

David and Jane Marchant

3 The Pines
Fulbourn
Cambridge
CB21 5HZ

3rd November 2014

Mr A Fillmore
Planning and New Communities,
SCDC, South Cambridgeshire Hall
Cambourne Business Park
Cambourne,
CAMBRIDGE, CB23 6EA

**Ref: S/2273/14/OL – Planning Application – Land at Teversham Road,
Fulbourn for 110 dwellings**

Dear Mr Fillmore

We write as residents of an adjacent property to the above application and **we strongly object to planning permission** being granted because:

- 1. The site has already been rejected recently by the council**, along with other rejections going back over the last 23 years or more. Should we even be getting involved, as we put our trust rightly in the council to do the correct thing?
- 2. Under the Emerging Plan, Fulbourn is to be a ‘Minor Rural Centre’** and this site fails the minor rural centre criteria which limit new development to 30 homes maximum. The developers are “trying to get a foot in the door” prior to this plan that has already undergone strict consultation.
- 3. Local green space must be protected.** The emerging policy in the Local Plan designates this site to be ‘Local Green Space’ and protected from development. As an example, this site backs on to Poor Well, which in turn is directly opposite Home Close, a care home. We know of several residents who walk up and down Cow Lane every morning passing this area. The backdrop of these Fenland fields, beyond Poor Well, creates the tranquillity that is what Local Green Space is about. The developers have neglected to show how their development would look, from this most obvious angle. The rural aspect to Cow Lane would be removed.
- 4. This site is not needed for the Councils to meet local housing targets.** We understand that the developers’ argument is spuriously implying that we have no 5 year plan approved, yet they again neglect to state that both the City and SCDC have joined forces agreeing a Memorandum of Understanding, which in turn does

provide for the total housing requirements. With The Swifts and the proposed Ida Darwin development, Fulbourn is already more than fulfilling its obligation for additional housing.

5. **The application provides for insufficient affordable houses.** It is plainly obvious from the Applications' Planning Statement words that this is going to be an expensive area to develop: *"assessment will be necessary to determine the level of affordable housing taking into account the 'abnormal' site development costs"*. This implies that high development costs may make affordable houses difficult for them to build, let alone local people on low incomes to purchase.
6. **The site has major technical problems including surface water flooding and high groundwater levels.**

Surface Flooding and Insurance

Our own house overlooks the proposed fields and in some years we have seen flooding and have photographs of the wet lands there. Cow lane is renowned for its aquifers, wells and springs that feed into this area, so building upon it does seem slightly illogical.

"The Pines" is a case in point, it is situated 1m below that of Cow Lane at a similar level to the proposed development and has its own sewerage pumping station to deliver upwards to Cow Lane. An obvious concern is with the additional houses on this land, unpredictable climate change and an ineffectual drainage system, that the land might not be able to deal with run-off water predicted, could cause flooding in the new Development as well as The Pines houses or sewerage systems.

A rhetorical question to the planning committee is: "Who is to maintain the developers proposed 3 ditches around the site on an ongoing basis?" There is no provision in perpetuity for the developer to protect or insure these or other properties for their potential losses.

I note that there are some houses in Teversham Road near the proposed access point that have difficulty in getting house insurance due to flooding and ground water – no doubt based on their postcode. Would individual houses in the new development be offered flood water protection insurance?

Boardwalks and Public Safety

The developer makes much publicity about the beautiful boardwalks, meadowland and ponds. In this day and age of the "compensation culture", who will maintain these boardwalks and bridges that will become slippery when covered in leaves in the autumn, or bad weather? Boardwalks would need regular upkeep, and if not could allow adults and children to slip off them into semi filled boggy waters. Again any public wooded path particularly near water would have to be lit at night for personal safety and possibly fenced – this would take away the rural character mentioned in point 3 above.

7. Fulbourn is full. The village infrastructure will be overwhelmed e.g. the school, the health centre, and the parking areas of the high street cannot accommodate yet more numbers.

Already we are seeing the High Street being jammed as more cars, have difficulty getting through, once delivery lorries stop in the middle of the street to unload, there is no way to get past them. For some reason, this point was not picked up in the Transport Assessments 1 or 2.

As I am sure you are aware, although it is not declared in the planning application, Fulbourn, through the centuries has become a radial village with all roads leading into the High Street. Congestion will indeed be exacerbated by more homes with associated vehicles. This is starting to be visible by the additional houses from The Swifts, and further proposed houses from the Ida Darwin sites, in the future, will not improve the situation.

Taking into account the current village infrastructure and that **Fulbourn is Full** then one would have to strongly disagree with point 3.9 in the Planning Statement, where the Site is NOT within a sustainable location in Fulbourn and does NOT form any logical extension to the urban form – indeed the opposite - it takes away the rural character.

Our conclusions show at least 7 clear planning aspects above that are being ignored by the developers in the rush to gain acceptance – particularly prior to and against the Emerging Plan. The site has been tested and rejected by many planning inspectors over the years.

Of course Fulbourn must develop, over the coming years, but please let it grow with a rural feel, in a controlled way and with the infrastructure that can match the population.

Yours sincerely,

David Marchant

Jane Marchant