

S/0096/17/OL - Gladman Developments Ltd, Agricultural land northeast of Back Road – Amendment to outline planning application for the erection of up to 95 dwellings with public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage system (SuDS) and vehicular access point from Back Road. All matters reserved except for means of access. Additional information: Transport Statement including appendices.

The previous comments on this application stand; these comments are additional to the comments already submitted.

General comments:

- The site lies at western outskirts of village, outside the village envelope, and some distance from the centre of the village with its amenities, shops, pubs, medical centre, schools and links to public transport.
- The distances are significantly greater than described in the application, especially if taking the distance from the middle of the site to the actual entrances of schools, etc. The everyday sustainability of the development is much less favourable than the application makes out.
- This site is outside the village envelope and was rejected in the SHLAA and Local Plan assessments as having no development potential (part of SHLAA site 197). Reasons included distance to key local services and facilities (graded as red in the SHLAA conclusions).
- Traffic data has not been collected from significant junctions.
- Traffic volumes for the site have been underestimated, especially for traffic impact on the A1307/High Street junction. The extra number of car journeys expected for 95 houses has been misjudged, especially as the residents are most likely to be commuters.
- Surface water regularly floods onto Back Road, into The Woodlands. A concern is that the SUDS ponds would fill, then overflow, at times when rainfall and surface water flooding are greatest, as they do not ultimately lead to a natural watercourse. Additional flood risk to Linton and villages downstream, and impact of flooding on driver and journey safety on Back Road, is expected if there is building on this hillside.

Site description

- The site is not accurately described. It is bordered by Back Road to the south, the road to Chilford Hall and uphill is a site of ancient woodland, beyond Paines Meadow.
- The pathway to the east of the site is not "an unmade track" but is part of the ancient Icknield Way, a long established and popular walking area, including a regular route used by the Ramblers Association. The Ramblers Association, Cambridge Past Present and Future and CPRE should be included as statutory consultees.
- We have fought hard to protect our part of the Icknield Way and the views from it. It deserves better than to have a character-free and inappropriate development alongside it.
- The site is at the far edge of the village, at significant distance from the village centre and its amenities.
- The distances stated have not been taken from the centre of the site to proper destination access points. The walking times significantly underestimated, particularly for the high proportion of older people and children (Linton has a skewed population of these groups) who currently use the walking routes.
- The transport to work data indicates travel is predominantly by car/van, but at a lower than expected level for the population - this is due to the high proportion of elderly/retired people and children. Another influx of commuters would have a proportionately greater impact on road use.
- There is only one site access with no emergency access. This is directly opposite and close to the Woodlands, creating a potentially dangerous junction, with limited visibility. The nuisance from noise and headlights to current houses would be significant.

Walking Routes

- There are no pavements adjacent to the site, just a grass path on the south side of Back Road, some parts now being part of gardens. There is little space for a pavement on the north side, between the road with its protected verges, the hedge and the site with its proposed SUDS pools.
- Walking on this part of Back Road is dangerous, and the impractical foot access to the village is reflected in the low "pedestrian flow" data. Few people walk from this area into the village
- There are no street lights on this part of Back Road,
- The route between Back Road and Symond's Lane - past our Community Orchard - has no pavement and is limited in width in some parts. Provision of pavement here, which would be needed to make walking routes safe and viable, might be unworkable.
- Walking to amenities, bus stops, etc., takes longer than suggested partly due to the need to use safer routes through areas of housing.
- A safer route to the village through Crabtree Croft ends in either coming down a bank or a diagonal crossing to Stantons Lane. Neither are particularly safe, and both are unprotected.

- New pavements to the village are not proposed, adding to the non-sustainability of the site.

