From: Keith Hutchinson

Sent: 14 January 2016 12:44 **To:** Programme Officer

Subject: Council follow-up work, Tilney St Lawrence

Dear Clare

We refer to the Council's follow-up statement regarding the issue of allocating the whole site (KGB Transport Site (779/780) at Tilney St. Lawrence, given the appeal decision and the brownfield issues on the site.

We are pleased to note the Council's response in Paragraph 2.1 to extend the allocation to include the remainder of our client's site, but we still remain of the opinion that the whole site should be allocated, rather than just the additional area. The permission granted on appeal by the Inspector is due to expire later this month and so technically it will no longer be a commitment. Even if it were still to be regarded as a commitment, there is no reason why the whole site should not be allocated, so long as care was taken not to "double-count" the potential housing numbers. Presumably, the same principle is being used by the Council with regard to the proposed allocated site at School Road, Terrington St. John (G94.1), which we understand now benefits from a planning permission and so is already a commitment. Whilst we agree the proposed allocation of our client's site would be an "effective" use of land, we see no reason why the allocation should be "set at a fixed number of dwellings to meet demand." We consider that assessment should be carried out at the detailed stage of any future planning application. The outline planning permission granted on appeal specifically related to "residential development" and whilst there was a plan showing a development of 23 dwellings, that was merely illustrative of how the site might be developed and it was clearly not a restriction on the final number that might be put forward in any subsequent application for the approval of reserved matters.

We welcome the Council's acceptance in Paragraph 2.3 that the remaining land is within the overall curtilage, none of the land is greenfield and "logic suggests" that the whole site should be used comprehensively for residential purposes.

We note the lack of 5-year housing supply referred to in Paragraph 2.4, but, bearing in mind the cost of an application, together with the previous costs of pursuing an appeal, our client is reluctant to proceed with an application on the total site without the comfort of a housing allocation.

We agree with the Council's comments in Paragraph 2.6 confirming that an allocation would be the preferred mechanism for bringing the land forward for development and we trust we can look forward to its inclusion in the list of Main Modifications when this is published.

Yours sincerely

Keith HutchinsonPartner **HUTCHINSONS**

Tel: 01480 861469 Mob: 07802 718960

Email: keith@hutchinsons-planning.co.uk

Hutchinsons, Planning & Development Consultants. 15 Castle Gardens, Kimbolton, Cambs. PE28 0JE