

congestion at peak times. There are serious doubts that the analysis fails to take account of the correct peak hours in respect of queuing times or the effect of the queue back from the Twenty Pence Road junction with Wilburton High Street. Cross-reference should be made with the Mereham results as they refer to different rush hour results. Furthermore, the accident statistics for the junction of Wilburton Road with New Road do not reveal the full story, as they are simply those actually reported. There have been many more which are unrecorded on official records. There is no mention of the effect on the village of HCV traffic, particularly when the A14 is closed for some reason and diversions are in operation. No provision is suggested for foot or cycle traffic to connect with the rest of the village in a safe manner.

5. that the proposal directly contravenes our own "Village Vision" developed in conjunction with ECDC and makes a mockery of "localism" and local determination of priorities in respect of housing land allocation.
6. that there is no proven need for additional "affordable housing" in the village at present, especially since the recent approval for 24 houses off Northumbria Close.
7. that the loss of Grade 2 and 3 farmland is treated as though it doesn't matter much and it has no real farming value.
8. that the results of the "consultation" have been disregarded entirely and have made the process worthless as a consequence. The majority of the feedback has been against the proposal, but this has had no effect on their submission. It appears that it was going to be made regardless and the exercise in consultation has been a sham.

Motion carried unanimously.

13/01102/FUL Berry Fen, Dam Bank Drove, Haddenham (Amendment): The erection of one anemometer mast up to 61.5m in height, supported by guy wires and complete with instrumentation for a temporary period of 24 months. Amendment involves: Additional information received includes responses to RSPB and Natural England's comments.

Members of the public were again invited to speak regarding their views/concerns.

Cllr Bush proposed and Cllr Parr seconded that the Parish Council should return the following response:

The Parish Council would again recommend outright refusal of this application and all previous comments submitted still stand.

In addition they would also submit the following:

1. Haddenham Parish Council is concerned that although Mr Gary Oliver of SLR has attempted to follow the methodology proposed in the EIA Scoping Report for the wind farm, in order to assess the impact of this mast and has obtained the report from Dr Steve Percival as evidence, our parishioners dispute his conclusion. Specifically they believe that the assertion that swan flights in the vicinity of the mast might occur in 1 year out of 7 is inaccurate and misleading.

There are also concerns regarding the impact of development on breeding protected species such as Hobbies.

Given this major concern we would expect a full EIA to be provided.

2. We are concerned that REG has failed to carry out investigations suggested by the CAA in an email dated 7th January 2014 from Mark Smailes, Airspace Regulator at CAA to Penny Mills. We would ask that ECDC satisfy themselves in this regard.