife sites - professional assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (%) of site area at risk (uFMfSW):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year: 0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5. Site Suitability

1. **Proximity to contaminated land**
   - Site located more than 250m from contaminated land

2. **Local road impact**
   - No objections with minor mitigation measures

3. **Strategic Road Network impact**

4. **Transport impacts - professional assessment**
   - Subject to the applicant being able to demonstrate that they can provide adequate visibility and junction geometry and access width

5a. **Proximity to public transport**
   - Less than 5 min walk (<400m)

5b. **Proximity to medical services**
   - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

5c. **Proximity to shops**
   - Less than 20 min walk (<1,600m)

5d. **Proximity to Primary School**
   - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

5e. **Proximity to Secondary School**
   - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6a. **Proximity to employment sites**
   - Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)

6b. **Primary education impacts - professional assessment**
   - The catchment forecasts suggest that the scale of development proposed across Wooditton and Cheveley can be accommodated in this village school

6c. **Secondary education impacts - professional assessment**
   - Bottisham VC is in the process of being expanded from 7FE to 10FE an additional 450 places 11-16. Future catchment forecasts indicate that there will be some limited capacity available at the school to accommodate growth. In addition, there are plans for a new secondary school to the east of Cambridge to serve that areas development needs. The school will be in part of Bottisham VC current catchment area. If pupils in this area are served by the new school that will free up further capacity to accommodate the growth proposed within the Local Plan and the sites identified in this second round.

6d. **Available primary school capacity**
   - No spare places, no room for expansion

6e. **Available secondary school capacity**
   - Limited capacity

7a. **Proximity to County Wildlife Sites**
   - CWS within 500m of site

7b. **County Wildlife Sites - Professional assessment**

7c. **Groundwater PZ and aquifers**

7d. **Agricultural land classification**
   - All or part of site intersected by ALC2 or lower
Current Status: Rejected - not a site allocation
Site Name: Land south of Stetchworth Road
Parish: Wooditton CP
Site Ref: Site/35/03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7e. Public Rights of Way</th>
<th>C – Opportunities to connect to nearby PRoW within the site boundary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) PROW comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Footpath 8 runs along the southern boundary of the site. Provide a safe off road link from Public Footpath 8 across the site to Ditton Green Road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(i) Conservation Area</td>
<td>CA more than 2km from site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(ii). Listed building</td>
<td>LB within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iii) Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>SAM within 500m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f.(iv) Archaeological asset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g. Heritage / archaeology comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECDC - Listed building 30m southeast, potential to cause harm to the character, appearance and setting of the designated heritage asset.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE - Whilst there are no heritage assets within the site boundary there is a grade II listed building, Valence House, to the south east of the site. There is also a scheduled monument, Devil’s Ditch, to the north west of the site. Development of this site has the potential to impact upon the setting this listed building. Any development of this site will need to preserve the listed buildings and its setting. This might be achieved through mitigation measures such as appropriate landscaping/plant and setting the development back from the listed building and perhaps by limiting the development to frontage development along Stetchworth Road. Regardless, if the site is allocated, it is important that requirement to preserve the listed building and its setting should be included in the policy and supporting text of the Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h. Visual Impact</td>
<td>Detrimental impact on landscape/townscape or key views - visually intrusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification for score:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional criterion 7i. TPOs</td>
<td>No TPO within 15m of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Council support and rank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Parish Council support this site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form E - Parish Council site ranking:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form G - Parish Council's view:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDLP Consultation (Jan-Feb '17) - Summary of comments received</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of main issues raised during public consultation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This site submission was received during consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. Consequently, it was not published for public consultation.