

| Site ID | Site Address | Site Area (ha) | Settlement Hierarchy | Summary of comments from Public Consultation | Allocation | Justification (summary only) | Total housing |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|--|------------|---|---------------|
| Housing Sites | | | | | | | |
| H001 | Barnstock and Essendyke Sites | 3.95 | City | Overwhelming objection to this site. Includes general objection to all sites proposed in Bretton and overall levels of development. Majority of objections focus on loss of open space (Bretton Park), loss of ancient woodland and school playing fields. Concerns that local infrastructure will not be able to support new development, especially schools, if playing fields are lost. More people will increase the need for more open space. Size and shape of site not appropriate for housing and would lead to problems of overlooking. | Withdrawn | Site withdrawn form assessment process by Bretton 2010. | 208 |
| H002 | Marholm Road South | 1.08 | City | Overall objection for this site, some support for use as housing but would be more appropriate to remain in employment use. Main objections include: noise from trains; overhead pylons; loss of employment use; and poor access to community facilities as site is clearly separated from main residential area. Support for site as it meets requirements of Core Strategy; it is close to a number of bus routes; good access across railway bridge to Voyager school; and existing screening from railway line. | Rejected | Site rejected due to poor access to community facilities and shops. Also if site was allocated for housing it would result in a loss of employment land. Other issues include contaminated land which may affect the deliverability of the site, there is also an overhead power line running through site. | 46 |
| H003 | Bretton Industry | 4.59 | City | Slight objection to this site. Some support for use of site as housing but would be more appropriate to remain in employment use. Main objections include: noise from trains; overhead pylons; loss of employment; and poor access to community facilities as site is clearly separated from main residential area. Support for site as it meets requirements of Core Strategy and encourages redevelopment of disused brownfield site. It is close to a number of bus routes, there is good access across railway bridge to Voyager school and there is existing screening from railway line. | Rejected | Site rejected due to poor access to community facilities and shops. Also if site was allocated for housing it would result in a loss of employment land. Other issues include contaminated land which may affect the deliverability of the site, there is also an overhead power line running through site. | 172 |
| H004 | Watergall and Pyramid Centre | 3.36 | City | Overwhelming objection to the inclusion of this site as it could result in the demolition of existing properties. General consensus that pyramid centre is in need of significant regeneration, but not | Withdrawn | Site withdrawn form assessment process by Bretton 2010. | 136 |

| Site ID | Site Address | Site Area (ha) | Settlement Hierarchy | Summary of comments from Public Consultation | Allocation | Justification (summary only) | Total housing |
|---------|---|----------------|----------------------|---|----------------------|--|---------------|
| | | | | through demolition. | | | |
| H005 | Land North of Eyrescroft School | 1.46 | City | Overwhelming objection to this site, main concerns include: loss of play facilities (adventure play area) at Crofts Corner; loss of 2/3 of school playing field; loss of woodland; affects on the main pedestrian/cycle rout through Bretton. Local infrastructure could not support the development. Poor access to the site will constrain development | Withdrawn | Site withdrawn form assessment process by Bretton 2010. | 62 |
| H006 | Bretton Way Oak Tree Site | 1.38 | District Centre | Almost 50/50 split with one more comment in support than in objection. Support because site has been vacant for many years; preferable to employment use; and close to Bretton district centre. But many people suggest mitigation including, appropriate landscaping, respect of woodlands and Oak tree. Most comments want to see low density housing on this site. Objections: loss of employment allocation; balance of growth of housing with employment; loss of views of the open countryside; and archaeological remains have been reported on the site | Preferred allocation | | 69 |
| H007 | Ellindon and Pyhill Green | 1.27 | City | Overwhelming objection to any development on this site because it will result in loss of quality open space within Bretton Park and the loss of the paddling pool. Development would add to traffic and parking. | Withdrawn | Site withdrawn form assessment process by Bretton 2010. | 54 |
| H008 | Heltwate | 0.61 | City | Some support for this site as area is seen to be in need of regeneration including the improvement of the community facilities and shops in the area. However, overall majority of comments in opposition to the inclusion of this site. | Rejected | Site has been rejected due to deliverability issues. The site could form part of wider regeneration plans for the area for mixed use development. Development includes existing properties. The site does not need to be allocated if wider regeneration schemes come forward at a later date. | 26 |
| H009 | Land adjoining Watergall Primary School | 1.06 | City | Overwhelming objection to this site and the encroachment on to Bretton Park and associated loss of open space. Two comments in support both suggest that site could come forward as part of wider master plan/regeneration of Bretton. | Withdrawn | Site withdrawn form assessment process by Bretton 2010. | 45 |

| Site ID | Site Address | Site Area (ha) | Settlement Hierarchy | Summary of comments from Public Consultation | Allocation | Justification (summary only) | Total housing |
|---------|--|----------------|----------------------|---|----------------------|---|---------------|
| H010 | Bretton Woods Community School | 1.93 | District Centre | Some level of support for this site, however, the majority of comments are in opposition. Many of the comments in support are because the site is thought to already have planning permission for 150 dwellings. Many objections relate to school closure and loss of community facility. | Preferred allocation | | 143 |
| H011 | Land adjacent to Ravenside Retail Park Maskew Avenue | 3.42 | City | Objections due to access issues and poor links to local facilities. There could be issues with noise from the railway line. Further investigation into potential archaeological remains also required. Site should remain as employment or would be better suited for retail rather than housing. | Rejected | Site has been rejected due to poor access and links to community facilities, the site is separated from main residential area by Bourges Boulevard and is located close to railway line. Site is more suited to remain in employment use. Part of site is located within Minerals and Waste protection zone for transport, which is in place to protect potential future rail infrastructure. | 128 |
| H012 | Land off Bourges Boulevard, Maskew Avenue | 0.38 | City | Some support for use of site for residential development, but there are concerns relating to access. Several objections, including Sport England regarding the loss of open space. | Rejected | Site has been rejected due to deliverability issues. The site is currently in use as a well used community centre | 19 |
| H013 | Craig Street Car Park | 0.28 | City | Objections to this site due to car parking issues in area. There could be archaeological remain on site and this would require further investigation. | Withdrawn | Site withdrawn form assessment process. Now Considered as part of City Centre Area Action Plan | 14 |
| H014 | New England Complex, Lincoln Road | 0.74 | City | Objection to this site due to loss of community/social facilities and historic buildings considered to have important local value. | Rejected | Site has been rejected due to deliverability issues. The site is currently in use by a number of community organisations. Allocation would result in loss of well used facility. | 44 |
| H015 | Welland Allotments, Bluebell land | 1.58 | City | Majority of comments against loss of allotment area especially with the increasing demand for allotments in the city. | Rejected | Site rejected as it would result in loss of open space in an area of open space deficiency. If allotments are surplus to requirements site should remain as public open space. Site is also located within proximity of an area of critical drainage issues. | 67 |
| H016 | John Mansfield | 1.11 | City | Mixed response, concerns that there should be no | Rejected | Now considered as wider school site | 50 |

| Site ID | Site Address | Site Area (ha) | Settlement Hierarchy | Summary of comments from Public Consultation | Allocation | Justification (summary only) | Total housing |
|---------|---|----------------|----------------------|--|----------------------|---|---------------|
| a | School | | | overall loss in community facilities. Planning application outstanding for this site. | | | |
| H016 b | John Mansfield school building and playing field | 4.06 | City | | Preferred allocation | | 140 |
| H017 | Hereward Community College | 6.73 | City | Most comments refer to outstanding planning application on this site. Concerns about loss of school and loss of school playing field/open space. | Rejected | Part of site has been rejected as no longer available for housing development. Remainder of the site is being consider through H017b below. | 230 |
| H017 b | Hereward Community College | 1.15 | City | Most comments refer to outstanding planning application on this site. Concerns about loss of school and loss of school playing field/open | Preferred allocation | | 40 |
| H018 | St Augustines Walk/Oundle Road Allotments | 1.05 | City | Objection due to loss of allotment site. There is a high demand in the area. If development does go ahead there should be provision made on alternative site. | Preferred allocation | | 45 |
| H019 | Site off New Road Woodston (EH Lee Ltd) | 0.98 | City | Mixed response. Proposed use as a housing site is seen as more appropriate than current use. | Preferred allocation | | 41 |
| H020 | Peterborough WEB, Oundle Road | 2.66 | City | No objection or support only comments requesting more information. | Rejected | Site rejected on deliverability issues. In use as an employment site. Almost half of site located within flood zone 2, site more suited to less vulnerable uses such as employment. | 100 |
| H021 | Fletton Avenue/Whittlesey Road (adjacent to cemetery) | 0.69 | City | Mixed response – overall support for site however there are concerns relating to proximity to conservation area and the importance of high quality design if development goes ahead. | Preferred allocation | | 29 |
| H022 | Galvanising Works, Oundle Road | 1.44 | City | Support for site as it is located close to city centre. Concerns relating to flooding and poor access from Oundle Road. Mixed use development considered as more appropriate use than purely residential scheme. | Rejected | Site has been rejected because of deliverability issues. Site is in active use as an employment site with no current reason to relocate. Almost half of site is located in flood zone 2 so is more suited to development that is less vulnerable such as employment | 61 |
| H023 | Guild House, | 1.46 | City | Mixed response, concerns relating to the loss of | Preferred | | 62 |