Traffic issues for Back Road

- The effect of the extra traffic on our lanes, and the cumulative impact on the A1307, have not been properly assessed. Traffic data was gathered over a very short time and not at all at significant junctions. For example, data has been collected into Hillway, a cul-de-sac, but not at the Abington junction with the A1307. This creates serious distortion to the traffic picture.
- Back Road, from the Abington junction, is a rat run. It is particularly used to avoid traffic queues on the A1307 and standing traffic through Linton, in the evening.
- The data collected confirms the significant increase in traffic from Back Road onto Balsham Road in the evenings. The increased numbers should be seen in addition to those using Back Road from/to Symond's Lane to reflect the real use of Back Road.
- The development is located on Back Road, a minor rural road, once a farm cart track (based on historical information) this lane with its inadequate sub-base, is unsuited to even moderate levels of traffic. It is effectively a single lane track with passing places.
- The rural nature of Back Lane is confirmed by domesticated geese being a regular hazard!
- Back Road was recently re-surfaced, but is already disintegrating, especially at the edges. Extra traffic, especially the HGV traffic expected for the site might well result in the need for a complete rebuild, a cost that CCC would not have budget for. We had to lobby for years to get repairs to the road due to CCC budget constraints.
- The verges of Back Road (S21) are protected due to their rare flora; there is local "red book" data on their rare species. They are being eroded by vehicles overlapping road edges. The impact of yet more traffic, especially HGVs, will damage these further.
- Back Road is narrow and it is difficult for cars travelling in opposite directions to pass. This has already led to the sides of the road becoming badly rutted in many places, as drivers have to pull in tightly to the edges to make passing possible. Moreover, the road is winding and undulating and it has a raised verge, which is protected. This further hampers visibility for both drivers and cyclists.
- Back Road is designated as a safer cycling route and a police emergency road. It is the only road to use when the A1307 is blocked.
- The accident and crash data presented does not reflect the accidents that have been reported by residents and medical professionals (as reported in the public meeting).
- Speeding is a known problem in the area of the proposed development. From the March 2013 survey data opposite the Woodlands, the average speed towards Hildersham is 40mph, with 70.45% exceeding the 30mph speed limit. Heading into Linton, the average speed is 36mph, with 61.41% exceeding the speed limit.
- Leaving the estate turning towards Cambridge, traffic would take Back Road towards Hildersham. Traffic could then go through the picturesque village of Hildersham up congested Beech Row, meeting the A1307 at a still notoriously difficult junction. This would adversely impact Hildersham's Conservation Area and its historic buildings.
- Alternatively traffic could continue past the Hildersham crossroad, with its poor sightlines, to the A1307 junction at Abington. The right turn to Cambridge is particularly difficult at peak times. The left turn off the A1307 is on an awkward rising curve.
- Traffic from the site could also leave the village using the congested High Street, through our Special Conservation Area. The harm that this would bring is unacceptable, not just through congestion, damage to buildings and increased pollution, but also to the character of Linton.
- Leaving the development eastward, to reach the High Street, extra traffic would have to use Symond's Lane or Back Road/Balsham Road, both narrow and (due to resident and visitor parking, including that to Symond's House Care Home) effectively single lane traffic. Houses in these area often have hidden drives and poor sight lines.

Traffic Issues for the A1307

- The junctions with the A1307 at Abington and Hildersham, and the Back Road junction at Hildersham crossroads, have not been assessed as part of the Transport Assessment. This is a major omission.
- Following the City Deal proposals for the A1307 and Linton High Street to speed bus journeys (see the A1307 Three Campuses to Cambridge Bus, Cycle and Walking Improvements report), there would be a bus lane east to west but not west to east. This will lead to further queuing of traffic through the

"pinchpoint" of Linton and inevitably more traffic using Back Road as a rat run to avoid standing traffic through Linton.

- From the independent Iceni data, between 7:00 and 10:00 there were over 5,000 traffic movements and more than 5,100 at evening peak times at the High Street junction with the A1307. This is a main feeder junction for the village and does not include expected traffic from new developments. The estimated 60-70 additional traffic movements expected at peak times is unrealistic for 95 additional houses for commuters.
- The safety and capacity issues on the A1307 and its hazardous junctions are a major issue. The developments in Haverhill and Saffron Walden, both of which send traffic past Linton, make the A1307 increasingly busy and hazardous.
- The Iceni "Committed Developments assessment", notes:
The following approved application has been considered: Land at Horseheath Road Application (Ref: S/1963/15/OL) as far as we are aware this has not been approved.
- Also "the effects of other planning applications have not been considered". This would include Bartlow Road (S/1969/15/OL otherwise s/2553/16/OL), 1 Horseheath Road s/2504/14/OL, other infill housing and extensions. With this application, this is over 200 houses in the pipeline. These developments must be considered in terms of their cumulative effects, rather than as separate stand-alone applications. Development at Haverhill (another 2,500 house recently approved), Saffron Walden, Steeple Bumstead, Horseheath, Abington, etc all contribute to traffic flows on the A1307 and consequent impact on Linton junctions.

