

From: Sarah Edwards

Sent: 03 November 2014 22:27

To: scdc@scambs.gov.uk

Subject: Planning Application No. S/2273/14/OL - Objection Letter, S. Edwards, 3rd Nov 2014

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

Planning Application No. S/2273/14/OL

Dear Mr. Fillmore,

I object to the above planning application for the following reasons:

In Principal Objection

There is adequate development land available through the duty to co-operate now settled between local authorities in the locality and in higher order settlements and in locations with better environmental capacity and greater development suitability which will contribute more to the affordable housing and sustainability of the local authority area.

This site is extending development into the only identified community green space for the settlement and is in the sensitive setting of Poorwell.

The site has environmental sensitivity and surface water capacity and drainage issues which make it costly and difficult to develop reducing the potential for community and infrastructure contributions and affordable housing.

The site is in close proximity to noise generating uses of the train line and established industrial uses. These noise sources reduce the potential development land and result in an over intensification of development out of keeping with the grain of the village when taken as a net developable area. This results in poor use of land.

Commitments

1. The planning application as submitted indicates that the plan *could* meet issues, not that it will. With a site as sensitive, and difficult to develop as this, even if the location is demonstrated to be appropriate in planning terms and when considered against up to date planning policy and the emerging development plan, items such as the maximum number of dwellings, type and layout should not be reserved matters - they should be considered at the outline stage alongside access. Without this certainty there is no way that the site can be demonstrated to even attempt to meet the site environmental, physical, setting and sensitivity challenges as well as the national and local policy tests.
2. There is nothing in the application that indicates the developer has adequate access and land rights and control or resource to deliver policies to demonstrate the policy tests are fully met. Without such certainty and guaranteed delivery the policy tests cannot be 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 and control mechanisms through

condition and planning obligation be put in place before consent is considered and potentially granted.

4. Section 106 planning obligations need to be stated and fully secured before issue of any consent at this point.
5. 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 for this to have any contextual meaning in the landscape setting and in terms of visual and landscape impacts.

Character, Context and Visual Impact

6. 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, which provides an open setting from Autumn through to Spring.
7. 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. Breach of the skyline and change of visual context and profile. The character and context of Poor Well would be completely changed resulting in significant harm.
8. The development is not of the same character and grain as the rest of the village, especially the housing in the immediate vicinity which is part of a conservation area. The physical characteristics, environmental and water table sensitivities and neighbouring uses to the site significantly impinge and limit the potential physical development area of the proposed site, resulting in a limited net development area with high densities out of character with the village and setting as a result of these constraints resulting in a site that cannot bring forward the best and most versatile development delivery in the locality.

Environmental and Wildlife Impact

9. The otter, badger and water vole survey was a 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 over a sustained period, especially as there is local observational evidence of such species recently.
10. The drain 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 and the physical circumstances and potential consequential effects on neighbouring low lying developed land has not been adequately assessed or taken into account.

11. A suitable relocation site for snakes etc. needs to be identified and fully established 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.

Emerging Policy

13. The application outline plan and proposals is not in accordance with the emerging local policy classifying Fulbourn as a minor rural centre, and the fields being protected as local green space. If this application were to be approved it would completely undermine the principles of the emerging development plan, the re-categorisation of the settlement and provision of local green space. The location of a superstore outside and not part of the settlement as a justification for keeping of a higher categorisation is wholly inappropriate and inadequate. The proposed application makes no provision for equivalent replacement local green space.
14. 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 fully taken into account in the consideration of delivery of housing need and appropriate location for provision included in the application.

Water Management, Flooding and Sewerage

15. Sewerage has not been considered in the planning application this is known to be an issue in the locality and could have a direct effect on the existing neighbouring development such as the Pines which already relies on independent pumping.
16. The application should have all permitted development rights removed, as any additional development could adversely affect the surface water mitigations suggested, increasing surface water run-off and consequential -flood risk not only to the site but the surrounding area.
17. The 100 years plus 30% surface water provision is inadequate. The site must be future proofed particularly in accordance with government published climate change figures.
18. The consequential flooding of the surrounding area has not been considered. The storage areas, if breached could exacerbate the effects of flooding both on site and the surrounding area, particularly with regard to the ground levels at which neighbouring site drainage is set.
19. 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. These matters must be guaranteed and secured in perpetuity.
20. The management company responsible for the maintenance of the site and drainage features must be fully endowed to make sure it continues in perpetuity.

21. 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.
22. 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 a 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. This is foreseeable as an outcome of the proposed development now and must be taken into account.

Noise and Odour

23. 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. This is foreseeable as an outcome of the proposed development now and must be taken into account.

Effect on Amenities

24. Fulbourn does not need extra development in order to be self-sustaining. It does not need to get any bigger to sustain the community or facilities. There is no evidence of out migration or reduction or threat to services requiring such development.
25. The Tesco superstore is not a village amenity, not in settlement and should not be taken into account as such.
26. No consideration has been made into the effect of other developments on healthcare facilities in Cherry Hinton.

Site History

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

Please acknowledge receipt of this e-mail.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Sarah Edwards,

2, The Pines,
Fulbourn
Cambridge
CB21 5HZ