| Site ID | Site Address | Site Area (ha) | Settlement Hierarchy | Summary of comments from Public Consultation | Allocation | Justification (summary only) | Total housing |
|---------|---|----------------|----------------------|---|----------------------|--|---------------|
| | Oundle Road | | | open space that fronts on to Oundle Road and how development would fit with the surrounding character of the area. | allocation | | |
| H024 | Land North of Wesleyan Road | 1.69 | City | Site already under construction. | Withdrawn | Site withdrawn from assessment process as it has now been built. | 72 |
| H025 | Lady Lodge Goldhay Way | 0.71 | City | Opposed to loss of Lady Lodge Arts centre and loss of community facility. Site should be retained as a community facility. | Preferred allocation | | 30 |
| H026 | Land in front of Matley Primary School | 0.59 | City | One objection and one informative received for this site. Site contains archaeological remains which should be investigated prior to any construction taking place. | Preferred allocation | | 25 |
| H027 | Land South of Oundle Road | 3.24 | City | Opposed to development as site forms an important gateway to city and should remain as open land. Access issues from Oundle Road. | Preferred allocation | | 122 |
| H028 | Land at Rose Court, Yaxley | 0.94 | City | Support for site allocation but concerns regarding access issues and potential ransom strip. Site is on the catchment boundary between the Environment Agency's (EA) Stanground Lode and the Commissioners' system. The site is outside the floodplain shown on the EA Flood Map and is not within an area shown to be susceptible to flooding. However both receiving watercourses are known to be close to capacity and are within the floodplain and in an area susceptible to surface water flooding. Both the River Nene and the Great Ouse CFMP would apply to this site. The Commissioners would require the provision of a FRA for this site. | Preferred allocation | | 27 |
| H029 | Orton Brick works South of Hampton Vale off London Road | 15.10 | Urban Extension | Site provides a logical and sustainable link to Hampton, however there are a number of concerns raised as the site is located adjacent to Orton Pit (SSSI/SAC) need to fully consider ecological impacts and mitigation measures. | Preferred allocation | | 453 |
| H030 | Woodston Point, Shrewsbury Avenue | 1.40 | City | One comment in support for use as housing. | Preferred allocation | | 60 |

| Site ID | Site Address | Site Area (ha) | Settlement Hierarchy | Summary of comments from Public Consultation | Allocation | Justification (summary only) | Total housing |
|---------|---|----------------|----------------------|--|----------------------|--|---------------|
| H031 | Land West of Hampton Vale "Triangle Land" | 6.47 | Urban Extension | Mixed response some support for site as it provides a logical and sustainable extension to Hampton and a better location for growth. However, there are a number of concerns raised as the site is located adjacent to Orton Put (SSSI/SAC). Need to fully consider ecological impacts and mitigation measures. | Preferred allocation | | 243 |
| H032 | Bus Depot, Lincoln Road | 0.50 | District Centre | General support for site because it is within the District Centre. Development could help to strengthen the centre, however, there are a number of concerns linked to access and traffic implications in the Millfield area. Site used as tram terminal, could be used if city installed new light railway system. | Preferred allocation | | 30 |
| H034 | Norwood Lane, Caravan Park | 1.93 | Urban Extension | General support for this site as it will link to the development at Paston reserve. A replacement site for Gypsies and Travellers would be required as there is already outstanding need. Concerns that the loss of a large site would increase demand in surrounding areas. | Rejected | Site has been rejected as it is in use as a Gypsy and Travellers permanent site. Loss of this site would require a replacement and would be contrary to RSS and Core Strategy. Part of site Allocated for Gypsy and Travellers transit site | 82 |
| H034 a | Norwood Lane, Caravan Park | 0.76 | Urban Extension | N/A | Preferred allocation | Existing Gypsy and Travellers site to be extended to include 10 transit pitches | |
| H035 | Land off Cathwaite | 0.67 | City | Concerns about the loss of open space and landscape; poor access to site; and noise from A 47. Suggestions that site may be better used for retail or leisure. | Rejected | Site has been rejected due to deliverability issues. There is no access to site or any realistic options to access the site. There are also likely to be issues with noise and air quality from A47. If this site was allocated it would result in loss of open space. | 28 |
| H036 | Honey Hill Primary School | 2.41 | City | Some support for this site especially if the PACT becomes redundant. However, there are still concerns regarding the loss of educational facilities, community use and open space. | Rejected | Site has been reduced to only include playing fields. Site H036a is now a preferred site | 90 |
| H036 a | Honey Hill Primary School | 1.68 | City | N/A | Preferred allocation | | 50 |

| Site ID | Site Address | Site Area (ha) | Settlement Hierarchy | Summary of comments from Public Consultation | Allocation | Justification (summary only) | Total housing |
|---------|--|----------------|----------------------|--|----------------------|--|---------------|
| H037 | Hampton Car Park, Westwood Centre | 0.44 | City | Agree with site unless it undermines vitality of existing Westwood facilities. Needs to preserve parking and views into existing scheme. May be better suited as a mixed use scheme. Disagree to site as it is too small and located too close to bus route. | Rejected | Now forms part of wider mixed use redevelopment site M020 | 19 |
| H038 | Hampton Court Shops | 0.55 | City | General support for development of this site; could be a mixed use scheme to incorporate the existing post office, pharmacy and GP surgery. | Rejected | Now forms part of wider mixed use redevelopment site M020 | 24 |
| H039 | Hampton Court Shops | 0.32 | City | Agreement for this site providing shopping facilities remain. Site should be used for mixed use development rather than housing. Car parking must be provided. | Rejected | Now forms part of wider mixed use redevelopment site M020 | 16 |
| H040 | PPDC, Cottesmore Close | 0.85 | City | General agreement that part of site is suitable for housing development provided that the former RAF officer mess is protected as it forms an important part of the city's history. It is suggested that site could be refurbished and used as a community facility. | Preferred allocation | | 36 |
| H041 | Fletton High Street Allotments | 2.73 | City | Object to loss of statutory allotment site especially as there is evidence of rising demand. Also concerns over poor access from Fletton Avenue. | Rejected | Now forms part of larger site H041a which incorporates sites H042 and site H047. | 102 |
| H041 a | Fletton High Street Allotment Land Combined Site | 4.12 | City | | Preferred allocation | | 0 |
| H042 | Fletton High Street Former Allotments | 1.04 | City | Object to loss of open space. Suggest site could be reused as allotment site especially as there is evidence of rising demand. Also concerns over poor access from Fletton Avenue. | Rejected | Now forms part of larger site H041a which incorporates sites H041 and site H047. | 44 |

| Site ID | Site Address | Site Area (ha) | Settlement Hierarchy | Summary of comments from Public Consultation | Allocation | Justification (summary only) | Total housing |
|---------|--------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|---|----------------------|--|---------------|
| H043 | Former Garages behind Coneygree Road | 0.42 | City | Mixed response to site. Objections to loss of car parking area and current access through site to allotments. The site is on the catchment boundary between the Environment Agency's (EA) Stanground Lode and the commissioners' catchment. The site is outside the floodplain shown on the EA Flood Map and is not within an area shown to be susceptible to flooding. However both receiving watercourses are known to be close to capacity and are within the floodplain and in an area susceptible to surface water flooding. | Rejected | Site has been rejected as access would be required through site to allotments; this reduces the net developable area and would result in the provision of 3 or 4 dwellings. This is below the site size threshold set as a housing allocation. However, this site could still come forward as a planning application and if approved would be classed as windfall development. | 18 |
| H045 | Land off Wessex Close, Tenterhill | 0.75 | City | Majority of comments objecting to the inclusion of this site because of flooding issues. Part of the site is located within flood zone 3 and would require sequential approach. Site may be acceptable if overall area is reduced. Concerns about loss of open space, and question whether the site could be used as allotments. | Preferred allocation | | 32 |
| H046 | 67 South Street Stanground | 0.32 | City | Site currently has outline planning permission. | Withdrawn | Site withdrawn form assessment process as site has been developed. | 16 |
| H047 | Former Fletton Goods Yard | 1.28 | City | Oppose site on grounds of poor access. Also site may form part of a wider habitat network complementing Fletton Lake CWS and other nearby valuable habitats. Question whether the habitat potential & value of this brownfield site been assessed. | Rejected | This site would be rejected if considered in isolation due to access issues and deliverability issues. However this site now forms part of wider site H041a which also includes sites H041 and H042. Access can be achieved through other sites making this site more deliverable in the future. | 55 |
| H048 | Roman and Saxon Court, Congsby Road | 0.76 | City | Opposition to the site due to uncertainty regarding what type of development would come forward on this site. | Rejected | Site not allocated for development. Any future development of the site would be considered against the general development plan policies. | 32 |
| H049 | Stanground Stables | 0.82 | City | Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009. | Preferred allocation | | 35 |