Traffic issues for the village centre

- The proposals for the High Street by City Deal need to be considered as the impact of yet more development has not been taken into account. These proposals for the High Street involve loss of pavement and narrowing the carriage way of what is already the narrowest High Street in South Cambs.
- Due to the limited parking and congestion in the historic village centre, it would be easier for new residents to use shops and supermarkets in nearby towns than to access local shops, so not benefitting village commerce; this is not conducive to sustainability.
- To note, we do not have as many pubs and shops as described in the report - no clothes or furniture shops, fewer pubs and the pub and cafe on the Hadstock road closed long ago.
- Further development would add to the traffic, parking and congestion problems within the Special Conservation Area of the village. Residents would drive rather than walk to shops and village amenities, particularly as the return is an uphill journey. This would add to the serious problems with parking in the High Street.
- Cycling in Linton is already difficult due to the narrowing of roads by parked traffic. There are no dedicated cycle routes and no safe cycle link to this site
- There are no cycle paths in the Linton area, and little scope to create safe cycle routes.
- The bus services stated in the application give a very rosy impression of public transport - two services no longer run and the bus stops on the High Street near the Crown do not exist. The stop on Back Road is for Haverhill-bound traffic only, due to the one way system, and it is a long walk to the nearest stops, which are on Cambridge Road.
- Due to congestion and parking issues, the No. 13 services through the village are under threat. The frequency of bus services stated in the application appear rather optimistic.
- To catch a train you still have a car journey to Whittlesford or Audley End. The stated time to travel to these stations is unrealistic, especially at peak times. It takes 30 to 35 minutes to drive to Audley End and park, and significantly longer to drive to Cambridge station, which has very limited parking capacity.
- At worst, it can take 15 to 20 minutes to leave the High Street, due to traffic density and unhelpful junctions on the A1307. Car journey times reported might be possible at 5am (when one councillor travels) but generally not otherwise.

Summary:

- The effects on an already busy and dangerous Back Road, a rat run, would be unacceptable.
- The City Deal proposals for the A1307 and Linton High Street would increase rat running along Back Road, especially in the evenings.

- If construction vehicles used Back Road the damage would be considerable, routes through Linton and its congested Special Conservation Area would not be practical - just how would materials get to the site?
- This site is not sustainable by the criteria applied in the NPPF and should be rejected.

LPC's Recommendation: To Object. To refer to SCDC Full Planning Committee.

S/0096/17/FL- Gladmans Development Ltd, Agricultural land northeast of Back Road, Linton- Amendment – Transport statement addendum, revised ecology report and landscape comments.

LPC's Comments: S/0096/17/OL Agricultural land northeast of Back Road amendments:

Transport

Linton Parish Councils comments:

Original comments and objects still stand.

These are initial comments due to the short time since receiving these amendments

Upon reviewing the traffic data, the number of cars using Back Road in rush hour is listed as 177 vehicles travelling towards Cambridge which is a substantial number of cars passing the entrance of the proposed site, often at high speed. The transport statement also noted that 351 cars are travelling towards Haverhill during the evening rush hour to avoid the pinch point on the A1307 at Linton.

Linton Parish Council request the raw data be sent through as this has been removed from the website and would also like to request it is re-instated online. Data was also not included for junction 3.

The Council noted that the reason for the amendment are the transport comments from 2nd march 2017. Some aspects have been accepted, some commented on but no solution and mitigation has been suggested and agreed.

For example-

Comment 2: Regarding footways- we have confirmed there is no suitable footways and no safe crossing points, and the data suggests it's busier than originally thought. This does not take into account the speed issue which is a contributing factor.

Comment 6: Referring to walking distances, amenities are further away than indicated and take far longer to walk to than suggested.

