21st September 2018 CAPL388544/A3/JD



Annette Feeney
Local Plan Programme Officer
c/o Huntingdonshire District Council

Pathfinder House St Mary's Street Huntingdon PE29 3TN

By email to: annette.feeney@huntingdonshire.gov.uk

Jonathan Dixon BA (Hons) MA MRTPI FRSA E: jonathandixon@savills.com DL: +44 (0) 1223 347069 F: +44 (0) 1223 347111

> Unex House 132-134 Hills Road Cambridge CB2 8PA T: +44 (0) 1223 347 000 F: +44 (0) 1223 347 111

savills.com

Dear Annette,

HUNTINGDONSHIRE LOCAL PLAN LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION - COMMENTS ON EXAMINATION DOCUMENT 'EXAM/04'

On behalf of our client – Catesby Estates Plc, we note from list of actions prepared following the Examination Hearing session on Matter 3 on 18th July, that the District Council was to prepare a update note (EXAM/04) on services in Key and Local Service Centres.

The list of actions circulated states that EXAM/04 was sent to you on the 13th August and circulated on 14th August. As discussed, we have been unsure whether comments on EXAM/04 were being invited by the Inspector as there was no mention in the notes or on the Council's website that comments were invited, or a deadline for the submission of comments. However, from our recent discussions we understand that the Inspector is taking comments on EXAM/04 into consideration, and thus, as agreed, we should therefore be grateful if you would pass the following comments on to the Inspector when he returns to considering this matter next week.

Comments on EXAM/04

The review of services carried out in EXAM/04 stems from it becoming apparent during the Examination Hearing sessions on Matter 3 that the Council did not have a complete and/or up-to-date understanding of what services were provided in which settlement.

Savills and other parties contended that this undermined the Council's approach to defining the settlement hierarchy as the existence, or not, of particular services was used to determine into which tier of the hierarchy a settlement might be placed.

As included in our Hearing Statement on Matter 3, in order for a settlement to be defined as a 'Local Service Centre', the draft Plan explains that the settlement must contain: a primary school, doctor's surgery, public hall, public house and convenience shop. Those settlements not identified as a Local Service Centre all remain identified as Small Settlements.

From the assessment of services carried out by the Council during the preparation of the draft Plan it was evident that Great Gransden had a comparable level of services to Bluntisham, which was identified as a Local Service Centre, yet Great Gransden was categorised as a 'Smaller Settlement'. We concluded that this was due to the assessment failing to record that the existence of health service provision in Great Gransden – all the other services required for categorisation as a Local Service Centre were recorded.







Although we were not sure of the reasons for the omission, we speculated at the Examination Hearing session that this might have been due to the health service provision in Great Gransden being provided as a branch of a GP practice based in South Cambridgeshire, rather than within Huntingdonshire.

We welcome EXAM/04 in that it now correctly records the existence of health service provision within Great Gransden and thus it is clear that Great Gransden has all the necessary services to allow it's recategorisation as a Local Service Centre. We are, however, concerned that the Council does not appear to be proposing the re-categorisation of Great Gransden as a result of the reassessment.

Should the Council not propose the re-categorisation of Great Gransden as a Local Service Centre, we would suggest that the Examination Hearing session on Matter 4 should be reopened to allow us and other parties opportunity to make the necessary oral representations to the Inspector.

We trust that the Inspector finds the above of assistance.

Yours sincerely,



Jonathan Dixon BA (Hons) MA MRTPI FRSA Associate Director

cc: Catesby Estates Plc