

March Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 16 Consultation Responses

Ref	Name/Organisation	Policy/section of plan	Comments
MTC001	Middle Level Commissioners	General	<p>(A) Our general comments on the documents considered are: The area covered by March Town Council involves the following Risk Management Authorities (RMA), the Middle Level Commissioners, March Fifth D.D.C., March Sixth D.D.C., March East I.D.B., March West & White Fen I.D.B., Euximoor I.D.B., Ransonmoor D.D.C. and Whittlesey & District I.D.B. The designation should not unduly affect these authorities but please be advised that even though a neighbourhood area has been designated, compliance with the provisions of the Land Drainage Act and the relevant RMAs byelaws would still be required. It is noted that some of our previous comments have been included in the revised documents that have been considered.</p>
		Policy H1	We note and applaud the philosophy contained within this policy as it encourages developers to give consideration to relevant items at an early stage. We note the reference to both flooding and surface water.
		Policy H2	We note the reference to both flooding and surface water.
		Policy TC2	Issues related to water level and flood risk management, including effluent disposal, are a prime consideration for all three sites and any adverse impacts need to be considered at the earliest possible stage.
		Site 1	We note the reference to the Old River Nene (ORN) its associated 20m wide maintenance access strip and the need to seek the Commissioners' prior written consent. However, it is disappointing to note that despite being a significant asset to the town, the potential benefits and opportunities in respect of leisure, recreation, tourism and amenity purposes, no reference is made to the Old River Nene. The Commissioners and associated Boards encourage Pre-application discussion.

Ref	Name/Organisation	Policy/section of plan	Comments
		Sustainability Assessment: Environmental Report (Sept 2016)	<p><u>Table 1 : Sustainability Assessment Objectives</u></p> <p>Item 1 – We are uncertain of the background of this item and presume that it relates to the Water Framework Directive (WFD). However, whoever requested it clearly has little knowledge of the local water level and flood risk management systems.</p> <p>Whilst it is accepted that Floods Drain, a Ransonmoor DDC Board’s Drain, does form the southern boundary of the Town Council’s area, it is a low level pumped watercourse and with the exception of surface water run-off and treated effluent from the farms within the area, its catchment is nearly all arable land.</p> <p>Well Creek is approximately 3.5km (2.17 miles) to the north east of the Council’s area and is a higher level navigation channel separated from the Old River Nene by a lock at Marmont Priory!</p> <p>Therefore, in reality, any influence that the Town Council has on either Well Creek or Floods Drain is extremely low.</p> <p>[Further general information, not specifically related to the March Neighbourhood Plan was also provided]</p>
MTC002	Stephen Court	Paras 3.1 to 3.5; Paras 3.12 to 3.19; Policies H1 & H2	<p>The structure of a neighbourhood plan is that it acts to complement other planning regulations such as national and those at district level. It can highlight specific issues by consulting with the local community and give greater clarity to these issues because local people are involved.</p> <p>Having read through the consultation document which followed along much the same lines as the FDC local plan I found it much easier to understand. It clearly states under the neighbourhood plan policy H1 the allocation for housing which was decided on in the FDC local plan as being strategic allocations : South East March 600 dwellings and West March 2000 dwellings with broad location for being in south west March 500 dwellings .For a building program up to 2030. It goes on to state that this plan must be prepared with “extensive, ongoing, meaningful consultation with land owners stakeholders and the community”. Local people can contribute to give clarity to the plan.</p> <p>Policy H2 which deals with windfall development clearly states on page 19 that a windfall development is 9 dwellings. It then goes on to give 8 very common sense reasons as to how such an application would be considered with more justification given on the following page . I particularly note paragraph 3:8 which recognises that windfall</p>

