

RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION REQUEST ON LOCAL PLAN

GREATER CAMBRIDGE PLANNING;- deadline 13 December 2021

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING A CALL FOR SITES SUBMISSION

HEYDON END 87 CHISHILL ROAD HEYDON SG8 8PN

REFERENCE 47352 (PAGE 404 OF HELAA APPENDIX 4B)

This is a consultation submission for this particular site from the landowners



POLICY CONTEXT FOR SUBMITTING ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IN RESPECT OF HEYDON END SITE, REF 47352

The proposed selection of sites from the Call for Sites proposals includes only 4% from the Rest of the Rural Area. This is despite the National Planning Policy guidance calling for 10% of sites to be local small scale sites. The fact that none of the “approved” sites are from what are currently infill villages shows that this Local Plan has not taken any opportunity to actually change the way that smaller villages are treated to make them sustainable.

In Heydon, there is the perfect example of such an opportunity to explore a more rural focussed development proposal, and a well documented appetite from the residents for some small scale development, with smaller properties on a site which will not impact on the village street scene, or broader landscape and which has environmental benefits.

The proposal for around eight small houses at Heydon End (47352) is such a site. It includes setting aside a significant portion of the site for tree planting, for screening, biodiversity enhancement, a community facility in an existing barn, it is well planned for solar and ground source heat pump renewable energy self -sufficiency, and provides an excellent platform for other sustainable innovations.

NEW INFORMATION:
SURVEYS OF LOCAL RESIDENTS ATTITUDE TO DEVELOPMENTS
SHOWS CONSIDERABLE SUPPORT FOR SMALL SCALE DEVELOPMENT
AT HEYDON

There have been two surveys of residents attitude to development carried out by the Heydon Parish Council. The first was in February 2021 asking about attitudes to the six Call for Sites proposals at Heydon, the second was in November 2021 asking about attitudes to more general development issues, in a Parish Plan format.

The results of the February questionnaire are available on the Heydon Parish Council website at heydonparishcouncil.com The most important table is reproduced below, with the scores for positive or negative attitudes to individual sites in the Call for Sites proposals at Heydon. I have added a column showing the proportion of responses which were neutral, positive or very positive.

“HEYDON PARISH COUNCIL HEYDON QUESTIONNAIRE FEBRUARY 2021 Question 1 Of the five sites put forward, are there any specific locations that you think are suitable for new homes/development (1-5 being very negative to the proposed development, 3 being neutral and 5 being very positive) ?”

SCORE	1	2	3	4	5	%3+4+5/ ALL SCORES (POSITIVITY INDICATOR)
Heydon Golf Course 1	45		1			2%
Heydon Golf Course 2	44		1			2%
Land south of Heydon Lane	32	11	3		3	13%
Land west of Fowlmere Road	30	8	4		1	12%
Land West of Chishill Road	33	7	3	3		13%
HEYDON END	29	3	9	3	6	36%

As can be seen, the proportion of neutral, positive or very positive scores was 36% for Heydon End (47352), whereas the average for the other proposals was 8%. Clearly, Heydon End (47352) would be selected as the most well supported proposal, with what is in fact a very high level of support for a residential development in any village, which is normally met with almost unqualified opposition as you will know from many such proposals.

Comments about Heydon End in the questionnaire included -

“Heydon End as it is the smallest of the proposed developments –most suitable

“Of all the six proposed developments only Heydon End appears to have any merit.”

“ This is the smallest of the proposed developments and as such would have the least impact on the village. Heydon End should be within the village envelope-only feasible site which could provide a small development. Edge of village with least impact on village infrastructure”

None of the other sites had any positive comments, and Heydon End (47352) stands out as having received significant positive sentiment.

In November 2021 a Parish Plan has was prepared for Heydon, with possible development as one of the aspects included in a questionnaire.

Important findings relating to development proposals are given in Q.15 Type of Residential Development Desirable or Acceptable.

Q15 -% OF RESPONDENTS SUPPORTING TYPES OF DEVELOPMENT

NO DEVELOPMENT	28%
SMALLER MARET HOUSING	42%
PREMIUM HOUSING	13%
AFFORDABLE LOCAL HOUSING	43%
LOCAL AUTHORITY/HOUSING ASSOCIATION	16%
SELF-BUILD PLOTS	33%
MIXTURE	20%

Only just over a quarter of respondents were against any development, nearly a half would support smaller market housing. This is remarkable degree of support for this type of development in a small village. And this is precisely what the Heydon End (47352)proposal would, uniquely, provide.