| Site ID | Site Address | Site Area (ha) | Settlement Hierarchy | Summary of comments from Public Consultation | Allocation | Justification (summary only) | Total housing |
|---------|---|----------------|----------------------|---|----------------------|---|---------------|
| H050 | Peterborough Road, Farcet | 0.82 | City | Object because site is located adjacent to former landfill site. Support is sites comes forward as part of wider site with H051, H052 | Rejected | Now forms part of larger site H137a, and combines H050, H051, H052 and H137 | 35 |
| H051 | Peterborough Road, Farcet | 1.36 | City | Object because site is located adjacent to former landfill site. Support is sites comes forward as part of wider site with H050 H052 | Rejected | Now forms part of larger site H137a, and combines H050, H051, H052 and H137 | 58 |
| H052 | Land adjacent to 197 and rear of Old Mill, Farcet | 0.94 | City | Object because site is located adjacent to former landfill site. Support is sites comes forward as part of wider site with H050 H052 | Rejected | Now forms part of larger site H137a, and combines H050, H051, H052 and H137 | 40 |
| H053 | Windsor Avenue | 1.97 | City | Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009. | Preferred allocation | | 84 |
| H054 | Land off Itter Crescent | 1.86 | City | Objection to loss of allotments, some support for use as a care home. | Preferred allocation | | 25 |
| H055 | Land at Foxcovert Road | 6.86 | City | Some support for allocation, other suggestions for use as open space and allotment land | Rejected | Site has been rejected as it falls within protection zone of gas pipeline. Allocation of this site would be against HSE advice. | 257 |
| H057 | Land at rear of 467 Fullbridge Road | 1.67 | City | Overwhelming objection to allocation of site, site should remain in use as allotments | Withdrawn | Site has been withdrawn from assessment process as it is now to be used for allotments | 71 |
| H058 | Land on North side of Mayor Walk, The Grange | 5.70 | City | Objection to loss of allotment site | Rejected | Site now based on application as shown for site H058b | 214 |
| H058 a | Land on North side of Mayor Walk, The Grange | 6.90 | City | | Rejected | Site now based on application as shown for site H058b | 259 |
| H058 b | Land on North side of Mayor Walk, The Grange | 5.01 | City | | Preferred allocation | | 173 |
| H059 | Land at the Grange | 2.50 | City | Objection to loss of allotment site | Rejected | Site rejected as site is to be used as allotment land and area to north H058b is to be developed for housing. | 94 |

| Site ID | Site Address | Site Area (ha) | Settlement Hierarchy | Summary of comments from Public Consultation | Allocation | Justification (summary only) | Total housing |
|---------|---|----------------|----------------------|---|------------|---|---------------|
| H060 | Railworld | 1.88 | City | Object due to poor access from river lane as well as loss of safeguarding site for railway. Support for development on derelict city centre site. | Withdrawn | Site withdrawn from assessment process. Now Considered as part of City Centre Area Action Plan | 112 |
| H061 | Rebus Software ltd, Thorpe Road | 2.32 | City | Object due to affects on setting of listing building and historic gardens. Also concerns about archaeological remains within site | Rejected | Site has been rejected due to deliverability issues and the loss of high quality employment site. Site is also located adjacent to Thorpe hall and any development could have an impact on the building and setting | 87 |
| H062 | Bretton Gate Sports ground | 5.49 | City | Objection to loss of sports facility including objection from Sport England | Rejected | Site has been rejected due to loss of open space /playing fields and loss of community facility. This site is not well connected to existing residential areas. | 206 |
| H064 | Tasman Caravan Park | 0.64 | Key Service Centre | Objection as site is in use as a caravan site | Rejected | Site is rejected as it is currently in use as a mobile home caravan park, this raised issues over availability and deliverability of the site particularly as the site was allocated in 2005 Local Plan. Part of site falls within flood zone 3b and Minerals and Waste consultation area. However, the site falls within existing village envelope. This means the site could come forward as a planning application if site becomes available in the future. More appropriate sites have been identified in the village of Eye. | 16 |
| H065 | Land off Thorney Road, Eye | 4.05 | Key Service Centre | Concerns relating to: nature reserve; transport infrastructure; and lack of infrastructure. | Rejected | Site now forms part of site H150 East of Eye Development Area. Combining sites H071 and H142 H149 | 91 |
| H066 | Land at Eye Green (North of A47) | 3.39 | Key Service Centre | Concerns relating to: impact upon nature reserve; safeguarding for road network expansion; and flood risk. | Rejected | This site has been rejected as larger site H075a has been identified as a preferred allocation, which overlaps this site. | 76 |
| H067 | Land South and west of Crowland Road, Eye | 0.99 | Key Service Centre | Concerns relating to: impact upon nature reserve; flood risk; and relationship with existing built form. | Rejected | Site has been rejected as almost half of site falls within flood zone 3, part of site may be suitable but there are still issues relating to deliverability as site | 25 |

| Site ID | Site Address | Site Area (ha) | Settlement Hierarchy | Summary of comments from Public Consultation | Allocation | Justification (summary only) | Total housing |
|---------|--------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|---|------------|---|---------------|
| | Green | | | | | was allocated in 2005 Local Plan and there has been limited interest in the site. There are also issues with access to this site. | |
| H068 | Banks Grain, Eye | 5.80 | Key Service Centre | Concerns relating to: relationship with existing built form; impact upon SSSI and nature reserve; flood risk; utility capacity; transport impacts; issues with access; and joining up with urban area. | Rejected | Site has been rejected as it is remote from main village, part of site falls within flood zone 3. Site is also located within close proximity to Dogthorpe Star Pit SSSI and the allocation of this site would raise objections from Natural England. | 130 |
| H069 | Hodney Road, Eye | 3.09 | Key Service Centre | Concerns relating to: relationship to existing built form; impact upon nature reserve; need to safeguard any potential to expand the a47; impact on road network; drainage and water pressure; flood risk; and joining up with urban area. | Rejected | Site has been rejected as it is remote from main village and part of site falls within flood zone 3. Site is also located within close proximity to Dogthorpe Star Pit SSSI and the allocation of this site would raise objections from Natural England. | 69 |
| H070 | Land off Crowland Road, Eye Green | 3.81 | Key Service Centre | Concerns relating to: relationship to existing built form; impact upon nature reserve; need to safeguard any potential to expand the a47; impact on road network; drainage and water pressure; flood risk; convalescence; ground water; and vulnerability zone. | Rejected | Site has been rejected as the site encroaches on to Eye Green Gravel Pit SSSI. The allocation of this site would result in objection from Natural England. The site is also considered too large a scale of development for village of Eye Green and would not fit with overall character of the village. | 86 |
| H071 | Cranmore Bungalow, Eye | 1.23 | Key Service Centre | Concerns relating to: impact on Eye Green nature reserve; impact upon road network; and flood risk. | Rejected | Site now forms part of site H150 East of Eye Development Area. Combining sites H065, H142, and H149. | 31 |
| H072 | Land at Eye (off Peterborough Road) | 4.46 | Key Service Centre | There are potential access issues. Proximity to the landfill site could require further assessment. Question relationship to the existing urban built form. | Rejected | Site rejected due to poor access to site which is separated from main village of Eye by Car Dyke. Also site falls within Minerals and Waste Consultation area. | 100 |
| H073 | Land adjacent to Dalmarak Group, Eye | 0.88 | Key Service Centre | Objections to the site include concerns regarding the relationship of the site to the urban area; impact on the nature reserve; and the importance of S10 (any sites coming forward should include adequate facilities); impact upon transport | Rejected | Site rejected as it is separated from main village. Although other preferred allocations H065 extended east of the village there would still be a significant gap between this site and the Village. | 22 |

