

Robert Culshaw
Piney Lodge
66 Cow Lane
Fulbourn
Cambridge CB21 5HB

29 October 2014

Planning & New Communities
South Cambridgeshire District Council
South Cambridgeshire Hall
Cambourne Business Park
Cambourne
Cambridge
CB23 6EA

Dear Sirs,

**PLANNING APPLICATION S/2273/14/OL LAND AT TEVERSHAM ROAD,
FULBOURN (Site 162)**

I object to this planning application.

My main reason is that Site 162 is not suitable for housing. Previous applications have, correctly been refused. These fields have always been prone to flooding, because the water table is very high. Building here would increase the flood risk for Poor Well (immediately adjacent) and for nearby properties including mine on Cow Lane. Castlefield's own engineers have admitted that the site is "exceptionally difficult", and the extreme measures they propose to mitigate the flood risks - boardwalks, raised foundations, large open drains etc - show how risky it would be to put a housing estate here. Future maintenance of such vulnerable facilities could not be guaranteed, since neither they nor the estate roads would be the responsibility of the Council. In all these ways, Site 162 fails the criteria for sustainable development. I note also (as a former Deputy Director of the British Antarctic Survey) that the impact of future climate change will include more instances of extreme weather and a higher risk of flooding: knowing this, it would be irresponsible now to build on fields which already flood, relying on artificial and unproven counter-measures.

I strongly support the proposed designation of Local Green Space for these fields (Policy NH/12). Together with Poor Well, they are a valuable green amenity for Fulbourn, adding greatly to the village's rural character. There are good reasons why this part of the village, with its historic horse pond, has been classified as a Conservation Area. Poor Well and Site 162 are used every day by many local people, including children (sometimes whole classes, from school). They also provide an open outlook and a peaceful natural environment for the residents of Home Close, the care home directly opposite: lack of mobility makes this particularly valuable for these old people, who can enjoy the wildlife and the changing of the seasons.

The wider impacts on Fulbourn of any development of Site 162 would be very serious, coming on top of the expansion of The Swifts and the likely provision of new housing at Ida Darwin. Cow Lane is not appropriate for increased traffic, and village facilities such as the Health Centre and the primary school are fully stretched. I support Minor Rural Centre status for Fulbourn (Policy S/9), as matching the limited facilities which the village has (there is, for example, no longer a full Post Office here).

I have organised an independent ecological survey of this site which shows the potential loss of habitat to be more serious than the Castlefield documents suggest. I note that they provide no comprehensive Environmental Impact Assessment.

The proposed development, with its abnormal infrastructure costs, does not and probably cannot provide affordable homes. In this, as in other respects, it does not meet the criteria set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

In conclusion, this site should remain outside the village development boundary and be protected as Local Green Space. To build housing on it would be unsustainable, would do irreversible damage to the rural character of Fulbourn, and would pose an unacceptable increase in future flooding risk for nearby properties.

Yours faithfully,
Robert Culshaw

MA MVO MCIL
FRSA FRGS