



### Site Submissions

Draft Fenland Local Plan

<b>Key</b>
 Site submission



Do not scale

© Crown Copyright and database rights 2022 Ordnance Survey 10023778

Date: 29 Apr 2022

## Major Criteria

<b>1. Site Availability</b>	Available for development in short term (0 - 5 yrs)			<b>A</b>	
<b>2.(i) Min. + Waste Team comments:</b>					
<b>2.(ii) Intrsects Min. + Waste resource:</b>					
<b>2.(iii) Min. and Waste policy area:</b>					
<b>3. Flood Risk - Vulnerability:</b>	More vulnerable				
<b>3a.(i) Main Flood Zone:</b>	>50% of site area in Zone 2			<b>C</b>	
<b>3a.(ii) Site area in FZ1:</b>	14%	<b>3a.(iii) Site area in FZ2:</b>	86%	<b>3a.(iv) Site area in FZ3:</b>	0%
<b>3b.(i) Surface Water Flood Risk:</b>	0% risk of surface water flooding (1 in 30 year event)			<b>A</b>	
<b>3b.(ii) 1 in 30yr event (area):</b>	0%	<b>3b.(iii) 1 in 100yr event (area):</b>	0%	<b>3b.(iv) 1 in 1000yr event (area):</b>	0%
<b>3c.(i) Intersects Historic Flood Map:</b>	No	<b>3c.(ii) Area intersected by Historic Flood Map:</b>		0%	
<b>4.(i) Prox. to hazardous apparatus:</b>	Does not intersect the Consultation Distance of hazardous apparatus; or intersects Consultation Dist. but HSE does not advise against development			<b>A</b>	
<b>4.(ii) Intersects HSE Consultation Dist:</b>	No				
<b>4.(iii) Intersects gas pipe buffer:</b>	No	<b>4.(iv) Overhead line on site:</b>	No	<b>4. (v) Pylon/tower on site:</b>	No
<b>5. Proximity to designated sites:</b>	2.01km - 5km from site			<b>B</b>	

## Strategy and History

<b>6. Settlement Hierarchy</b>	Small Village A			<b>D</b>
<b>7.(i) Planning History (Form B):</b>				
<b>7.(ii) Planning History Search</b>				

## Transport

<b>8a. Local road impacts:</b>	Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land			<b>D</b>
<b>8b. Transport team comments:</b>	Access visibility issues to overcome.			
<b>9a. Strategic Road Net. impacts:</b>				
<b>9b. Highways England comments:</b>				
<b>10a. PROW Opportunities:</b>	No PROW connection opportunities			<b>E</b>
<b>10b. PROW Team comments:</b>				

## Access to Services

<b>11a.(i) Proximity to public transport:</b>	Less than 5 min walk (< 400m)			<b>A</b>
<b>11a.(ii) Bus stops / rail in 5 min walk:</b>	Station Rd; Station Road			

11b.(i) Prox to medical services:	Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)	E
11b.(ii) Medical srvs in 5 min walk:		
11b.(iii) Medical srvs 5-10 min walk:		
11b.(iv) Medical srvs 10-15 min walk:		
11b.(v) Medical srvs 15-20 min walk:		
11c.(i) Proximity to shops:	Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)	E
11c.(ii) Shops within 5 min walk:		
11c.(iii) Shops 5-10 min walk:		
11c.(iv) Shops 10-15 min walk:		
11c.(v) Shops 15-20 min walk:		
11d.(i) Prox to primary school:	Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)	E
11d.(ii) Primary schs in 5 min walk:		
11d.(iii) Primary schs 5-10 min walk:		
11d.(iv) Primary schs 10-15 min walk:		
11d.(v) Primary schs 15-20 min walk:		
11e.(i) Prox to secondary school:	Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)	E
11e.(ii) Secondary sch in 5 min walk:		
11e.(iii) Secondary sch 5-10 min walk:		
11e.(iv) Secondary sch 10-15 min walk:		
11e.(v) Secondary sch 15-20 min walk:		
11f.(i) Proximity to employment:	Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)	E
11f.(ii) Emp area in 5 min walk:		
11f.(iii) Emp area 5-10 min walk:		
11f.(iv) Emp area 10-15 min walk:		
11f.(v) Emp area 15-20 min walk:		
12a.(i) Primary school catchment	Elm CofE Primary	
12a.(ii) Primary school capacity:	Spare capacity in every year	A
12b. Pri school capacity comments:	Elm CofE Primary is an Academy with an age range of 4-11 years. The school has a PAN of 30 and total capacity of 210 pupils. In 2020/2021 there were 129 primary aged pupils living in the catchment area. Forecasts show an upward trajectory to 152 in 2027/2028.	
13a.(i) Secondary school catchment	Thomas Clarkson Academy	
13a.(ii) Secondary school capacity:	Limited capacity	C
13b. Sec school capacity comments:	Thomas Clarkson Academy has an age range of 11-18 years. The school has a	

PAN of 240 and total capacity of 1200. In 2020/2021 there were 1337 secondary aged children living in the catchment area. Forecasts show a continuous upward trajectory to 1548 pupils in 2027/2028. Although the school operates at a PAN of 240 the LA view is that the physical capacity is closer to 300 and total of 1500 places 11-16.