Ref	Name/Organisation	Policy/section of plan	Comments
			<p>developments could come up outside of the strategic and broad growth areas of the town.</p> <p>The regeneration of the town centre sites is something that a local plan can be used to address and the MNP appears to be doing that by stating clear areas such as land to the west of High Street and land to the south of Station Road as such areas in need of attention. Bullet points are used effectively to highlight the issues around redevelopment. With a good use of pictures as well.</p> <p>The relationship to the Fenland Local Plan is clearly stated on page 37 again not with long drawn out paragraphs but with clear bullet points around the various policies. I also like the fact that MTC did a sustainability appraisal and did not just rely on the FDC Local Plan appraisal. Thus giving the MNP credibility in its own right.</p> <p>Although I am both a March Town Councillor and Fenland District Councillor i have not been largely involved in developing this plan as most of the ground work was done before I joined the council.</p> <p>I think overall that it is a good attempt to deliver neighbourhood planning for the town.</p> <p><u>Recommended Changes</u></p> <p>More photographs to illustrate some of the points being made.</p>
MTC003	Michael Rutter	Paras 3.3 & 3.4	<p>The MNP is a very clear document, far easier to comprehend & relate to, than FDC's Local Plan.</p> <p>The MNP's description of Windfall is clear & accurate. FDC have never been able to understand, define or apply Windfall correctly.</p> <p>3.3 & 3.4. There has always been a risk that FDC's Policy LP7, regarding Urban Extensions, may be an opportunity for FDC to consider a planning application without the required scrutiny, because of the lack of clarity or definitions. Or, in other words:- "Windfall Development – through the back door"!</p> <p>This is particularly important for residents in North East March.</p> <p>MTC should monitor, check & apply pressure where possible, to ensure that the FDC Planners comply with the correct standards. An example of this, below:-</p> <p>The MNP's supporting document "Sustainability Assessment – Environmental Report", page 40. Regarding "Develop land efficiently to preserve high quality farming land". As</p>

Ref	Name/Organisation	Policy/section of plan	Comments
			<p>the report states, para 112 of the NPPF encourages Authorities to prioritise developments on areas of poorer agricultural land quality.</p> <p>The para above is just one example of where MTC has an opportunity to monitor, check, apply pressure & demand their Additional Requirements. And, equally, other examples can be made regarding Infrastructure, Community Services, Flood risks etc.</p>
MTC004	Appletree Holdings Ltd	Para 3.2 & Policy H1	<p>The provision and transparency of adequate infrastructure.</p> <p><u>Recommended Changes</u> This requires further amplification appertaining to the viability of building houses in March based on Fenland District and Cambridge County Council's Section 106 requirements in particular the up front funding of a primary school. Hatchwoods Farm owned by Appletree Holdings Ltd(AHL) is the majority landholding within the strategic allocation West March. AHL would welcome the opportunity of engaging with March Town Council to consider the phased development of the West March strategic allocation.</p>
		Paras 2 & 3.11; Policy H3	<p>Reference is made to the use of viability assessments to consider the provision of affordable housing and that viability evidence will be robustly scrutinised. Hatchwoods Farm owned by Appletree Holdings Ltd(AHL) is the majority landholding within the strategic allocation West March. AHL would welcome the opportunity of engaging with March Town Council to consider the phased development of the West March strategic allocation.</p> <p><u>Recommended Changes</u> In addition to viability assessments being prepared to justify the reduction in affordable housing viability assessments also to be utilised to consider all 106 requirements such as the funding of education.</p>
MTC005	Anglian Water	n/a	<p>Thank you for contacting Anglian Water in regards to the above consultation, however, we do not have any comments to make.</p>