| Site ID | Site Address | Site Area (ha) | Settlement Hierarchy | Summary of comments from Public Consultation | Allocation | Justification (summary only) | Total housing |
|---------|--|----------------|----------------------|--|----------------------|--|---------------|
| H074 | Edgerley Drove, Eye | 0.35 | Key Service Centre | infrastructure and any future widening of the A47. There are three references in support of the site. Objections raise concerns about flood risk; impact on landscape character (countryside); and the relationship with the urban area. | Rejected | Site is rejected as it falls within functional flood plain and is also within Minerals and waste consultation area. | 11 |
| H075 | Land South of Nature Reserve, Eye Green | 1.44 | Key Service Centre | Objections to the site include concerns regarding the loss of employment land, infrastructure capacity and potential flood risk. There are also several references to the impact on the local nature reserve and the ability of development to mitigate the effects. | Rejected | Site boundary has been reduced to limit any adverse effect on the Country Wildlife site. This is now shown as site H075a | 37 |
| H075 a | Land South of Nature Reserve, Eye Green | 2.44 | | | Preferred allocation | | 0 |
| H076 | Horlock Land, Station Road, Thorney | 2.27 | Key Service Centre | Objections to the site include concerns regarding the loss of employment land; infrastructure capacity and potential flood risk. | Rejected | Site rejected as a housing allocation as it is located within flood zone 3a. More suitable for less vulnerable uses such as employment. This allocation would result in loss of rural employment site. | 51 |
| H077 | Land off Gas Lane, Thorney | 6.87 | Key Service Centre | Objections to the site include concerns regarding the site being dependant upon other sites being allocated; loss of agricultural Greenfield land; and flood risk concerns. | Rejected | Site rejected as it is located within Flood zone 3a. There area also issues around deliverability as site is reliant on H076, H080 and M009 coming forward to provide appropriate access. | 154 |
| H078 | Site off Sandpit Road, Thorney | 2.79 | Key Service Centre | Objections to the site include concerns regarding the loss of agricultural land; negative impact upon the character of the village; the generation of traffic; and concerns regarding drainage capacity. There is also a mention of support, suggesting that the site fits better than others in the locality. | Rejected | Site rejected due to limited access, more appropriate sites identified within the village. | 63 |
| H079 | Site Adjacent to Dark Close and Park Crescent, Thorney | 1.60 | Key Service Centre | Objection to the site include concerns regarding the loss of agricultural land; negative impact upon the character of the village; the generation of traffic; and concerns regarding drainage capacity. There is also a mention of support, suggesting that the site fits better than others in the locality. | Rejected | Site rejected as 94% of the site falls with flood zone 3. | 41 |

| Site ID | Site Address | Site Area (ha) | Settlement Hierarchy | Summary of comments from Public Consultation | Allocation | Justification (summary only) | Total housing |
|---------|--|----------------|------------------------|--|----------------------|---|---------------|
| H080 | Site off Gas Lane, Thorney | 0.44 | Key Service Centre | Concerns relating to greenfield/brownfield, access, flood risk issues and traffic impact. Comment of support for the site, stating that it has good access to facilities in the village. | Rejected | Site rejected as over half of the site falls within flood zone 3a. There is also poor access to the site. | 11 |
| H081 | Land at Woburn Drive, Thorney | 3.41 | Key Service Centre | Loss of agricultural land and suggestion that contrary to the site description access to social and physical infrastructure is limited. Comment in support of Thorney being designated as a Key Service Centre and also suggests that the numbers could be expanded. Road network would be a constraint. | Rejected | Site rejected due to poor access to site. Could come forward with site H131 however this would result in a development that would be too large scale for the village. | 77 |
| H083 | Land South of Glington Road, Helpston | 2.05 | Limited Growth Village | Concerns relating to traffic, loss of agricultural land; and lack of community infrastructure and capacity in schools etc. Impact upon the character of the village, particularly the John Clare Heritage, drainage capacity and the difficulty of improving this infrastructure. There is no gas supply in Helpston. | Rejected | Site rejected due to limited access. More appropriate sites identified within the village. | 46 |
| H084 | Land Adjacent to 29 Maxey Road, Helpston | 0.32 | Limited Growth Village | Objections to the site. There are detailed comments on the extent of wildflowers and protected birds. Concerns relating to drainage, traffic, rail crossings, quantum of recently constructed houses. Impacts upon the conservation area (John Clare heritage), infrastructure capacity, economic climate, landscape impact are all raised as concerns. | Preferred allocation | | 10 |
| H085 | Land North of Glington Road, Helpston | 2.30 | Limited Growth Village | Major concerns regarding access off Golden Drop which is considered to be a narrow track and passes between two listed buildings; transport infrastructure; community facilities particularly school places and services; impact upon the rural settlement; drainage; lack of employment opportunities; railway crossing; and impact upon the overall character of the site. There are some concerns that development will be at a higher scale. There is also reference to the challenge of delivery in the current economic climate. | Rejected | Site rejected due to limited access. More appropriate sites identified within the village. | 52 |
| H086 | Land between Helpston Road | 0.42 | Limited Growth | A number of objections to this site, concerns relate to the impact on the character of the conservation | Preferred allocation | | 11 |

| Site ID | Site Address | Site Area (ha) | Settlement Hierarchy | Summary of comments from Public Consultation | Allocation | Justification (summary only) | Total housing |
|---------|--------------------------------------|----------------|------------------------|---|----------------------|---|---------------|
| | and Main Street, Alisworth | | Village | area; traffic impact; access; severe drainage issues; and the implications on the wildlife habitats. | | | |
| H087 | Clay Lane, Castor | 1.67 | Limited Growth Village | Comments raise concerns about the impact on adjacent County wildlife site. There is a suggestion that this site currently has outline permission. Archaeological remains remain a concern. | Preferred allocation | | 42 |
| H088 | Land at Clay Lane, Castor | 1.30 | Limited Growth Village | Comments raise concerns similar to the other sites in Castor, potential issues with physical and social infrastructure, character, and the cumulative effects of any further allocations in addition to site H087. There are specific references to the national importance of the potential for archaeological remains associated with the Roman settlement of Praetorium. | Rejected | Site rejected due to deliverability issues. The access routes to this site are not adopted highway this has affected the site coming forward. Also adjacent to County Wildlife Site. More appropriate sites identified within the village | 33 |
| H089 | Land at Clay Lane, Castor | 1.84 | Limited Growth Village | Comments raise concerns that the site is not a natural extension to the village. Concerns that the cumulative effects of this site combined with site, (H087) which has outline permission, would have negative implications on the character and capacity of the village. | Rejected | Site rejected as it is separated from main part of village by open fields | 47 |
| H090 | Land at Peterborough Road, Castor | 0.89 | Limited Growth Village | There are concerns that development on this site would not be consistent with the character of the village. There are also concerns regarding the access. Capacity in physical (water) and social infrastructure has also been raised as a potential issue. | Rejected | Site rejected as it is removed from main part of the village. More appropriate sites identified in the village. | 23 |
| H091 | Land Adjoining the Surgery, Glington | 1.09 | Limited Growth Village | There are some objections to this site with the main concern being how a new development in this location will be in keeping with the existing character of the village. Comments of support also reflect these reservations. There is also a specific concern about the loss of an adult education facility. | Preferred allocation | | 28 |
| H092 | No. 59 Helpston Road, Glington | 1.00 | Limited Growth Village | Main reason for objection is the proximity to the bypass and the implications of any access. There are also references to the proximity to the gas pipeline and the implications of HSE legislation. A | Rejected | Site rejected as it almost half of site is located within flood zone 3a. Site is also located within 600m of the gas compressor station. Allocation would | 25 |

| Site ID | Site Address | Site Area (ha) | Settlement Hierarchy | Summary of comments from Public Consultation | Allocation | Justification (summary only) | Total housing |
|---------|---|----------------|------------------------|--|------------|---|---------------|
| | | | | note of support considers that the site could easily mitigate any of the negative implications that arise in the assessment. | | be against the HSE advice | |
| H093 | Land Off Lincoln Road, Adjacent to Playing Fields, Glington | 7.54 | Limited Growth Village | Concerns relating to allotment land, traffic issues, quantum of housing, community infrastructure, frequent references to convalescence and the importance of maintaining a 'green wedge' between the urban boundary of Peterborough. There is also a reference of support for this site, detailing why it is the most suitable out of the sites. | Rejected | Site rejected as it is within 600m of the gas compressor station and would be against HSE advice. Access would not be permitted from the main road. Smaller area of site considered (H139) this is not within Gas compressor zone but rejected due to access issues. | 170 |
| H094 | Land South East of Glington | 17.53 | Limited Growth Village | Opposition to this site. Concerns regarding the loss of allotment land, convalescence and the importance of a green wedge, the lack of community facilities and the potential for archaeological remains. | Rejected | Site rejected as located within gas compressor zone and allocation would be against the advice of the HSE. The scale of development would not be appropriate for a limited growth village. | 315 |
| H095 | Glington Glebe Land | 38.95 | Limited Growth Village | Opposition to this site. There are a number of concerns featuring the prospect of convalescence, the proximity to the gas compression site, transport and school places. The site lies in an area of high flood risk and there may be archaeological features on the site. | Rejected | Site rejected as scale of proposed development would not be suitable for a limited growth village and would be contrary to the Core Strategy. Site is located within close proximity to gas compressor station and development would be against the advice of the HSE. Approximately 20% of the site is located within flood zone 3a. | 701 |
| H096 | Allotments, Wittering | 1.55 | Limited Growth Village | There is strong opposition to this site. There are references to the biodiversity on the site including sightings of Badgers and Long Eared bats. There is strong opposition to the loss of allotment land. There are also frequent references to the unsuitable transport infrastructure. Further issues including surface water flooding, and the lack of community infrastructure and services. | Rejected | Site rejected due to deliverability issues and access to site. Also objections on ecological and biodiversity issues. More suitable and deliverable sites identified within the village. | 40 |
| H097 | Land at Towns End, Wittering | 4.67 | Limited Growth Village | There is strong opposition to this site. As with the other sites in Wittering, there are repeated concerns regarding the impact of any further development on the road network. Other concerns include the loss of agricultural land, loss of | Rejected | Site rejected as half of site is within the explosion zone of RAF base; this limits access to the development. More appropriate sites identified in the village. | 105 |

