



Report on the Key Issues raised

Proposed Submission - Addendum (June - Aug 13)

August 2013

Introduction

From June 27 – 7 August 2013 a six week consultation was held on the changes made to the Core Strategy (and any updated evidence base) with these changes being described as an addendum to the Proposed Submission Core Strategy. Representations were invited specifically on these changes; it was therefore not a full consultation on the whole Core Strategy.

The representations received in the original Feb-April 2013 consultation remain valid, but will now be supplemented by any additional comments received as part of this latest consultation.

As with the previous proposed submission stage, the Council does not use the comments to make changes to the plan. Instead, the comments are collated and sent to a Planning Inspector to inform the independent examination of the plan. The role of this report is therefore to highlight to everyone a summary of what was said.

We received a relatively modest number of responses, 25 in total. This was to be expected as comments made at the previous stage remain valid. All 25 comments related to the changes resulting from the removal of the NE March allocation.

We have kept the comments as anonymous as possible because what is said is more important than who said it. However, if anyone feels we have substantially misinterpreted your views, then please let us know or the programme officer in charge of managing the examination of the Core Strategy.

Next steps

The comments summarised below, in conjunction with those received through the proposed submission consultation, will be tested by an Independent Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State before the final plan can be adopted (end 2013 or early 2014).

Consideration of Issues Raised

Please note that all references to a policy, section, paragraph etc. are referring to such items as can be found in the Fenland Local Plan – Core Strategy Proposed Submission Addendum - July 2013.

You can get this document in another language, in large print, in Moon, in Braille, on audio cassette and in electronic format.
Please ask us if you would like this document in any of these formats.



Fenland District Council

Fenland Hall, County Road, March, Cambridgeshire. PE15 8NQ
Tel: 01354 654321 Email: info@fenland.gov.uk Web: www.fenland.gov.uk

Comments in support of the amendments to the Proposed Submission Version as set out in the addendum relating to North-East March

Summary of comments received	• Support for the reallocation to the South West March broad location for growth.
	• Support removal of NE March site as playing fields have been in place for last 70 years, and it is not logical to relocate elsewhere.
	• Changes will allow FDC to continue to meet its overarching housing target.
	• In general terms additional development towards the south of March is preferable on sustainability grounds.

Comments against the amendments to the Proposed Submission Version as set out in the addendum relating to North-East March

Summary of comments received	• Housing should be redistributed to a site at the North-West of March rather than to the south and windfall.
	• The preference for growth in the south does not justify the deletion of the NE March allocation.
	• The evidence does not suggest that NE March is the least sustainable site.
	• The deletion of NE March is a political decision rather than based on good planning reasons.
	• The development of NE March would provide needed executive homes.
	• The development of NE March would be a natural extension to March.
	• The boundary for March East should be amended to include some of the redistributed housing growth and improve access.
	• The redistribution towards the South of March increases the risk of impacting on the heritage assets, particularly St Wendreda's Church.
	• Housing growth should be redistributed amongst each of the market towns and 'other areas'.
	• A smaller development through the extension of the existing Berryfields housing estate would be more appropriate.
	• Growth should be redistributed towards Whittlesey.
	• Growth should be redistributed towards Wisbech.
	• The level of windfall allowance is unrealistic.