Ref	Name/Organisation	Policy/section of plan	Comments
MTC006	Natural England	General	Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. The Plan boundary does not include any statutorily designated nature conservation sites or landscapes. A number of nationally designated nature conservation sites are located nearby including the Nene Washes Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site. The plan boundary includes a number of County Wildlife Sites (CWS). As stated in our response to the SEA Screening consultation, dated 21 October 2016 (ref. 196645), Natural England is satisfied that March Neighbourhood Plan is unlikely to have any significant effect on key issues within our remit including designated sites.
		Vision	We support the plan Vision for growth to be accommodated sustainably and for the quality of the natural environment and recreational provision to be improved, in line with the aspirations of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
		Policy HC1	We generally welcome Policy HC1 Large Development Sites which supports the allocations for development identified in the adopted Local Plan (2014). Natural England supports the requirement for the Broad Concept Plan for Urban Extensions to identify how a network of linked open spaces will be provided for amenity, play, sport and recreation, including allotments. This could be amended and strengthened to promote the protection and enhancement of biodiversity, to ensure that development will incorporate informal open space areas to benefit wildlife and people's enjoyment of it. This is particularly pertinent given the removal of the nature conservation policy from the plan and the requirement for development to deliver net biodiversity gain, where possible, prescribed through paragraph 109 of the NPPF.
		Deleted Policy NC1	It is disappointing to note that Policy NC1 Nature Conservation has been removed since we commented on the draft Plan in our response dated 21 April 2015 (ref. 148695). This represents a significant missed opportunity to ensure that development not only protects wildlife habitat but also helps to deliver an extended and improved semi-natural green infrastructure network for the Parish, to benefit wildlife and people's access to and enjoyment of the countryside. Natural England strongly encourages the inclusion of a

Ref	Name/Organisation	Policy/section of plan	Comments
			<p>policy within the Plan to require development to help deliver the deficit in green infrastructure and wildlife habitat provision for March, as referenced in sections 2.1.7 and 2.1.9 of the plan Vision. This should also require protection and enhancement of any geological interests in line with paragraph 117 of the NPPF.</p>
		Policy OS1	<p>Natural England welcomes the inclusion of an open space policy. However, to reiterate our previous advice, Policy OS1 could be strengthened to recognise the importance and value of multifunctional green infrastructure provision including benefits for drainage, landscape, biodiversity, health and wellbeing and climate change mitigation. New housing development will place significant pressure on the existing green infrastructure network, including designated sites. This Plan provides an opportunity to ensure that development protects and extends this network of semi-natural habitats and increases the area of accessible open space to meet the additional demand for access to the countryside. The role of green infrastructure in absorbing recreational pressure and diverting this away from more sensitive sites should be recognised. You may find reference to Natural England’s guidance Nature Nearby - Accessible Natural Greenspace Guidance helpful.</p> <p>As currently worded this policy misses an opportunity to require that development incorporates natural green space and contribute towards a high quality green infrastructure network connected to the wider countryside, to benefit wildlife and people – including new and existing residents of March. We recommend that the policy could be improved with the inclusion of a requirement for proposals to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity Strategy to deliver a package of habitat creation and access enhancement measures which contributes to the wider GI network and provides substantial wildlife, landscape and access improvements to enhance people’s enjoyment of the countryside. <p>We support the requirement that, where appropriate, public access should be encouraged onto existing and new wildlife habitats. However, in order to deliver benefits for biodiversity we advise that the policy should encourage a range of access levels, in order to ensure that some areas remain relatively undisturbed for wildlife.</p> <p>As previously advised, plan policies should ensure that development offers adequate protection to the conservation of soil resources, including best and most versatile land, in accordance with paragraph 112 of the NPPF.</p>

Ref	Name/Organisation	Policy/section of plan	Comments
MTC007	Historic England	n/a	<p>Thank you for your email inviting Historic England to respond to the consultation on March Neighbourhood Plan. Unfortunately, owing to current staffing capacity we will be unable to comment. We enclose a copy of our Neighbourhood Plan advice and would recommend that you consult the relevant conservation and archaeological specialists in your district and county councils.</p> <p>[Additional guidance and information provided, including comments against previous consultations]</p>
MTC008	Fenland District Council	General	<p><u>Introduction</u></p> <p>This document is the formal submission of Fenland District Council (FDC) on the submitted March Neighbourhood Plan (MNP) as part of the Regulation 16 (Publication) Consultation between 9 January and 20 February 2017.</p> <p>These comments are intended to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide the view of FDC as to whether the policies meet the Basic Conditions as required by regulations; • Highlight some remaining areas of concern with the plan that FDC has; and • Provide some useful context for the examiner in considering the submitted comments. <p>The MNP has been the subject of ongoing dialogue between the Qualifying Body and FDC since March Neighbourhood Area was designated in December 2013.</p> <p><u>Context</u></p> <p>FDC is a pro-growth Council, actively seeking inward investment for the benefit of the area, including within the town of March.</p> <p>The Fenland Local Plan (FLP) was adopted in May 2014 and is the main, relevant part of the Development Plan for providing context for the MNP, and it includes the strategic policies that the MNP must be in general conformity with.</p> <p>The FLP identifies in Policy LP3 that March, as a Primary Market Town, is a top tier settlement in the settlement hierarchy. Policy LP4 of the FLP identifies that March is expected to deliver 4,200 dwellings in the plan period of 2011-2031 (the single most of any settlement).</p> <p>Policy LP7 of the FLP sets out the policy requirements for Urban Extensions, of which there are four identified in March (with details about these Urban Extensions given in</p>