| Site ID | Site Address | Site Area (ha) | Settlement Hierarchy | Summary of comments from Public Consultation | Allocation | Justification (summary only) | Total housing |
|---------|--|----------------|------------------------|--|----------------------|--|---------------|
| H098 | Land off Trent Road and Parker Road, Wittering | 19.56 | Limited Growth Village | allotment land, and capacity in the sewerage infrastructure; lack of employment in the locality, school capacity, wildlife, proximity to RAF base and the resulting noise pollution. The overall lack of community infrastructure is also a concern. Concerns relating to site access, transport, local amenities, archaeological interest, Sewage treatment capacity, schools capacity. | Rejected | Site H098 has been rejected due to large scale of development which would not be appropriate for a limited growth village. A number of options have been assessed. Site now allocated as H098e | 352 |
| H098 a | Land off Trent Parker Road, Wittering | 4.25 | Limited Growth Village | | Rejected | As per reasoning for H098 | 0 |
| H098 b | Land off Trent Parker Road, Wittering | 5.26 | Limited Growth Village | | Rejected | As per reasoning for H098 | 0 |
| H098 c | Land off Trent Parker Road, Wittering | 4.07 | Limited Growth Village | | Rejected | As per reasoning for H098 | 0 |
| H098 d | Land off Trent Parker Road, Wittering | 5.99 | Limited Growth Village | | Rejected | As per reasoning for H098 | 0 |
| H098 e | Land off Trent Parker Road, Wittering | 4.49 | Limited Growth Village | | Preferred allocation | | 0 |
| H099 | Willow Drive, Newborough | 0.47 | Limited Growth Village | Concerns relating to sewerage, departure from ribbon development settlement pattern, transport constraints, flood risk. | Rejected | Site rejected as lies within flood zone 3a | 12 |
| H100 | Peterborough Road, Newborough | 0.67 | Limited Growth Village | Opposition to the site, references to biodiversity including a barn owl, concerns over the loss of agricultural land and the departure from ribbon development settlement pattern. Flood risk is also raised as an issue. | Rejected | Site rejected as lies within flood zone 3a | 17 |
| H101 | Land South East of Newborough | 19.21 | Limited Growth Village | Opposition to the site, concerns include the impact upon wildlife including bats, importance of farmland, sewerage capacity, the level of facilities | Rejected | Site rejected as lies within flood zone 3a | 346 |

| Site ID | Site Address | Site Area (ha) | Settlement Hierarchy | Summary of comments from Public Consultation | Allocation | Justification (summary only) | Total housing |
|---------|---|----------------|------------------------|--|----------------------|--|---------------|
| | | | | and services, and transport infrastructure. There could also be flood risk issues. The representations drew attention to the potential for a gas main. | | | |
| H102 | St Martins Road, Newborough | 2.43 | Limited Growth Village | Opposition to the site. Concerns regarding flood risk, the loss of agricultural land, transport and community infrastructure. | Rejected | Site rejected as lies within flood zone 3a | 55 |
| H103 | St Martins Road, Newborough | 0.65 | Limited Growth Village | Strong opposition to the site. There are concerns over the loss of agricultural land and infrastructure capacity. | Rejected | Site rejected as lies within flood zone 3a | 16 |
| H104 | St Martins Road, Newborough | 1.87 | Limited Growth Village | Majority of the reps have concerns about the site. There are several references to a barn owl who frequently visits the site. The site is currently used as a field and not 'disused' as suggested in the description. There are also references to the limited capacity of the rural roads. | Preferred allocation | | 48 |
| H105 | Land rear of Gunton's Road, Newborough | 1.02 | Limited Growth Village | Predominately opposition to the site, however there is notable support. Four of the reps recognise this site as the most suitable (out of those in Newborough). | Rejected | Site rejected as lies within flood zone 3a | 26 |
| H106 | North St Martins Road, Newborough | 0.52 | Limited Growth Village | As above, strong opposition to the site. Main issues referring to the size of the development sites and the impact on the village. Concern about the impact on existing community. | Rejected | Site rejected as half of site is located within flood zone 3a. Remaining area would result in a scale of development that does not meet the minimum threshold of the Site Allocations DPD. | 13 |
| H107 | Land South of Maxey Road, Northborough | 1.31 | Limited Growth Village | As above (same comments have been copied and pasted to the sites) with the addition of concerns over the lack of facilities/services in the village. Also a concern about the cumulative impact of sites (H107,H109,H110) | Rejected | Site rejected as lies within flood zone 3a | 33 |
| H109 | Land Rear of Lincoln Road, Northborough | 6.71 | Limited Growth Village | As above (same comments have been copied and pasted to the sites) with the addition of concerns over the lack of facilities/services in the village. Also a concern about the cumulative impact of sites (H107,H109,H110) | Rejected | Site rejected as lies within flood zone 3a | 151 |
| H110 | Land South of B1162, | 4.73 | Limited Growth | As above (same comments have been copied and pasted to the sites) with the addition of concerns over the lack of facilities and services in the | Rejected | Site rejected as lies within flood zone 3a | 106 |

| Site ID | Site Address | Site Area (ha) | Settlement Hierarchy | Summary of comments from Public Consultation | Allocation | Justification (summary only) | Total housing |
|---------|--|----------------|------------------------|--|------------|---|---------------|
| | Northborough | | Village | village. | | | |
| H111 | Land Rear of Deeping St James Road, Northborough | 4.85 | Limited Growth Village | As above (same comments have been copied and pasted to the sites) | Rejected | Site rejected as lies within flood zone 3a | 109 |
| H112 | Rippons Drive, Northborough | 0.41 | Limited Growth Village | As above (same comments have been copied and pasted to the sites) | Rejected | Site rejected as lies within flood zone 3a | 10 |
| H113 | Land off Pingle, Northborough | 2.65 | Limited Growth Village | Strong opposition to the site. Issues include: loss of agricultural land, flood risk, local and wider transport concerns. | Rejected | Site rejected as lies within flood zone 3a | 60 |
| H114 | Land West of Pasture Lane, Northborough | 3.49 | Limited Growth Village | Strong opposition. There are concerns regarding many issues including the loss of agricultural land, flood risk, building on green field land, the potential for archaeological remains, co-ordination with the Core Strategy. There are further concerns regarding the local and wider implications of transport demands. | Rejected | Site rejected as lies within flood zone 3a | 79 |
| H115 | Land East of Pasture Lane, Northborough | 0.44 | Limited Growth Village | Strong opposition to this site: a lack of services, high flood risk, located outside village boundary, lack of sewage capacity, possibility of archaeological remains, impact on transport, local services all cited as reasons for this opposition. | Rejected | Site rejected as lies within flood zone 3a | 11 |
| H116 | Bainton Road, Ashton | 0.37 | Small Village | General opposition to the site; Reasons include site is outside the village envelope, would be better used as an allotment, Mature trees occupy the site, concerns about road capacity. | Rejected | Site Rejected as the Core Strategy does not propose any further allocations within Small Villages | 11 |
| H117 | Plants Eggs, Bainton | 0.96 | Small Village | General opposition to the site; Reasons include poor relationship to existing settlement, negative impact upon the character, appearance and setting of Baines conservation area. | Rejected | Site Rejected as the Core Strategy does not propose any further allocations within Small Villages | 24 |
| H118 | Land at rear of First drift, Wothorpe | 0.87 | Small Village | Objection to the site. Suggestion that the site would deliver very few plots. | Rejected | Site Rejected as the Core Strategy does not propose any further allocations within Small Villages | 22 |
| H119 | Croft Farm, Thornhaugh | 0.31 | Small Village | General opposition to the site. Consideration should be given to the conservation area. An amendment to the village envelope would be | Rejected | Site Rejected as the Core Strategy does not propose any further allocations within Small Villages | 9 |

