

Dear Mrs Makant.

POLICIES SS 3.9 AND SSS 3.7.

1. In accordance with your request to be advised of any queries or concerns regarding the Local Plan, Country Watch (CW) has some concerns with the content of the Statement of Common Ground (SofCG) for Policies SS 3.9 and SS 3.7 which were published on 28th August 2015, ref PS/02/40, and PS/02/41. CW must express our concern that the Local Plan has taken several years including items most recently such as Statements of Common Ground. The deadline for submission of appearance statements has been publicized for several months yet the two SofCGs only appeared on the web site on the 28th August - which is not available to many people. This allowed inadequate time for consultation/consideration by respondents to meet the Programme Officers required deadline of the 4th September. Nevertheless we are making the following interim comments on Policies SS 3.9 and SS 3.7.

2. In relation to both sites CW sees no obvious reason on the proposed inset maps, the attendant appendices 2 and 3, or their keys, or in the SofCGs, to justify removal of our principle objection to the allocation of both sites in the Local Plan, and to our OBJECTION that the site is unjustifiably too large for the 450 homes proposed in the Local Plan.

POLICY SS 3.9 - INSET MAP.

3. There is no indication that appendix 3 constraints map will be included in the Local Plan text together with the inset map. CW REQUESTS that the pollution control limits and the extent of the BPA and the flood zones 2 & 3 be included, within the site, in the inset map, to match the specification para 6.6 of the SofCG.

4. CW REQUEST that the appendix 3 constraints map be included in the Local Plan, preferably next to the inset map.

5. There is a discrepancy between the proposed phase 1 residential development area in the inset map (appendix 1) and the HCC revised illustrative masterplan (appendix 2) in that both appendices claim that the different sized areas will produce 450 dwellings. This is because residential areas North of Whitmarsh Lane in the inset map and the HCC masterplan do not match. If the constraints map appendix 3 "approx outer extent of odour constraint" is to be effective then the eastern section of the two fields North of Whitmarsh Lane would need to be excluded from the inset map.

6. If there should not be within the Plan period, as indicated by a star in the inset map, a school, then that would release land as one possibility for residential development which in CW's opinion should be counted towards the proposed 450 dwellings proposed for the site.

POLICY SS 3.9. TEXT.

7. Para. 7.22 final sentence states that the Environment Agency (EA) has raised no objection on Policy SS 3.9, which is correct. However this gives a false impression as in response to the 2008 SHLAA consultation they objected to the development and recommended its removal, and in response to the 2010 SHLAA consultation they stated the site continues to be considered high risk. CW REQUESTS that the previous recommendation and response from the EA be added to para 7.22.

POLICY SS 3.7. INSET MAP.

8. The comments on Policy SS 3.9 inset map, detailed above, are also relevant to Policy SS 3.7.

9. Appendix 2 draft layout does not include definition or indication of use in the map, in the key, or in the SofCG of approx 25+% of land comprising the eastern section of SS 3.7. The possibility therefore exists for any future change of circumstances, e.g. new development to the East or South of the site, to create pressure for development on this section. CW believe that this section should be deleted from the proposed SS 3.7 site.

Regards

H E Mansfield
For Chairman Country Watch