Ref	Name/Organisation	Policy/section of plan	Comments
			<p>Policy LP9). Policy LP7 of the FLP seeks for these Urban Extensions to be planned holistically to ensure that the benefits of scale can be realised, delivering the key infrastructure alongside the housing and other commercial development. The policy goes on to state that FDC will look to work with land owners / developers and other key stake holders to produce a Broad Concept Plan that would be approved by FDC to provide a framework for the delivery of the site.</p> <p>Policy LP9 of the FLP provides details about some of the main challenges for the urban extensions in March as well as highlighting some expectations of what will be delivered at each site.</p> <p>Policy LP6 of the FLP sets out the approach to retail and employment in Fenland including specifically in March and this includes the designation of the town centre and Primary Shopping Frontage and Primary Shopping Area.</p> <p>The FLP also contains a number of other strategic and non-strategic policies, against which development proposals will be judged.</p> <p>Following adoption of the FLP, in November 2014 FDC made the decision not to introduce CIL due to viability issues in the District, including in the main Market Towns. This decision was made principally as viability testing identified that viability is quite finely balanced for the scheme types and main locations (such as urban extensions in March) required to deliver the FLP. This work highlighted that sales values are such that they begin to support schemes, however, once other development costs are factored in, there is insufficient headroom for the substantial infrastructure contributions needed. This work shows that, with viability in the area being less favourable than elsewhere in the region, it is very important that significant burdens are not placed on potential developments that would deter developers from building in accordance with the strategic policies of the FLP. The Broad Concept Plans required by Policy LP7 of the FLP are not intended to be a detailed masterplan that would be overly onerous for would-be developers, but are instead intended to assist in the holistic delivery of the urban extensions, with partnership work with FDC and other organisations to create additional certainty for developers.</p> <p>It is in this context that the below comments on the MNP are provided.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p>

Ref	Name/Organisation	Policy/section of plan	Comments
			<p>FDC recognises the efforts that have gone into the March Neighbourhood Plan which is well presented and is generally a useful document to be used in decision making in March.</p> <p>However, FDC considers that some changes are needed to ensure that the March Neighbourhood Plan meets the Basic Conditions as required by regulations. These proposed changes will ensure that the draft plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Fenland Local Plan, that it has regard to national policy and guidance, and that it will contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. FDC considers that the plan, both in its current form and if the proposed amendments are included, does meet parts f and g of the Basic Conditions which require that it does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with EU obligations, and that other prescribed conditions have been complied with.</p> <p>It is considered that the proposed changes can be made to the plan without additional consultation being needed as they retain the general direction of the policies in the plan, but make changes, primarily to ensure clarity for the decision maker and also to ensure that sustainable development will come forward.</p> <p>The below assessment sets out FDC's comments on the submitted plan and provides recommendations for how the plan should be amended to rectify any concerns.</p>
		Policy H1	<p>The broad principle of this policy is supported, however, there is significant concern that, in its current form, the policy would prevent the delivery of sustainable development at the allocated urban extension sites and broad locations for growth. Given that viability in the district is finely balanced, it is important to avoid the risk of detracting from the delivery of these strategic sites.</p> <p>The policy, as worded, is inflexible and there is risk that parts of the policy would be undeliverable in its current form. It is recommended that a number of amendments are made in order to ensure that it meets the basic conditions and that it will be deliverable, providing clarity for decision makers and applicants on how it should be applied, as required in paragraph 154 of the NPPF.</p> <p><u>Recommended Changes</u></p>