| Site ID | Site Address | Site Area (ha) | Settlement Hierarchy | Summary of comments from Public Consultation | Allocation | Justification (summary only) | Total housing |
|---------|--|----------------|----------------------|---|------------|---|---------------|
| | | | | required. | | | |
| H120 | Manor Farm, Sutton | 0.44 | Small Village | General opposition to the site on the grounds that part of the site is outside the village envelope. There is also some support provided that there is careful consideration of the conservation area. | Rejected | Site Rejected as the Core Strategy does not propose any further allocations within Small Villages | 11 |
| H121 | Little Chef, Wansford | 0.46 | Small Village | General opposition to the site. Concerns regarding access and proximity to the A1. | Rejected | Site Rejected as the Core Strategy does not propose any further allocations within Small Villages | 12 |
| H122 | Land at Old Leicester Road, Wansford | 7.53 | Small Village | General opposition to the site. Reasons include; Site is not in proportion to existing settlement, site lies adjacent to SSSI and ecological effects should be considered. | Rejected | Site Rejected as the Core Strategy does not propose any further allocations within Small Villages | 169 |
| H123 | Werrington Bridge Road, Milking Nook | 1.50 | Small Village | Opposition to the site; Reasons include: out of context with the existing settlement (isolated site) and flood risk issues. | Rejected | Site Rejected as the Core Strategy does not propose any further allocations within Small Villages | 38 |
| H124 | Deeping Road, Peakirk | 4.57 | Small Village | General opposition to the site. Reasons include: remoteness of the site and conflict with Etton minerals extraction designation. | Rejected | Site Rejected as the Core Strategy does not propose any further allocations within Small Villages | 103 |
| H125 | Nos.75, 77, 79 Riverside, Deeping Gate | 0.37 | Small Village | Concerns about the detrimental impact on visual amenity and local services. Comments that development should be on Brownfield land. | Rejected | Site Rejected as the Core Strategy does not propose any further allocations within Small Villages | 11 |
| H126 | West End Depot, West End Maxey | 0.50 | Small Village | Objection states that the site would not conform with the Core Strategy | Rejected | Site Rejected as the Core Strategy does not propose any further allocations within Small Villages | 13 |
| H127 | Land North of Etton | 3.03 | Small Village | General opposition to the site. Reasons include; the site is too remote from existing settlement, located within Flood Zone 3 (high risk) and located within close proximity to high pressure gas pipeline. | Rejected | Site Rejected as the Core Strategy does not propose any further allocations within Small Villages | 68 |
| H128 | Briggs Farm, Willow Hall Lane, Thorney | 0.68 | Small Village | General opposition to the site. Reasons include; Remote location would increase car use, inadequate foul sewage capacity, access to A47 is poor. | Rejected | Site Rejected as it is located in Open Countryside, the site is not well connected to existing settlement and is therefore against National and Local planning Policy | 17 |
| H129 | Monkhams Hurn Road Werrington | 1.73 | City | General opposition to the site. Reasons include; the site being too remote from the adjacent settlement, encroachment into open countryside | Rejected | Site Rejected as it is located in Open Countryside, the site is not well connected to existing settlement and | 44 |

| Site ID | Site Address | Site Area (ha) | Settlement Hierarchy | Summary of comments from Public Consultation | Allocation | Justification (summary only) | Total housing |
|---------|---|----------------|------------------------|---|----------------------|--|---------------|
| | | | | and issues regarding access. | | is therefore against National and Local Planning Policy | |
| H130 | The Forge House, Great Road | 1.01 | City | Generally points of note are highlighted by statutory bodies; the site is within 1.km of Orton Pit; there is a need for "full and detailed evaluation of transport impacts on housing site"; and the site should follow standard brownfield contamination land process. | Preferred allocation | | 43 |
| H131 | Land of Whittlessey Road | 6.25 | Key Service Centre | Limited opposition to the site. Reasons include; increased traffic through the village and more appropriate sites within the village (e.g. M009).Advised of need for "full and detailed evaluation of transport impacts on housing site", and need fro detailed assessment of potential impacts on conservation areas and listed buildings. Site is within 4km of Nene washes designations. | Preferred allocation | | 141 |
| H132 | Land at Green Road/Woolfellhi Il Road Eye | 6.61 | Key Service Centre | Objections include, intrusion into the countryside, traffic impacts, unsustainable location, more appropriate locations available at Thorney. Advised of need for "full and detailed evaluation of transport impacts on housing site", and the site lies within 300m of Dogsthorpe Star Pit SSSI. | Rejected | Site rejected as part of site is located within in flood zone 3a. Site is located north of the A47 and not well connected to existing village and associated community facilities. | 137 |
| H133 | Land at 7 Heath Road, Helpston | 0.37 | Limited Growth Village | Widespread support, for a single dwelling, based on site being considered within the confines of the village and enhancing the approach to the village. Objection based on unnecessary and unsuitable extension to village envelope. Advised that site lies within 2.5km of Castor Hanglands SSSI. | Rejected | Site rejected as it is located in open countryside and not connected to existing settlements; this is against the Core Strategy. | 11 |
| H134 | Middle Road/Guntons Road, Newborough | 0.82 | Limited Growth Village | General opposition based on site lying beyond the village envelope and site H104 being preferred by the Planning Inspector. Advised that the site lies within Flood zone 3, is within 2.5km of Dogsthorpe Star Pit SSSI and is crossed by gas pipelines. | Rejected | Site rejected as lies within flood zone 3a | 21 |
| H135 | Field off Gas Lane, Thorney | 1.22 | Key Service Centre | Objections based on loss of allotment land, poor access, and more suitable site being available at M009. Advised that the site lies within flood zone 3; within 5km of Eye Gravel Pit SSSI; need for "full and detailed evaluation of transport impacts on | Rejected | | 31 |

| Site ID | Site Address | Site Area (ha) | Settlement Hierarchy | Summary of comments from Public Consultation | Allocation | Justification (summary only) | Total housing |
|---------|--|----------------|------------------------|---|----------------------|---|---------------|
| H136 | Land at Eyebury Road, Eye | 8.95 | Key Service Centre | housing site"; and to follow standard contaminated land process. Generally points of note are highlighted by statutory bodies; the site is within 1.5km of 4 designated (natural) sites; there is a need for "full and detailed evaluation of transport impacts on housing site". Concerns are raised that visual access to the primary school should be restricted. Objections based on the site intruding into the countryside, and support for the site being adjacent to existing services and complimenting the village boundary. The site is also crossed by gas pipelines.. | Rejected | Site rejected as lies within flood zone 3a | 201 |
| H137 | Land West of Peterborough Road, Farcet | 1.55 | City | Advised that the site lies within 2.4km of Orton Pit, is proximate to Stanground Nature Reserve and CWS, and that the site should consider sustainable transport links to amenities such as Great Fen in Cambridgeshire. | Rejected | Site now considered as part of wider area combining sites H050, H051 and H052. the boundary is show as site H137a | 66 |
| H137 a | Land West of Peterborough Road Farcet | 3.11 | City | | Preferred allocation | | 0 |
| H138 | Off penwald Court/Rear of 37 - 43 St Pega's Road | 0.54 | Small Village | Advised that; the site may have increased traffic impacts, poor access and detrimental affect on wildlife; social housing with amenity space and parking would be preferred; and that contaminated land process should be observed. | Rejected | Site Rejected as the Core Strategy does not propose any further allocations within Small Villages | 14 |
| H139 | Land off Lincoln Road, adjacent to playing fields, | 3.27 | Limited Growth Village | General opposition based on non accordance with the IGS and Core Strategy, site falling outside the village envelope, protecting the principle of non-coalescence, traffic impacts and gas protection zones. Support based on accordance with the IGS and Core Strategy. Advised that the site lies within 3km of Deeping Gravel Pits SSSI, and the capacity of the site to help deliver appropriate open space. | Rejected | Site rejected as there is limited access to the site | 74 |
| H140 | Hampton Court Shops and Garages | 0.75 | City | Advised that the site is within 1km of Grimshaw Wood LNR; and should follow contaminated land process. | Rejected | Now forms part of wider mixed use redevelopment site M020 | 32 |
| H141 | Broadweel | 1.98 | Limited | Strong objection to the site based on poor access, | Preferred | | 51 |

