

PPWC – 22nd June 2017

Hi I'm Andy Dodsley – Chair of Little Easton Parish Council

The very least we should be looking for from this awful process of deciding which parts of our beautiful countryside are going to be concreted over is a level playing field in terms of the site selection process.

I've previously expressed my concerns to this committee over the bias against Easton Park in the Heritage Impact Assessments and to date have received no answers to any of my questions. It's clear that the way that the information is presented and the conclusions reached in the assessments shows a clear bias against Easton Park.

Why has a different approach been taken to the heritage assessments just for Easton Park?

Why in 5 of the assessments is the setting and contribution to significance listed separately for every heritage asset but not for Easton Park?

Why in 5 of the assessments is the impact and harm on every heritage asset and whether considered harmful listed separately for every asset but not for Easton Park?

Why in 5 of the assessments is the harm that new development would cause and how it could be avoided listed separately for every asset but not for Easton Park?

The Easton Park assessment groups assets together rather than list them individually and makes no assessment of the impact on each asset as has been done for the other sites using vague phrases like "the site features a variety of listed buildings"

Making the assessment so vague in comparison to the other sites, hides the total number of assets affected, diminishes the impact and harm of development upon each of the heritage assets and thus the overall impact of development across the site.

Question: Is the lack of a full detailed assessment just incompetence or does it show an approach that is intended to downplay the serious detrimental impact upon the heritage assets within Easton Park?

The conclusions in the assessments also have similar anomalies – For example:

In Gt Chesterford - 5 listed buildings and not in a conservation area results in a conclusion that :

“it is unlikely that the proposed scheme could be achieved without causing significant harm to the numerous heritage assets”

Whilst in Easton Park - 19 listed buildings, the listed Gardens of Easton Lodge and the site **does** fall within a conservation area results in a conclusion that “the scheme **could** be achieved on the site **without** causing substantial harm to the heritage assets”.

Question: Where is the evidence to support these differing conclusions?

Question: Are any Councillors prepared to ask or answer these questions?

You should be – Because you’re being asked to make a decision that will fundamentally change the face of our district for ever – Causing irreversible harm to our heritage assets.

I believe that you’re being asked to make that decision based on flawed information.

These heritage documents will form part of the evidence base for the local plan – If these papers are flawed – the evidence base of the local plan is flawed.

Future generations will not thank us for destroying our precious assets – even more so if the wrong decisions are made based upon pre-conceived ideas, agendas or misleading data.

There is still a debate to be had as we are assured that no decisions have already been made. I would therefore urge you to robustly challenge each and every assumption and conclusion made. This is the **only** chance you will **ever** get to do this.