Comment 7: This is reference to the bus stops, they are inadequate and are not as described as in the report, the nearest being the A1307 or Swan Bridge. The transport amendments have not resolved the existing issues.

Width of the road is being increasingly eroded by the current traffic levels and is encroaching upon the protected verges and we see no way that the developer could deliver construction materials to site
Transport Plan - amendments.

LPC found it difficult to tie up the terms Icen/Count sequential used for junctions, with the everyday names that we use. We request that the junctions are identified and confirmed, using consistent terminology.

Please confirm whether we are correct in understanding:

1- "Hildersham Road" means the Back Lane from Hildersham Old Rectory/Balsham Road/Back Road crossroads up to Ley Rectory Farm/A1307 junction, at Abington

2 - "A1307/High **Street** Priority Junction" means main "A1307/Hildersham Hall Crossroads." The junction between A1307 and Beech Row, Hildersham, to the east of Hildersham Hall

3- "A1307/Hildersham Road Priority Junction" means "A1307/Ley Rectory Farm Junction". This is where Back Lane meets the A1307 at Abington.

It appears that the reports have confused Linton with Hildersham - there appear to be two whole pages of data in the report saying Linton when it actually refers to Hildersham.

(<http://plan.scambs.gov.uk/swiftlg/MediaTemp/1145441-702638.pdf>, p 3.

These are very different junctions with very different traffic flows

Also, a non-existent road called Laburnum Way (p 2, same report) is referred to. .

It is stated that the Back Road measures "on average" 5 metres -

http://plan.scambs.gov.uk/swiftlg/MediaTemp/1145441-677667_Transport_Assessment.pdf - PDF 8, pg 5, 2.5.

"Back Road runs along the southern boundary of the site and is mostly rural in nature. It is a single carriageway road running in a south east to north westerly direction and is approximately 5m in width."

However, Councillors Bald (LPC) and Kelly (HPC) have measured this at several points between the Hildersham junction to where the electricity cables cross the lane at the water pumping station and house. .

The width is actually around 4m, and often less - see attached report - Bald & Kelly (20.5.17).

Linton Parish Council's decision: To object and refer to SCDC Planning Committee.

Ecology

Linton Parish Council's comments: The current objections still stand.

There are concerns with the proposed overall design as this would still be interfering with the bat flight paths. The mitigation measures proposed to screen the site would be outside the redline, are not owned by the applicant and are not deliverable. The Council also has further concerns regarding the ancient hedge and Icknield Way.

Linton Parish Council's decision: To object and refer to SCDC Planning Committee.

Landscape

The landscape character and setting would indeed be affected, as well as the long views over Chalklands to the listed Rivey Tower. The visual effect on the landscape would be unacceptable.

There are also concerns relating to the impact line, as this covers the medieval fish pond and moat at Little Linton, meaning the development would have a wider impact than first envisaged.

Further comments will follow.

Linton Parish Council's decision: To object and refer to SCDC Planning Committee.

Linton Parish Councils overall decision: To object on all aspects of the new amendment and refer to SCDC Planning Committee.

S/0096/17/OL- Gladman Development Ltd, Agricultural land northeast of Back Road- Outline planning application for the erection of up to 95 dwellings with public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage system (SuDS) and vehicular access point from Back Road. All matters reserved except for means of access.

Linton Parish Councils general comments:

- The site lies at western outskirts of village, outside the village envelope, and some distance from the centre of the village with its amenities, shops, pubs, medical centre, schools and links to public transport.
- The distances are significantly greater than described in the application, if taking the distance from the middle of the site to the actual entrances of schools, etc. These distances suggest that the everyday sustainability of the development is less favourable than the application makes out.
- This site is outside the village envelope and was rejected in the SHLAA and Local Plan assessments as having no development potential (part of SHLAA site 197). Reasons included distance to key local services and facilities (graded as red in the SHLAA conclusions)).
- Linton is classified as a Minor Rural Centre which should allow a maximum of 30 houses in any one development. This is over 3 times that number.
- The as yet incomplete Neighbourhood Plan addresses the limits of development and housing in Linton and Hildersham; this application plays no part in the NP.
- The number of houses expected, along with the LEAP, SUDS and suitable protection of existing hedges, appears to be rather greater than the size of site would allow (compare visually to the rather cramped Woodlands). The housing numbers appear to be undeliverable.
- The indicated number of on-site parking spaces is insufficient for a settlement that would be largely for commuters.
- Public involvement by the developer has been limited to a brochure sent out only to a limited area of the village near to the site.
- LPC has met the development team (as we always seek to do) and are aware that they have no personal involvement in the village; this is a commercial exercise for them. For us, it is the future of the village, its character and its community.