| Site ID | Site Address | Site Area (ha) | Settlement Hierarchy | Summary of comments from Public Consultation | Allocation | Justification (summary only) | Total housing |
|---------|--|----------------|----------------------|---|------------|--|---------------|
| | Road, Helpston | | Growth Village | detrimental impacts on school, residents and village character, the site lying beyond the village envelope, and the recent approval of a 43 dwelling scheme in the village which should be regarded as contributing sufficiently to rural growth targets. The Council have intimated recent growth is sufficient for the village; the site lies within 4km of Barnack Hills and Holes designated site. | allocation | | |
| H142 | Tanholt Farm, Eye | 37.32 | Key Service Centre | General points of note are highlighted by statutory bodies; the site is within 500m of a SSSI and adjacent to a PROW. Advised of need for "full and detailed evaluation of transport impacts on housing site", and need for detailed assessment of potential impacts on conservation areas and listed buildings. Objections centre on intrusion into the countryside, the scale of the development, and traffic impacts. Support is based on the scope of the development to deliver a critical mass necessary to deliver substantial sustainability benefits. The site is also crossed by gas pipelines. | Rejected | Site rejected as the scale is considered to be too large for the village. Small area now forms part of wider East of Eye development Area H150 | 672 |
| H142 a | Tanholt Farm Eye Part of H142 but a smaller site | 7.03 | Key Service Centre | Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009. | Rejected | Site rejected as it is considered too larger scale for village. Small area now forms part of wider East of Eye development Area H150 | 0 |
| H142 b | Tanholt Farm Eye Part of H142 but a smaller site | 2.64 | Key Service Centre | Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009. | Rejected | Site rejected as it is considered too larger scale for village. Small area now forms part of wider East of Eye development Area H150 | 0 |
| H143 | Land at rear of 39 Station Road, Thorney | 0.58 | Key Service Centre | Objections centre on poor access and availability of more appropriate site, M009. Advised of need for "full and detailed evaluation of transport impacts on housing site" and to follow contaminated land process. | Rejected | Site rejected as lies within flood zone 3a | 15 |
| H144 | 84 Eyebury Road, Eye | 0.98 | Key Service Centre | Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009. | Rejected | Site could link with Site H136, but not consider appropriate to deliver growth for the village. | 25 |
| H145 | Hurn Road Werrington | 14.46 | Open Countryside | Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009. | Rejected | Site Rejected as it is located in Open Countryside and against National and Local Planning Policy | 260 |

| Site ID | Site Address | Site Area (ha) | Settlement Hierarchy | Summary of comments from Public Consultation | Allocation | Justification (summary only) | Total housing |
|------------------------------|---|----------------|----------------------|--|--|--|---------------|
| H146 | Land at Junction of Lincoln Road, Deeping Gate | 5.80 | Open Countryside | Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009. | Rejected | Site Rejected as it is located in Open Countryside and against National and Local Planning Policy | 0 |
| H147 | Land North of Werrington Lincoln Road 1 | 5.76 | Open Countryside | Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009. | Rejected | Site Rejected as it is located in Open Countryside and against National and Local Planning Policy | 130 |
| H148 | John Mansfield remote playing field | 3.20 | City | Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009 | Preferred allocation | | 150 |
| H149 | Tanholt Farm Eye Part of H142 and H136 | 16.00 | Key Service Centre | Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009 | Rejected | Now forms part of wider East of Eye development Area H150 | 288 |
| H150 | East Of Eye Development Area | 18.42 | Key Service Centre | Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009 | Preferred allocation | | 200 |
| L001 | Stanground closed landfill site | 0 | City | Consideration should be given to nearby CWS, SSSI and SAC sites, and the Public Right of Way to the northern boundary maintained. | Rejected | Not considered necessary to allocate for these uses | |
| L002 | Showcase Cinema, Boongate | 4.035 | City | Consideration should be given to nearby SSSI, SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites. | Rejected | | |
| Mixed Use Development | | | | | | | |
| M001 | Land adjacent to Thorpe Wood House, Thorpe Wood | 2.48 | City | Recommendations for the site to be used for retail and hotel uses, and not housing. Consideration should be given to the nearby CWS and SAM sites. | Preferred allocation as an employment site | | |
| M002 | Land South of Eye | 19.28 | Key Service Centre | The site is supported for its location, suitability and sustainability credentials. Opposition is focused on coalescence and the loss of the Green Wedge. Consideration should be given to flooding issues and the use of the site for residential and business use. | Rejected | Site rejected due to the scale of the site and detrimental impact upon the existing settlement pattern | |
| M003 | Land South of Eye | 11.96 | Key Service Centre | The site is supported for its location, suitability and sustainability credentials. Opposition is focused on coalescence and the loss of the Green Wedge. Consideration should be given to flooding issues | Rejected | Site rejected due to the scale of the site and detrimental impact upon the existing settlement pattern | |

| Site ID | Site Address | Site Area (ha) | Settlement Hierarchy | Summary of comments from Public Consultation | Allocation | Justification (summary only) | Total housing |
|---------|--|----------------|----------------------|--|------------|--|---------------|
| | | | | and the use of the site for residential and business use. | | | |
| M004 | White Post Farm, Eye | 3.98 | Key Service Centre | Opposition focused on proximity to SSSI and CWS, coalescence, increased traffic, loss of amenity, below capacity utilities and flooding. | Rejected | Site rejected due to the scale of the site and detrimental impact upon the existing settlement pattern | |
| M005 | Land to the East of Woolfellhill Road, Eye | 6.21 | Key Service Centre | Opposition focused on proximity to SSSI and CWS, coalescence, increased traffic, loss of amenity, below capacity utilities and flooding. | Rejected | Site rejected due to the scale of the site and detrimental impact upon the existing settlement pattern | |
| M006 | Whitepost Farm East, Eye | 4.92 | Key Service Centre | Opposition focuses on the loss of open land. Consideration should be given to the nearby LNR and CWS, the viability of housing on the site is undermined by the A47 separating the site from the village. The site should be safeguarded for any future expansion of the A47 | Rejected | Site partially located within flood zone 3a, other sites considered more suitable to deliver employment land in the villages | |
| M007 | Eye, Thorney Road | 3.17 | Key Service Centre | Site is supported for its location, accessibility, sustainability and deliverability. The site is opposed due to its separation from the village. Consideration should be given to the nearby LNR and CWS. The site may require its own amenities, and may be suitable for small scale retail/business and residential. | Rejected | Now forms part of wider east of Eye Development Area H150 | 53 |
| M008 | Station Road, Thorney | 20.54 | Key Service Centre | Opposition focuses on the use of Greenfield land; maintaining the identity of the village; the disproportionate scale of the site on the village; the flood risk of the site; and the availability of more appropriate locations elsewhere. EA objects in principle on flooding grounds. Consideration should be given to the impact on the conservation area; and the possibility of a housing only site, with ancillary amenities. | Rejected | Site rejected due to the scale of the site and detrimental impact upon the existing settlement pattern. The site is also located within flood zone 3a. | |
| M009 | Land North of Wisbech Road, Thorney | 20.83 | Key Service Centre | Support came primarily from one respondent, highlighting location, access, sustainability issues, also pressing for site to be viewed as brownfield. Opposition focused on excessive size, disproportionate scale, negative impact on identity of the village and increased traffic. Consideration should be given to the conservation area, | Rejected | Site rejected due to the scale of the site and detrimental impact upon the existing settlement pattern. The site is also located within flood zone 3a. | |

| Site ID | Site Address | Site Area (ha) | Settlement Hierarchy | Summary of comments from Public Consultation | Allocation | Justification (summary only) | Total housing |
|---------|---------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|---|------------|--|---------------|
| M010 | Land at Market Deeping Bridge | 30.51 | Small Village | complementing existing community facilities and the suitability of just the western end of the site for housing. Strong opposition focused on non-compliance with the Core Strategy; costs of services/amenities will be born by South Kesteven DC; flood risk; loss of open countryside; and detrimental affect on Conservation Area. Most objections also relate to M011. Consideration should be given to connectivity with other settlements, and a full impact assessment required for effects on character, amenities and services. Support from Milton Estates. | Rejected | The site is remote from the urban area or villages, part of the site is also with functional flood plain | |
| M011 | Land at Market Deeping Bridge | 57.66 | Small Village | Strong opposition focused on non-compliance with the Core Strategy; costs of services/amenities will be born by South Kesteven DC; flood risk; loss of open countryside; and detrimental affect on Conservation Area. Most objections also relate to M010. Consideration should be given to connectivity with other settlements, and a full impact assessment required for effects on character, amenities and services. Support from Milton Estates. | Rejected | The site is located too far away from the urban area or villages, part of the site is also with functional flood plain | |
| M012 | Notcutts Garden Centre | 2.71 | City | Consideration should be given to nearby Local Nature Reserves | Rejected | Unclear what the landowner was seeking for the site. Council not promoting any alternative use other than as at present, but this does not prevent the landowner submitting proposals to the Council via the planning application process. | |
| M013 | Lovers land, Crowland road, Eye Green | 0.35 | Open Countryside | Consideration should be given to nearby SSSI. One objection based on remoteness of site from village envelope, one recommendation for site to be employment/office use to complement surrounding agricultural uses. | Rejected | This site is too small to be effective as a mixed use site. May come forward as a planning application. | |
| M014 | Horsey Grange | 29.11 | Open Countryside | Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009. | Rejected | Issues are finely balanced for this site; overall because this is an Urban extension, together with issues such as transport, habitats, archaeology | |

