

From: Richard Townley
Subject: Planning Application No. S/2273/14/OL
Date: 2 November 2014 11:46:57 GMT
To: scdc@scambs.gov.uk
Cc: FPC FulbournParishCouncil <clerk.fpc@btconnect.com>, Fulbourn Forum <fulbournforum@gmail.com>

Dear Mr Fillmore

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

I am writing to object to the above application. I believe the proposal to be fundamentally unsound and unsustainable as well as being inappropriately sited. In addition, if approved, it would cause harm to village amenity, services and facilities.

My principal concern is that by taking advantage of the period of uncertainty between submission of the draft Local Plan and its Examination in Public the developers are trying to sneak in a planning application on land recently rejected by the SCDC through the SCHLAA procedure, so side-stepping the proper plan-led process. The recent release of land in Waterbeach on Appeal should not be seen as a 'green light' or 'free-for-all' despite despite the technical shortfall in a 5-year supply of housing land in the District. To my mind this issue has been satisfactorily covered by the legal agreement signed between SCDC and Cambridge City. With the statutory duty to co-operate between adjoining local planning authorities you could not find a more suitable example than Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, where the latter surrounds the former thus providing for a sub-regional strategic planning approach to housing supply.

The application is fundamentally for a road access from Teversham Road to serve a notional number of dwellings stretching up to Cox's Drove with only emergency access allowed to the latter. I should be interested to know how ready the Highway authority would be to accept such an extended and sub-standard road system. Clearly the layout shown on the accompanying plans is purely illustrative and so are the written contentions. For instance, because it is claimed there would be high development costs due to site conditions, no commitment is made to meeting the District's affordable housing percentage. Though many of the more detailed matters could, theoretically, be covered by planning conditions or through a s.106 procedure surely there is too much uncertainty for approval to be contemplated at this stage.

Others have, I know, written about the site conditions and its long-term use as a local amenity area as well as its value as link between the village and the open countryside as proposed in the draft Local Plan as a Local Green Space. This open-ness is valued not only by residents in the vicinity and throughout the village but also by the residents of Home Close which looks straight at Poor Well and the fields beyond; in their case a unique view of a continuing open 'green' vista. In addition, because the site represents a rare fen edge location, it is not surprising there are strong indications of wildlife interest as observed by many residents familiar with the site over the years. Should the proposal in the draft Local Plan be maintained this would ensure, through good management in the future, a valuable biological

resource for the locality.

Again, others have written about the lack of capacity in key village services, such as the school and health centre. All of this points to need for the confirmation in the draft Local Plan of Fulbourn as a Minor Rural Centre. The existing infrastructure is clearly inadequate for major developments such as proposed in the application.

For these reasons and those raised in more detail in the submission from Fulbourn Forum for community action I ask that the application be refused.

Yours sincerely

Richard Townley
Fulbourn Manor
Manor Walk
Fulbourn
Cambridge CB21 5RJ