## Land Quality

14a.(i) Prox pot. contaminated land: Site located more than 250m from potentially contaminated land

A

14a.(ii) Intersects landfill for DI:

14a.(iii) Landfill for DI 0-50m:

14a.(iv) Landfill for DI 50-100m:

14a.(v) Landfill for DI 100-250m:

14a.(vi) Intersects Site for DI:

14a.(vii) Sites for DI 0-50m:

14a.(viii) Sites for DI 50-100m:

14a.(ix) Sites for DI 100-250m:

14b. Env Health Officer comments:

15a. Agricultural Land Classification: 50% or more is Grade 1

E

15b. ALC percentage site area GRADE 1: 100% | Grade 2: 0% | Grade 3: 0% | Grade 4 or 5: 0% | Not agric. land: 0%

## Natural Environment

16a.(i) Prox to Local Nature Reserves: LNR more than 2.01km from site

A

16a.(ii) Prox to County Wildlife Sites: CWS more than 2.01km from site

A

16a.(iii) Site intersects CWS:

16a.(iv) CWS within 500m:

16a.(v) CWS 500m - 1km:

16a.(vi) CWS 1-2km

16b. Record of protected species on site: Yes

16c.(i) Highest quality habitats:

16c.(ii) Existing Grassland: No      16c.(iii) Grassland Buffer: No      16c.(iv) Grassland Stepping Stone Opp: No

16c.(v) Existing Wetland: No      16c.(vi) Wetland Buffer: No      16c.(vii) Wetland Stepping Stone Opp: No

16c.(viii) Extstg Woodland: No      16c.(ix) Woodland Buffer: No      16c.(x) Woodland Stepping Stone Opp: No

16d.(i) Goose and Swan IRZ      Site does not intersect Goose + Swan IRZ

A

16d.(ii) Requirements to consult NE: NULL

No wildlife concerns

16e. Wildlife Officer comments:

17.(i) TPO points:	No TPO point within 15m of the site	A
17.(ii) TPO area:	No TPO area within 15m of the site	A
<b>Heritage</b>		
18a.(i) Prox to Conservation Area:	Asset(s) more than 2km from site	A
18a.(ii) CA intersects site:		
18a.(iii) CA within 500m:		
18b.(i) Prox to Listed Building:	Asset(s) within 500.1 – 1000m of site	C
18b.(ii) Listed Building on site:		
18b.(iii) LB within 500m of site:		
18c.(i) Prox to Scheduled Monument:	Asset(s) more than 2km from site	A
18c.(ii) Sched Mnmt intersects site:		
18c.(iii) Sched Mnmt within 500m:		
18c.(iv) Sched Mnmt 500m-1km:		
18c.(v) Sched Mnmt 1-2km:		
18d.(i) Prox to Reg Parks+Gardens:	Asset(s) more than 2km from site	A
18d.(ii) Reg P+G intersects site:		
18d.(iii) Reg PG within 500m:		
18e.(i) Prox to Heritage at Risk:	Asset(s) more than 2km from site	A
18e.(ii) HAR intersects site:		
18e.(iii) HAR within 500m of site:		
18f. Conservation Officer comments:		
18g. Archaeology comments:		

## Site Visit

**Date / Time of Site Visit:** 17/02/2020 15:00:00

**1a. Accessibility: Is the site capable of being accessible to all users?:** Yes

**1b. Describe accessibility of site:** Access to farm building already exists onto B1101. Despite 40mph limit a very fast road with regular traffic. Proximity to cul-de-sac to east is potential highways access issue. 0.9m wide footpath exists. Reasonably frequent March to Wisbech bus service.

**2a. Good neighbour: Is the proposed land use likely to be compatible with neighbouring uses?:** Yes

**2b. Describe neighbouring uses:** 2 storey dwellings to east and west. Modern cul-de-sac with detached houses to east. 2 storey semi to west with sizeable garden including for part of the proposed site.