Ref	Name/Organisation	Policy/section of plan	Comments
			<p>In order to ensure the plan meets the basic conditions, in being in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan, consistent with national policy, and that it does not prevent the delivery of sustainable development, the following changes are recommended:</p> <p>In part 2 of the policy the word ‘must’ should be replaced with the word ‘should’. This is an aspirational part of the policy, and should be worded as such.</p> <p>The wording of part 3 is overly restrictive and the Broad Concept Plan will not always be produced by the developer. As such, there is potential that this part of the policy will risk the delivery of the strategic sites. This part of the policy should either be removed, or be made more flexible to be clear that it is only indicative and that it need not constrain the delivery of the site. One possible rewording could be:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“The BCP should include an indicative phasing schedule to demonstrate potential time frames, and possible solutions for vehicular movement arrangements during construction of each phase.”</i></p> <p>Parts 5h, 5i, and 5j should be removed as these go beyond that expected from a broad concept plan and as such could prevent sustainable development on these strategic sites. These requirements are more appropriate to be considered at planning application stage.</p> <p>The last two paragraphs within the policy are not technically land use and planning matters and therefore fall outside the remit of a neighbourhood plan. In their current form they would be impossible to deliver as a planning application could not be refused if these requirements were not satisfied. However, they are aspirational goals and so it is considered that they could be included in a reworded form, for example:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“March Town Council should be consulted on draft BCPs throughout the production of the document, prior to submission to Fenland District Council. Following agreement of a BCP by Fenland District Council, if any substantial</i></p>

Ref	Name/Organisation	Policy/section of plan	Comments
			<p><i>changes are proposed, this should be the subject of proportionate community consultation.”</i></p> <p>In addition to these recommendations on this policy, it is considered that part 5c should be amended to be clear that they are indicative only and that at planning application stage more detailed evidence may indicate alternative solutions. For example:</p> <p><i>“c. It will identify potential locations for satisfactory primary and secondary access to the site that can deliver safe access with no significant effect”</i></p>
		Policy H2	<p>The principle of this policy is broadly supported, however, parts of the policy do not make it clear how it should be interpreted by decision makers as required by paragraph 154 of the NPPF. Other parts of the policy require minor amendments in order to be consistent with other national policy requirements particularly in paragraph 32 (in relation to part e) of the policy) and paragraph 100 (in relation to part d) of the policy). There are other parts of the policy which are not necessary to include and would benefit from being removed.</p> <p><u>Recommended Changes</u></p> <p>There is some conflict between part a) of this policy and policy LP7 of the Local Plan and, as worded, this would be unclear for decision makers. Windfall development by its very definition is not allocated, but if this fact is ignored, this part of the policy could undermine the delivery of small parts of the urban extension sites that are in accordance with a BCP and which would constitute sustainable development. As such part a) of the policy should be removed. This could be replaced, if it is deemed necessary, by an additional paragraph at the end of the policy to state:</p> <p><i>“Where a site for up to 9 dwellings is located within an allocated urban extension or a broad location for growth, it will be supported where it is in accordance with a Broad Concept Plan that has been agreed by Fenland District Council and would comply with the provisions of policy LP7 of the Local Plan”</i></p>

Ref	Name/Organisation	Policy/section of plan	Comments
			<p>In order to be in accordance with national policy, part d) should be amended by replacing the words “carried out” with “passed”.</p> <p>In order to be in accordance with national policy the wording of part e) should be amended as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“e) The proposal includes a safe vehicular access and it will not result in severe impacts on the road network taking into account any mitigation proposed;”</i></p> <p>Remove bullet point f) to remove duplication within the plan if policy H3 is retained. If policy H3 is removed as per the recommendation below, this could be amended as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“f) The proposal includes a mix of housing types and sizes to help meet local needs;”</i></p> <p>The last paragraph of the policy is unclear in how it would be delivered in practice as it is not considered that an application could reasonably be refused based on this not being satisfied. There is no explanation anywhere of what would be considered to be ‘appropriate and proportionate consultation’. Furthermore, as written, it does not require any comments to be taken into account in a proposal, and it would only be a box-ticking exercise that would lead to additional effort by developers with no requirement for action. This is an aspirational part of the policy, and should be worded as such, for example, the wording could be amended from ‘must’ and ‘will’ to ‘should’.”</p>
		Policy H3	<p>There is concern about this policy as it is in conflict with the affordable housing policy (policy LP5) of the Local Plan. If retained, it would also result in a severe lack of clarity over which policy should apply in a number of planning application scenarios. It also refers to Lifetime Homes which are now included in Part M of the building regulations.</p> <p><u>Recommended Changes</u> It is recommended that this policy is deleted.</p>

