

Mark Ridley
2 The Pines
Fulbourn
Cambridge
CB21 5HZ

2nd November 2014

Mr A Fillmore
Planning and New Communities - Development Control
South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cambourne Business Park
Cambourne
Cambridge CB23 6EA

Dear Mr Fillmore,

**Planning Application No. S/2273/14/OL, Residential Development of up to 110 dwellings,
Land at Teversham Road, Fulbourn**

I object to this planning application.

The site is clearly unsuitable for development having been rejected 3 times in the past by South Cambs council when put forward by the site owners, the latest rejection being during South Cambs "call for sites" (SHLAA) in 2012/13.

My specific objections are:

Commitments

1. The planning application indicates that the plan *could* meet issues, not that it *will*. With a site as sensitive, and difficult to develop as this, items such the number of dwellings, type and layout should not be deferred - they should not be in the reserved matters of the application, approval should be sought for the scope, design and layout of the scheme in the outline application, addition to access.
2. There is nothing in the application that indicates the developer has control or resource to deliver policies to demonstrate the policy tests are fully met.
3. There are no commitments to the environment, merely suggestion to what *could* be done. The outline planning must clearly state what *must* be done.
4. Section 106 planning obligations need to be stated at this point.

Character, Context and Visual Impact

5. The context and setting of Poor Well would be severely adversely affected. Currently the backdrop to Poor Well when facing North is open countryside, only partially screened by deciduous trees.
6. The picture in the Visual Impact study across Poor Well is taken from a point at the far south east corner of Poor Well facing the line of trees along the eastern boundary. This gives a totally misleading impression of the impact that the development would give to the backdrop of Poor Well. The view from Cow Lane in the centre of the southern boundary of Poor Well is much more open, and the development would be clearly visible, especially in Winter, when the deciduous trees have no leaves. No winter views have been presented in the supporting information to the plan. Visual permeability must be considered. I have attached a photo "Poorwell from Cow Lane facing North October 2014" from Cow Lane, near the centre of Poor Well looking North, taken on 28th October 2014. This shows how visible the development will be, even when the trees still have their leaves. I will send in an additional picture, once the leaves have fallen, showing that the site will be even more obtrusive during the months when there is no leaf cover.
7. The development is not the same character as the rest of the village, especially the housing in the immediate vicinity which is part of a conservation area.
8. The application states buildings will be up to 2 ½ storeys high. This is inadequate, heights to roofline from a set datum reference must be stated.

Environmental and Wildlife Impact

9. The otter, badger and water vole survey was as simple "site walkover" on one visit. This is insufficient to determine whether otters, badgers and voles are present. Additional visits at different times of the year are required. My wife has observed water voles in the chalk streams within the last two years.
10. The drainage ditch to the southern boundary of the site is incorrectly described as "The banks of Ditch 2 were almost exclusively man made concrete slabs (see Photograph 2)" in the supporting information. In fact the banks of ditch 2 are all earth, with the exception of the last 5 metres or so, where the photograph was taken, where ditch 2 joins ditch 1, which are concrete. This would indicate that the majority of ditch 2 has not been surveyed at all.

11. A suitable relocation site for snakes etc. needs to be identified before any development can go ahead.
12. Street lighting needs to be addressed to limit the encroachment of urbanisation features and the effect on wildlife such as bats which are known to use the site.
13. The drainage ditches on the site are deep, with steep sides, with about 300mm of water and another 300mm of soft mud in the bottom. If a small child were to fall into the water, there is a very real chance they would not be able to get out, without adult assistance. I see this as a major safety issue on the site, especially as it is proposed these areas are opened up for public access.

Emerging Policy

14. The outline plan is in contravention of emerging local policy classifying Fulbourn as a minor rural centre, and the fields being protected as local green space.
15. There is no consideration of the memorandum of understanding between Cambridge City council and South Cambs to jointly provide a 5 year housing supply. This was in place when the application was made and should be included in the application.

Affordable Homes

16. The developer has admitted that the site is technically challenging to develop, and has indicated that due to “abnormal” development costs the number of affordable homes that can therefore be provided will be determined by a future “feasibility assessment”. There is no commitment to supply the level of affordable housing need in the Fulbourn.

Water Management, Flooding and Sewerage

17. The developer has admitted that the site is wet, “prone to surface water flooding” with high ground water levels. This makes development on the site particularly challenging, necessitating large water retention basins, or marsh, requiring boardwalks surrounding relatively dense housing. These storage areas and boardwalks will be difficult and expensive to maintain, and will not be adopted by the council, giving doubt as to the long term sustainability of the development, from both a functional and aesthetic point of view. I have attached picture “Site 126 flooding May 2012” taken by myself when the field was generally sodden and had deep surface water over large areas for several weeks.

18. Sewerage has not been considered in the planning application
19. The application should have all permitted development rights removed, as any additional development could adversely affect the surface water mitigations suggested, increasing the flooding risk not only to the site but the surrounding area.
20. The 100 years plus 30% surface water provision is inadequate. The site must be future proofed.
21. The consequential flooding of the surrounding area has not been considered. The storage areas suggested, if breached could exacerbate the effects of flooding both on site and the surrounding area.
22. It must be specified who maintains the drainage of the site, how access is guaranteed, and who is responsible for foreseeable consequential effects in all weather states and circumstances.
23. The management company responsible for maintain the site and drainage features must be fully endowed to make sure it continues in perpetuity.
24. The surface water drainage of existing properties surrounding the site must be maintained, and has not been considered in the application. The discharge levels for surface water into the two drainage ditches is lower than the height of the development site.
25. The effect of inundation of water from the development site into the sewerage systems of existing surrounding properties has not been considered. The Pines has an electric pumping system to pump sewerage up to the main sewer on Cow Lane. If inundated by surface water flooding from the development site this would be inoperative.

Noise and Odour

26. The plan must ensure there is no control or impact on existing businesses adjoining the site. These businesses must not be affected to their fullest extent. With the joinery and car bodywork businesses noise and odour would reasonably be expected to be an issue, therefore any mitigations must be done within the development site itself.

Effect on Amenities

27. Fulbourn does not need extra development in order to be self-sustaining. It does not need to get any bigger.
28. The Tesco superstore is not a village amenity, and should not be taken into account as such.
29. The application does not take into account the effect of the completion of “The Swifts” and the existing planning permission for the Ida Darwin site which will add another 240 dwellings to Fulbourn. Amenities such as the Primary School and Healthcare are already overstretched and will become more so, even before another large development such as this application were to go ahead.

Site History

30. The site has been rejected as unsuitable for housing development on three previous occasions. Nothing has changed to reverse or invalidate these rejections.

Yours sincerely,

Mark Ridley