Site and setting:

- Linton lies in a river valley, almost hidden until the village edge is reached, allowing appreciation of the natural landscape, ancient woodland, and the vista across open fields.
- This area around Rivey Hill and Furze Hill contains sites of scenic interest, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, protected verges due to their significant flora, and is a good example of Local Character Landscape. There are sites of Neolithic roundhouses in Rivey woods.
- The area contains listed buildings - Rivey Water Tower and mediaeval Little Linton. Traffic from the site would pass Symond's House, Morley House, and impact upon our Special Conservation Area.
- This development would be very visible in the rising ground and from the west, which would adversely affect the long views and setting of Linton in the open landscape.
- The pathway to the east of the site is part of the ancient Icknield Way. We have fought hard to protect it and the views from it. It deserves better than to have a character-free and inappropriate development plonked alongside it.
- The housing opposite the site is set low, so that it minimises the landscape impact to the approach to Linton. This development, set well up the hill, would be prominent and harm the natural character of the area.
- The trees in the area are in copses - the remains of ancient woodland. There is an ancient hedge running through the proposed development - how would this be protected in the long term? It is unlikely that this could be preserved in the surroundings of a housing estate.
- The suggested tree barrier would increase the impact of the development, increasing its bulk and height, and interfering with and blocking the vista rather than diminishing the impact of new housing.
- Should trees be planted, they take time and care to grow, and could not be protected.
- The proposed housing does not preserve the character of the local landscape, fields, meadows and softer edge of this rural village. It would destroy the character of the area and the setting of the village.

Flooding:

- A major issue is the loss of land for soak-away and the probability for worsening surface water flooding
- Floods of surface water and mud have already affected houses in the Woodlands estate, downhill of the proposed site, through to Kingfisher Walk, on the riverside. The road to Little Chilfords is known to run with water during storms.
- Surface water not absorbed by the open fields eventually ends up in the Granta.

- The river here has a series of bends, especially the right angled turns around Little Linton, which would lead to backup of water into the village centre (especially when sluice gates downstream are closed to protect Cambridge).
- Linton is part of a long-term flood amelioration scheme worked out and agreed by the Environment Agency (EA) and SCDC. This development threatens to impact upon work, which was done to protect Linton's historic and commercial centre and the villages downstream. EA river water levels confirm the efficacy of the work, but development at Bartlow Road will add further water upstream.
- The thesis written after the 2001 floods, local knowledge and the newly revised EA flood maps confirm there is more flooding, particularly surface water flooding, than is indicated in the submission.
- As stated in the application, it is in flood risk zone 1, but this refers to river flooding, not surface water flooding, which is the actual problem here.
- We are not confident that the SUDS scheme would cope with surface water floods from the hill. Open SUDS ponds will be a hazard to safety and health, even in dry weather.
- Our concern is that these ponds would fill, then overflow, at times when rainfall and surface water flooding are greatest, as they do not ultimately lead to a natural watercourse.

Sustainability:

- The housing needs of the village are predominantly for bungalows (for downsizers) and smaller, affordable homes. The housing mix here should reflect the needs, and lower budgets, of our current population.
- This development has no potential for employment within the village so would mainly attract incoming commuters; this is not conducive to sustainability. Village business are predominantly family run, with few employment vacancies.
- The application is inaccurate in the range of shops in the village - for example we have no furniture or clothes shops.
- The site, located at the edge of the village, with the emphasis on on-site pedestrian recreational routes and with its own LEAP, confirms that this would be self-contained introverted development, discouraging integration with the community and local life. The housing is aimed at commuters and not at current local needs. Again, this is not conducive to sustainability and inclusion into village structure.
- The infrastructure is at capacity for schools. This is supported by evidence from Head Teachers and Governors from the Infant and Junior Schools, and Linton Village College. The Infant School in particular has little room for expansion given its site in the conservation area.
- The schools take children from outside the village, as expected for a minor rural centre, so that any places taken by new residents would have a knock-on effect to neighbouring settlements. Local children are already being bussed to schools some distance from Linton; again not conducive to sustainability. Some people wishing to move to Linton cannot do so because there are no places at the Village College. This has prevented the sale of some existing houses.
- This application does not fully address the provision of utilities, of water, sewage and other physical aspects which are at or near capacity.