**3. Describe topography and lanscape:** Flat, slightly lower than the road . Within built-up part of the village.

**4. Describe layout, form, street pattern:** Rectangular site on busy B road. Most development to the west in main part

of the village has a linear frontage facing the road, although spur roads (including cul-de-sac to the east) are present in the village.

**5. Describe building types and features:** Agricultural store building on site. Detached dwelling in cul-de-sac to east are very bulky: more in keeping with an urban rather than rural environment and appear cramped close to the busy road.

**6. Describe site's boundaries:** Concrete wall and gates - 0.8m high - to front. Hedge to east side. Hedge and low fences to west. Garden planting and hedges to the north.

**7. Describe features / constraints:** Removal of agricultural building needed. Be building on large garden area. Speed of road traffic and close to cul-de-sac entrance.

**8. Describe views, sight lines or vistas:** Open countryside to the south but enclosed on three other sides.

**9a. Relationship to built form:** Neutral

**9b. Visual impact on wider landscape:** Neutral

**9c. Historic features:** Neutral

**9d. Justification:** Would be within built footprint of village. Agricultural building set back from road and as long as any new development respected this could be an appropriate site development subject to highway safety issues. 1 or 2 dwellings may be possible. No impact on known heritage assets.

**19a. Character + Place Score:** Development of site is likely to have a neutral / negligible effect on local character and sense of place (this may be subject to the development providing mitigation measures and/or meeting specific policy requirements).

C

**19b. Justification:** If designed with 1 or 2 dwellings which respects current openness of site and amenity of neighbours, and with suitable access provided, may be possible to justify for development.

**19c. Key considerations for policy:** Coldham has very few services, but is on bus route. Impact on neighbours. Loss of relative openness in this part of the village.

## Local Preference

**(i) Does Parish Council support site?:** No

**(ii) Reasons for support / object:** The Parish Council opposes all further development in the parish of Elm, as the villages of Elm, Fridaybridge and Coldham lack the basic infrastructure to cope with the increased population and traffic movements. The roads are inadequate and poorly maintained, the school is full and the character of the villages is being lost due to over-development.

**(iii) Parish Council site ranking (0-10):** 0

## Recommendation

**20a. Individual site score** Potentially unsuitable

D

**20b. Comments** Development of the site is likely to be constrained by lack of safe vehicular access as a result of poor visibility. The site is mainly located within Flood Zone 2. The village lacks local services and facilities. The site is located within the built area of the village and is a relatively small site surrounded by built development. A development of 5 or more dwellings would likely result in harm

to the character of the area.

---

## Major Criteria

<b>1. Site Availability</b>	Available for development in short term (0 - 5 yrs)			<b>A</b>	
<b>2.(i) Min. + Waste Team comments:</b>					
<b>2.(ii) Intrsects Min. + Waste resource:</b>					
<b>2.(iii) Min. and Waste policy area:</b>					
<b>3. Flood Risk - Vulnerability:</b>	More vulnerable				
<b>3a.(i) Main Flood Zone:</b>	>50% of site area in Zone 2			<b>C</b>	
<b>3a.(ii) Site area in FZ1:</b>	0%	<b>3a.(iii) Site area in FZ2:</b>	100%	<b>3a.(iv) Site area in FZ3:</b>	0%
<b>3b.(i) Surface Water Flood Risk:</b>	Risk of surface water flooding, see SFRA			<b>N/a</b>	
<b>3b.(ii) 1 in 30yr event (area):</b>	0%	<b>3b.(iii) 1 in 100yr event (area):</b>	0%	<b>3b.(iv) 1 in 1000yr event (area):</b>	1%
<b>3c.(i) Intersects Historic Flood Map:</b>	No	<b>3c.(ii) Area intersected by Historic Flood Map:</b>		0%	
<b>4.(i) Prox. to hazardous apparatus:</b>	Does not intersect the Consultation Distance of hazardous apparatus; or intersects Consultation Dist. but HSE does not advise against development			<b>A</b>	
<b>4.(ii) Intersects HSE Consultation Dist:</b>	No				
<b>4.(iii) Intersects gas pipe buffer:</b>	No	<b>4.(iv) Overhead line on site:</b>	No	<b>4. (v) Pylon/tower on site:</b>	No
<b>5. Proximity to designated sites:</b>	2.01km - 5km from site			<b>B</b>	

## Strategy and History

<b>6. Settlement Hierarchy</b>	Small Village A			<b>D</b>
<b>7.(i) Planning History (Form B):</b>				
<b>7.(ii) Planning History Search</b>				
F/YR14/0469/F: Conversion of loft to living accommodation including insertion of 4no dormer win... (Grant)				
F/YR15/0016/F: Erection of a single-storey rear extension with terrace above involving the inse... (Grant)				