| Site ID | Site Address | Site Area (ha) | Settlement Hierarchy | Summary of comments from Public Consultation | Allocation | Justification (summary only) | Total housing |
|---------------------|--|----------------|----------------------|---|----------------------|--|---------------|
| M015 | Land North of Peterborough Werrington | 16.50 | Open Countryside | Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009. | Rejected | and uncertain linkage with the Regional Freight Interchange, the site has been rejected. | 0 |
| M016 | Land North of Werrington Lincoln Road 2 | 1.26 | Open Countryside | Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009. | Rejected | Site rejected as it is within 600m of the gas compressor station and would be against HSE advice. | 0 |
| M017 | Land North of Werrington Lincoln Road 3 | 17.95 | Open Countryside | Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009. | Rejected | Site rejected as it is within 600m of the gas compressor station and would be against HSE advice. | 0 |
| M018 | Land at Milking Nook | 32.98 | Open Countryside | Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009. | Rejected | The site is too remote from the urban area and key service centres. | 0 |
| M019 | Mancetter Square, Land at Lincoln Road, Peterborough | 10.90 | City | Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009. | Rejected | The site is rejected as part of the site lies within an area of a high probability of flooding (3a). The site is located within the urban boundary and may still come forward through a planning application | 245 |
| M020 | Hampton Court Shops. Includes sites H140, H037, 38 | 1.40 | City | Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009 | Preferred allocation | | 25 |
| Retail Sites | | | | | | | |
| R001 | Werrington District Centre | 3.76 | City | General support for the site. The car park should be removed from the boundary. Areas to the North and Southwest should be included. The boundary should be redrawn in line with the current planning application. The site could be designated for mixed use to include housing. | Rejected | Site already within district centre, not necessary to allocate for retail. | |
| R002 | Land off Bourges Boulevard, Maskew Avenue | 3.42 | City | The site is supported as a natural extension of the Brotherhood and Maskew Retail Parks; proximity to transport links; and broadening the retail offer. Strong opposition is focused on placing retail appropriately within the retail hierarchy; using the site for housing or rail uses; intensifying traffic problems and undermining the North Westgate | Rejected | Rejected - site not suitable for retail as outside designated retail centre and against Local and National Policy | |

| Site ID | Site Address | Site Area (ha) | Settlement Hierarchy | Summary of comments from Public Consultation | Allocation | Justification (summary only) | Total housing |
|-------------------------|--|----------------|--------------------------|---|----------------------|---|---------------|
| Employment Sites | | | | | | | |
| E001 | Oak tree site, Bretton | 1.38 | Urban and adjoining area | Use of the site for housing would be strongly supported, although some parties would prefer retail use. Respondents keen to ensure sensitive treatment of the ancient woodland and draw attention to the County Wildlife Site. | Rejected | The employment land review recommended that this site was de-allocated. No significant interest has been forthcoming since this study so the site is being considered for alternative uses. | |
| E002 | Stirling Way, North | 6.73 | Urban and adjoining area | The EA have objected in principle as part of the site lies in the functional floodplain (E003 may be used in conjunction to alleviate floodrisk to the site). General support from other parties. | Rejected | A large part of this site is within Functional floodplain, this is an absolute constraint. The site will be considered for safeguarding as a 'making space for water site'. | |
| E003 | Stirling way, extension | 5.22 | Urban and adjoining area | Objection based on incursion to open country. Site may offer flood storage to assist site E002. Development should not adversely affect the power station. | Rejected | Due to the E002 not being allocated, there would be no access to this site. The site is therefore rejected on deliverability grounds. | |
| E004 | Land at Dogsthorpe, (paston parkway/wellan d road) | 1.47 | Urban and adjoining area | David Locke Associates request to withdraw the site. Allocation can complement Norwood urban extension. Site is opposed for interfering with safeguarded waste site. Site is within 250m of Dogsthorpe Star Pit SSSI. Land may be contaminated; follow guidance in PPS23. | Rejected | The site is located within a Mineral and Waste Safeguarding area. | |
| E005 | Land at Dogsthorpe (Paston Parkway/ Peterborough Rd) | 1.72 | Urban and adjoining area | Opposed on grounds of coalescence. The site also received support because it is adjacent to a mix of commercial uses, has good access, and the allocation of Norwood sets a precedent for Green Wedge development. | Rejected | The site is located within a mineral and Waste safeguarding area; it also has an area of functional floodplain running down the South-Eastern boundary. This site was therefore rejected on deliverability grounds. | |
| E006 | Oxney South | 3.40 | Urban and adjoining area | No objections to the site, however any development should not adversely affect the power station. | Preferred allocation | | |
| E007 | Perkins North | 4.23 | Urban and adjoining area | Object on grounds of loss of facility, which is contrary to Sport England's policy and PPG17. Proposer suggests changes as laid out in representations document December 2008. Any development should not adversely affect the power station. | Preferred allocation | | |

| Site ID | Site Address | Site Area (ha) | Settlement Hierarchy | Summary of comments from Public Consultation | Allocation | Justification (summary only) | Total housing |
|---------|--------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|---|----------------------|--|---------------|
| E008 | Perkins South | 2.77 | Urban and adjoining area | Objection received on grounds of loss of the sport facility, which is contrary to Sport England's policy and PPG17. Proposer suggests changes as laid out in representations document December 2008. Any development should not adversely affect the power station. | Preferred allocation | | |
| E009 | First Drive | 2.22 | Urban and adjoining area | Proximity of site to Nene Washes requires any proposal for development to fully consider any ecological impacts and associated mitigation measures. Any development should not adversely affect the power station. Extensive consultation with council undertaken to determine appropriate additional information. | Rejected | Site rejected as located within Flood Zone 3. Other sites provide better scope for mitigation measures. | |
| E010 | Third Drive | 4.56 | Urban and adjoining area | Any development should not adversely affect the power station. Further information is required with regards floodrisk and proximity to the Nene washes. | Rejected | Site rejected as located within Flood Zone 3. Other sites provide better scope for mitigation measures. | |
| E011 | Oxney North | 7.88 | Urban and adjoining area | The eastern and western parts of the site should be treated differently in accordance with the archaeological interest on site. Any development should not adversely affect the power station. | Preferred allocation | | |
| E012 | Lynchwood (south) | 0.97 | Urban and adjoining area | No objections to the site, though as with all brownfield sites the EA requires further information with regards potential contamination issues. | Preferred allocation | | |
| E013 | Lynchwood (North) | 1.29 | Urban and adjoining area | No comments | Preferred allocation | | |
| E014 | Shrewsbury Avenue | 0.96 | Urban and adjoining area | No comments | Preferred allocation | | |
| E015 | Northam Works, Eye Green | 2.16 | Villages | Site is supported for being within the village envelope and for its good access, but should also be considered as a mixed use site in conjunction with H066 and H075. Opposition to the site based on proximity to Nature Reserve. Site should be safeguarded for A47 expansion. Site is within 400m of Eye Gravel Pit SSSI | Rejected | The site is located within close proximity to a county wildlife site. Other sites were considered more suitable to deliver employment land in the villages | |
| E016 | Edgerley drain | 17.08 | Urban and | Site is opposed because of its proximity to listed | Rejected | A Site rejected as it is within 600m of | |

| Site ID | Site Address | Site Area (ha) | Settlement Hierarchy | Summary of comments from Public Consultation | Allocation | Justification (summary only) | Total housing |
|---------|---|----------------|--------------------------|--|----------------------|---|---------------|
| | road | | adjoining area | buildings at Oxney Farmhouse, and its separation from the main urban area. Site is supported for its proximity to major roads, other industrial uses, and the power station and for being a more appropriate use of land on poor quality soils. The suitability of the site is affected by major gas pipelines in the vicinity. Any development should not adversely affect the power station. | | the gas pipeline. The site is also remote from the existing urban boundary and would have a detrimental impact upon the existing settlement pattern | |
| E017 | Station Road Thorney | 1.00 | Villages | Support for site as employment use to complement predicted housing growth in village. The parish council generally support the planning application for housing at H076 rather than having the site for employment use. | Preferred allocation | | |
| E018 | Regional Freight Interchange (Magna park) | 124 (approx) | Urban and adjoining area | Significant conflicting issues at stake. Negative impacts on locality set against broader benefits and wider suitability and sustainability factors, also potential for site to deliver sustainable local benefits. Further information required by various statutory bodies before support can be given. Key issues include; democracy (election of councillor who'd stated opposition); requirement for EIA; further flood risk information required; potential need for Appropriate Assessment; inclusion of freight navigation would be in line with RSS14; mineral extraction restoration proposals have been agreed; brickclay (mineral) is safeguarded; potential negative impact on archaeological features. | Preferred allocation | This site is being considered through the Core Strategy. The Site Allocations DPD defines the boundary of the site. | |
| E019 | Leedsgate Farm, former RAF Kings Cliffe | 1.90 | Villages | No comments | Rejected | The site is too remote from the urban area and villages | |
| E020 | Land off Lincoln Road (Glinton) | 14.2 | Urban and adjoining area | Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009. | Rejected | This site is rejected due to potential access issues and detrimental impact on the existing settlement boundary. | |
| E021 | Redbrick Farm | 30 (approx) | Urban and adjoining area | Site not consulted on at Issues and Option stage | Preferred allocation | | |

This page is intentionally left blank