A further important table is given below;

Q16 – ACCEPTABLE SCALE OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT,

% SUPPORT FOR SCALE OF DEVELOPMENT

NONE	20%
INFILL/LINEAR	68%
SMALL (UP TO 8 HOUSES)	32%
LARGE (UP TO 20 HOUSES)	7%

The opposition to any development was only a fifth of respondents, and whilst two thirds were content with the existing infill policy, this does of course, and a third who would be happy to have smaller scale developments of up to 8 houses, which is of course just the type of development proposed at Heydon End.(47352)

So we have situation where nearly half of the village would like smaller houses, around a third would like developments of up to 8 houses, (from the Parish Plan|), and around a third are supportive of Heydon End (47352) proposals quite specifically from the February Questionnaire. This suggest that the site would be very acceptable to local residents.

HELAA ASSESSMENT BY GREATER CAMBRIDGE PLANNING PARTNERSHIP – CORRECTIONS AND FURTHER INFORMATION

The HELAA Assessment for site reference 47352 has no red flags except relating to Accessibility to Services and Facilities used in the HELAA.

Note that the Adopted Development Plan Policies issue assessment is amber, on the grounds that the site is “Primarily outside the Development Framework”. So the fact that some of the site lies outside the Development Framework does not render the assessment red, should mean for this HELAA assessment that the Accessibility to Services and Facilities standards is the same as for approving Infill

Sites, which do not require these exacting accessibility distances, . This would of course mean that the Accessibility to Services and Facilities assessment would be amber.

The Historic Environment Assessment is amber on the grounds that part of the property is within 100m of a listed asset and 100 m of a conservation area. Note that the actual area within the property that is proposed for development on this site is greater than 100m from listed assets and the conservation area. The existing house at the front of the property is the only part near to the assets and conservation area, and this is not proposed to be changed, hence there will be no effective change to the impact on the historic setting by the proposed development.

Accessibility to Services and Facilities assessment is given as red, but it is worth noting the actual distances to these facilities.

- The nearest school is at Chrishall, only 1,400 m away, with another at Barley only 3,000m away
- Distance to Healthcare Service at Barley is only 3000 m away.
- Distance to Rural Centre at Royston is 6,000 m away.
- Distance to Employment Opportunities with the King William pub and restaurant only 400 m away and Wood Green Animal Shelter site is only 300 m away, hence the assessment that Employment opportunities are “Greater than 1,800 m” is categorically incorrect.
- Distance to Public Transport is of course very low since there is regular bus service that passes by the property and a bus shelter in the village of Heydon.

So the conclusion that overall there is inadequate access to key local services, transport and employment opportunities is incorrect in that ignores a school barely outside the required distance, a health centre very close by, employment opportunities close by, and transport close by. There is also very active local church with community functions.

Contamination and Ground Stability Issues states that there is potential for historic contamination. The site has been an low intensity agriculture, and now a paddock, so has had low key land use with no contamination history, and nothing specific is given in this assessment to justify and potential for historic contamination.

Constraints to development issue state that a Public Right of Way is on or crosses the site. This is completely wrong. The map used for the HELAA assessment is the planning map used by South Cambridgeshire District Council, and this seems to indicate about 6m of footpath crossing the very south east end of the site. However the Cambridgeshire County Council definitive map shows that the actual line of the footpath is outside the property. If the HELAA assessment had looked at the actual line of the footpath, they would have seen that it passes southeast of pond feature shown on the map, and that the boundary of the site is lies to the northwest of the pond feature. This is also confirmed by the land registry boundary of the site, showing that the boundary of the site does not include the area shown as pond with a footpath. It should be noted that the shaded area shown as pond on the definitive map is no longer a pond. Also the fence line of the site is northwest of the footpath and has always been there. So there is no constraint relating to a footpath or other right of way.

SUMMARY

My consultation response is that the exclusion of current infill villages from any call for sites approvals shows a lack of bold thinking about how to sensitively and sustainably help to give new life to any of the smaller villages. There should be some opportunities taken to treat infill villages differently from the current approach. At the very least, there should be some pilot test schemes to try out something new.

As I have explained above the Call for Sites proposal for Heydon End, reference 47352, and at page 404 in HELAA appendix 4b, provides just such a perfect opportunity to embrace small scale local development. Not only is the site good for this purpose in itself, but also there is sufficient support for this type of development, and Heydon End specifically shown in the two Parish Council surveys. And there is sufficient new information, correction, and clarification provided to the HELAA assessment for Heydon End to be reconsidered and approved for the next stage of consideration.