## Transport

<b>8a. Local road impacts:</b>	Major infrastructure required to off-set safety or acquisition of third party land			<b>D</b>
<b>8b. Transport team comments:</b>	Access visibility issues to overcome.			
<b>9a. Strategic Road Net. impacts:</b>				
<b>9b. Highways England comments:</b>				
<b>10a. PROW Opportunities:</b>	No PROW connection opportunities			<b>E</b>
<b>10b. PROW Team comments:</b>				

## Access to Services

<b>11a.(i) Proximity to public transport:</b>	Less than 5 min walk (< 400m)			<b>A</b>
<b>11a.(ii) Bus stops / rail in 5 min walk:</b>	Station Rd; Station Road			



11b.(i) Prox to medical services:	Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)	E
11b.(ii) Medical srvs in 5 min walk:		
11b.(iii) Medical srvs 5-10 min walk:		
11b.(iv) Medical srvs 10-15 min walk:		
11b.(v) Medical srvs 15-20 min walk:		
11c.(i) Proximity to shops:	Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)	E
11c.(ii) Shops within 5 min walk:		
11c.(iii) Shops 5-10 min walk:		
11c.(iv) Shops 10-15 min walk:		
11c.(v) Shops 15-20 min walk:		
11d.(i) Prox to primary school:	Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)	E
11d.(ii) Primary schs in 5 min walk:		
11d.(iii) Primary schs 5-10 min walk:		
11d.(iv) Primary schs 10-15 min walk:		
11d.(v) Primary schs 15-20 min walk:		
11e.(i) Prox to secondary school:	Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)	E
11e.(ii) Secondary sch in 5 min walk:		
11e.(iii) Secondary sch 5-10 min walk:		
11e.(iv) Secondary sch 10-15 min walk:		
11e.(v) Secondary sch 15-20 min walk:		
11f.(i) Proximity to employment:	Greater than 20 min walk (>1,600m)	E
11f.(ii) Emp area in 5 min walk:		
11f.(iii) Emp area 5-10 min walk:		
11f.(iv) Emp area 10-15 min walk:		
11f.(v) Emp area 15-20 min walk:		
12a.(i) Primary school catchment	Elm CofE Primary	
12a.(ii) Primary school capacity:	Spare capacity in every year	A
12b. Pri school capacity comments:	Elm CofE Primary is an Academy with an age range of 4-11 years. The school has a PAN of 30 and total capacity of 210 pupils. In 2020/2021 there were 129 primary aged pupils living in the catchment area. Forecasts show an upward trajectory to 152 in 2027/2028.	
13a.(i) Secondary school catchment	Thomas Clarkson Academy	
13a.(ii) Secondary school capacity:	Limited capacity	C
13b. Sec school capacity comments:	Thomas Clarkson Academy has an age range of 11-18 years. The school has a	

PAN of 240 and total capacity of 1200. In 2020/2021 there were 1337 secondary aged children living in the catchment area. Forecasts show a continuous upward trajectory to 1548 pupils in 2027/2028. Although the school operates at a PAN of 240 the LA view is that the physical capacity is closer to 300 and total of 1500 places 11-16.

## Land Quality

14a.(i) Prox pot. contaminated land: Site located more than 250m from potentially contaminated land

A

14a.(ii) Intersects landfill for DI:

14a.(iii) Landfill for DI 0-50m:

14a.(iv) Landfill for DI 50-100m:

14a.(v) Landfill for DI 100-250m:

14a.(vi) Intersects Site for DI:

14a.(vii) Sites for DI 0-50m:

14a.(viii) Sites for DI 50-100m:

14a.(ix) Sites for DI 100-250m:

14b. Env Health Officer comments:

15a. Agricultural Land Classification: 50% or more is Grade 1

E

15b. ALC percentage site area GRADE 1: 100% | Grade 2: 0% | Grade 3: 0% | Grade 4 or 5: 0% | Not agric. land: 0%

## Natural Environment

16a.(i) Prox to Local Nature Reserves: LNR more than 2.01km from site

A

16a.(ii) Prox to County Wildlife Sites: CWS more than 2.01km from site

A

16a.(iii) Site intersects CWS:

16a.(iv) CWS within 500m:

16a.(v) CWS 500m - 1km:

16a.(vi) CWS 1-2km

16b. Record of protected species on site: Yes

16c.(i) Highest quality habitats: Woodland,Broadleaved,Plantation,(orchard)

16c.(ii)Existing Grassland: No 16c.(iii) Grassland Buffer: No 16c.(iv) Grassland Stepping Stone Opp: No