Ref	Name/Organisation	Policy/section of plan	Comments
		Policy TC1	<p>The ambitions of this policy are generally supported, however, there are a number of concerns about the policy's conformity with Local Plan policy LP6. Parts of the policy also do not provide sufficient clarity for decision makers and as such are not in accordance with paragraph 154 of the NPPF. Some other elements of the policy need to be revised in order to conform to local and national policy.</p> <p><u>Recommended Changes</u></p> <p>It is recommended that a number of parts of this policy should be amended as follows:</p> <p>The proposal for part a) of the policy is for non-retail use not to exceed 40% of the frontage. Paragraph 4.5 of this plan deals with the relationship of this policy to the Local Plan and suggests that the Local Plan would allow for a 49% loss. In fact the Local Plan, in paragraph 3.5.24, clarifies that the policy seeks to retain 75% in retail uses. It therefore appears that there has been a misunderstanding of the Local Plan policy. However, the justification for policy TC1 in paragraph 3.13 states that in 2015 61% of the frontage was in A1 use and so is already over the threshold of the Local Plan. Furthermore, this policy, as it is currently worded, would not be clear in terms of how the requirement for the percentage of the frontage should be counted – should this be in frontage length, number of shop units, floorspace along the frontage, etc. As a result of all of the above, this part of the policy should be amended to resolve these issues:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“a) it would not, in isolation or in conjunction with other non-retail uses or permissions, result in non-retail uses detracting from the retail function of the Primary Shopping frontage,”</i></p> <p>The proposed policy seeks to amend the Primary Shopping Frontage designated in the Fenland Local Plan. Whilst the changes are relatively minor, there is no clear justification for these changes in the plan and FDC does not agree with the proposed changes and has concern that these would undermine the strategic function of the designation in the Local Plan. If this map is retained, it would not be clear as to which frontage should be used in decision making as the provision of retail development is a strategic policy, but the neighbourhood plan would be more recent plan. As such, the map supporting this policy should be amended to show the Primary Retail Frontage of the Local Plan policies</p>

Ref	Name/Organisation	Policy/section of plan	Comments
			<p>map. Subsequent amendments to the justification wording would also be required to reflect this change, if made.</p> <p>In part b) of the policy it is unclear what is meant by ‘uses that do not complement the shopping function of the town centre’. There is no explanation in the justification text and as such this part of the policy would be very difficult to apply in practice. As such, it is recommended that this part of the policy should be deleted.</p> <p>At the end of bullet point c) it currently includes “and” in the list to suggest that all criteria should be applied rather than just one or some of them – this should be replaced with “or”.</p> <p>The wording in part 1 is somewhat unclear as it does not quantify what is meant by “vacant long term”. In order to be deliverable, the wording should be amended to “<i>it would secure the re-use of an existing unit that has been vacant for at least five years and/or has been neglected to the extent that it is having a harmful effect on the quality of the built environment; and/or</i>”</p> <p>In the last paragraph of the policy it refers to development outside of the “Primary Shopping Area”. In order to be in general conformity with the Local Plan and consistent with national policy, this should be outside of the “Town Centre”.</p> <p>Also in the last paragraph it refers to retail development outside of the Primary Shopping Area not harming the vitality and viability of the Town Centre. In paragraphs 26 and 27 of the NPPF it suggests that proposals which would likely have a significant impact on criteria including the viability and vitality of the town centre it should be refused. Furthermore, the Planning Practice Guidance refers to the importance of avoiding ‘significant adverse impacts on existing town centres’. The majority of out of centre retail schemes of 500sq m will have potential to cause some harm to the town centre. However, in order to be consistent with national policy, this wording should be amended to refer to “<i>unacceptable harm to the vitality and viability of the Town Centre</i>”. This would also be more aligned to the policy wording in policy LP6 of the Local Plan.</p>