16c.(v)Existing Wetland: No 16c.(vi) Wetland Buffer: No 16c.(vii) Wetland Stepping Stone Opp: No

16c.(viii) Extstg Woodland: Yes 16c.(ix) Woodland Buffer: Yes 16c.(x) Woodland Stepping Stone Opp: Yes

16d.(i) Goose and Swan IRZ Site does not intersect Goose + Swan IRZ

A

16d.(ii) Requirements to consult NE: NULL

No wildlife concerns

16e. Wildlife Officer comments:

17.(i) TPO points:	No TPO point within 15m of the site	A
17.(ii) TPO area:	No TPO area within 15m of the site	A
<b>Heritage</b>		
18a.(i) Prox to Conservation Area:	Asset(s) more than 2km from site	A
18a.(ii) CA intersects site:		
18a.(iii) CA within 500m:		
18b.(i) Prox to Listed Building:	Asset(s) within 500.1 – 1000m of site	C
18b.(ii) Listed Building on site:		
18b.(iii) LB within 500m of site:		
18c.(i) Prox to Scheduled Monument:	Asset(s) more than 2km from site	A
18c.(ii) Sched Mnmt intersects site:		
18c.(iii) Sched Mnmt within 500m:		
18c.(iv) Sched Mnmt 500m-1km:		
18c.(v) Sched Mnmt 1-2km:		
18d.(i) Prox to Reg Parks+Gardens:	Asset(s) more than 2km from site	A
18d.(ii) Reg P+G intersects site:		
18d.(iii) Reg PG within 500m:		
18e.(i) Prox to Heritage at Risk:	Asset(s) more than 2km from site	A
18e.(ii) HAR intersects site:		
18e.(iii) HAR within 500m of site:		
18f. Conservation Officer comments:		
18g. Archaeology comments:		

## Site Visit

**Date / Time of Site Visit:** 17/02/2020 15:15:00

**1a. Accessibility: Is the site capable of being accessible to all users?:** Yes

**1b. Describe accessibility of site:** Existing narrow footway could be extended with engineered works. Access direct onto busy B road. Would be close to a very tight bend to the south east. Relatively frequent bus route through village. Bus stop within 150m.

**2a. Good neighbour: Is the proposed land use likely to be compatible with neighbouring uses?:** Yes

**2b. Describe neighbouring uses:** Existing cul-de-sac and edge of village is to the west. Extend village into open countryside. Conifer row to the east, open countryside to the north and south.

**3. Describe topography and lanscape:** Flat, 1.5m below road - steep bank.

**4. Describe layout, form, street pattern:** Busy, single rural road through village.

**5. Describe building types and features:** Prefab building on east part of site, otherwise open. Cul-de-sac to the west 10-

15 years old appear cramped on site and out of character with the village.  
Avoid replicating.

**6. Describe site's boundaries:** Large row of conifers to the east. Open to north and south. Hedges and fences to west.

**7. Describe features / constraints:** Significant works to provide access due to levels. Also restricted land and levels for new footway. Very fast traffic (despite 40mph restriction). Very tight bend to the east - previous accidents.

**8. Describe views, sight lines or vistas:** Long open views to the north and south, but to front (south) a line of mature trees provides some break.

**9a. Relationship to built form:** Neutral

**9b. Visual impact on wider landscape:** Somewhat negative

**9c. Historic features:** Neutral

**9d. Justification:** Would be same (bit less) extent i.e. depth of the existing cul-de-sac to west. Would encroach into open countryside and extend built development form of small rural village.  
No impact on known heritage assets.

**19a. Character + Place Score:** **Development of site will likely be detrimental to local character and sense of place (regardless of mitigation measures and/or meeting specific policy requirements).**

D

**19b. Justification:** Not in keeping with the overall rural character of the village despite cul-de-sac to the west.  
Extent of site development would impact on the openness of the countryside in this location.

**19c. Key considerations for policy:** Impact on village character and countryside, lack of services in village, highway safety. Large site, not infilling. Large number of houses possible - little justification in a village with no services.

## Local Preference

**(i) Does Parish Council support site?:** No

**(ii) Reasons for support / object:** The Parish Council opposes all further development in the parish of Elm, as the villages of Elm, Fridaybridge and Coldham lack the basic infrastructure to cope with the increased population and traffic movements. The roads are inadequate and poorly maintained, the school is full and the character of the villages is being lost due to over-development.

**(iii) Parish Council site ranking (0-10):** 0

## Recommendation

**20a. Individual site score** **Potentially unsuitable**

D

**20b. Comments** This site located in the small village of Coldham with few services facilities. The site is located 100% in Flood Zone 2. Potential adverse impact on open countryside.