Ref	Name/Organisation	Policy/section of plan	Comments
		Policy TC2	<p>There are no concerns about this policy in relation to it meeting the basic conditions or in terms of it being applied in practice. However, as it is currently presented there is some lack of clarity about Site 2 and Site 3 being located in separate boxes, which is not considered to be as clear as it could be for users of the plan.</p> <p><u>Recommended Changes</u> Separate this policy into three separate policies, one for each site, with the first paragraph in the policy box which provides details of the sites being relocated to outside of the policy box in the introduction, after paragraph 3.19.</p> <p>Furthermore, it would be beneficial to include a link to each map in the policies to bring them into the policy for clarity.</p>
		Policy OS1	<p>The goals of the policy are supported and it is considered to meet the basic conditions. However, the wording in the last paragraph does raise concern where it suggests that public access to wildlife habitats should be delivered where this is possible, appropriate and safe. There is some concern that this could result in the detriment of some habitats.</p> <p><u>Recommended Changes</u> It is recommended that a minor amendment to this wording would satisfy these concerns – by replacing the words “existing and new wildlife habitats” with “natural and semi-natural greenspace”, this would still achieve the goals of the policy without specifically stipulating access to habitats.</p>
MTC009	Fisher Parkinson Trust	Paras 3.4, 4.2 & 4.4, Policies H1 & H2	<p>The proposed Policy H1 is an over-elaboration of FDLP Policy LP7 and is completely unnecessary.</p> <p>Detailed proposals for the large development sites will be master-plan led through the preparation of a BCP in accordance with Policy LP7 of the Fenland Local Plan. The BCP will be prepared by landowners and/or developers for approval by the Fenland District Council in consultation with the March Town Council.</p> <p><u>Recommended Changes</u></p>

Ref	Name/Organisation	Policy/section of plan	Comments
			<p>Para 3.4 – Remove additional requirements for Broad Concept Plan. It is not the role of the March Town Council to impose planning conditions. The LPA can impose planning conditions which can be enforced on planning grounds.</p> <p>Policy H3 – Remove requirement to automatically provide affordable housing. Low cost housing can be delivered by other methods based on defined needs.</p> <p>Any requirement to provide a % of affordable homes must be linked to overall scheme viability in the context of the other infrastructure and S106 costs arising from the development.</p>
MTC010	Ian Hunter	General	<p>Could the Planning Committee please get active in solving the issue of the parcels of land ready for development between Gaul road and Knight`s End Road as numerous meetings with landowners and interested parties have taken place over the last 10 years and now the whole process is blocked by CCC demanding a school be built as part of the agreement/deal to have the land passed for development. Individual landowners could not afford that to come from their land sale for the benefit of others as that would be economically impossible. It is known that CCC hold a sizeable parcel of land within that designated zone and I would like to know why that land could not be used for the school building...its certainly big enough and accessible enough? As the land is not privately owned but part of the community assets anyway surely this is the most reasonable and sensible move to allow the land to be properly planned and developed thus going some way to satisfying the obligation to provide housing in this area which at current levels will never be achieved?</p> <p>Recommended Changes Allow small parcels of land to be developed to kick-start potentially larger developments and help the community housing shortages. Plus this will bring jobs and taxes to the town!</p>
MTC011	Brown & Co – Property and	H1(a)	We act for the owners of land to the rear of Wimblington Road comprising two separate fields of 17.45 acres and 5.26 acres respectively and which form part of the Strategic

Ref	Name/Organisation	Policy/section of plan	Comments
	Business Consultants LLP		<p>Allocation referred to as South East March. A plan indicating the location and extent of the land is appended.</p> <p>We are instructed to confirm that the land is available for immediate development and that meaningful dialogue is underway with house builders, other landowners and their agents.</p>