Traffic issues:

- The safety and capacity issues on the A1307 and its hazardous junctions are a major issue. The developments in Haverhill and Saffron Walden, both of which send traffic past Linton, make the A1307 increasingly busy and hazardous.
- This development would add to these traffic problems, especially as this is one of a series of speculative developments (currently over 200 houses are under consideration). These developments must be considered in terms of their cumulative effects, rather than as separate stand-alone applications.
- The development is located on Back Road, a minor rural road, designated as single carriageway. Once a farm cart track (based on historical information) this lane with its inadequate sub-base, is unsuited to even moderate levels of traffic.
- Back Road is designated as a safer cycling route and a police emergency road. It is the only road to use when the A1307 is blocked.
- Back Road, from the Abington junction, is a rat run. It is particularly used to avoid traffic queues on the A1307 past Linton.
- The verges of Back Road (S21) are protected due to their rare flora; there is local "red book" data on their rare species. They are being eroded by vehicles overlapping road edges. The impact of yet more traffic, especially HGVs, will damage these further.
- The junctions with the A1307 at Abington and Hildersham, and the Back Road junction at Hildersham crossroads, have not been assessed as part of the Transport Assessment. This is a major omission.

- The accident and crash data presented does not reflect the accidents that have been reported by residents and medical professionals (in the open meeting).
- Back Road is narrow and it is difficult for cars travelling in opposite directions to pass. This has already led to the sides of the road becoming badly rutted in many places, as drivers have to pull in tightly to the edges to make passing possible. Moreover, the road is winding and undulating and it has a raised verge, which is protected. This further hampers visibility for both drivers and cyclists.
- Leaving the estate turning towards Cambridge, traffic would take Back Road towards Hildersham. Traffic could then go through the picturesque village of Hildersham up congested Beech Road, meeting the A1307 at a still notoriously difficult junction. This would adversely impact Hildersham's Conservation Area and its historic buildings.
- Alternatively traffic could continue past the Hildersham crossroad, with its poor sightlines, to the A1307 junction at Abington. The right turn to Cambridge is particularly difficult at peak times. The left turn off the A1307 is on an awkward rising curve.
- Traffic from the site could also leave the village using the congested High Street, through our Special Conservation Area. The harm that this would bring is unacceptable, not just through congestion, damage to buildings and increased pollution, but also to the character of Linton.
- Leaving the development eastward, to reach the High Street, extra traffic would have to use Symond's Lane or Back Road/Balsham Road, both narrow and (due to resident and visitor parking, including that to Symond's House Care Home) effectively single lane traffic.
- The effect of the extra traffic on our lanes, and the cumulative impact on the A1307, have not been properly assessed. Traffic data has been gathered over a very short time and not at all at significant junctions. For example, data has been collected into Hillway, a cul-de-sac, but not at the Abington junction with the A1307. This creates serious distortion to the traffic picture.

Transport Assessment

- The site is at the far edge of the village, at significant distance from the village centre and its amenities.
- The distances stated have not been taken from the centre of the site to suitable access points, and the walking times significantly underestimated, particularly for the high proportion of older people and children (Linton has a skewed population of these groups) who currently use the walking routes.
- New paved footways are not proposed north of Back Road. South of Back Road is a grass track in front of houses, with no walking route between Back Road and the corner of the Woodlands (opposite the Community Orchard)
- The route to the village through Crabtree Croft ends in either coming down a bank or a diagonal crossing to Stantons Lane. Neither are particularly safe, and both are unprotected.
- Due to the limited parking and congestion in the historic village centre, it would be easier to use shops and supermarkets in nearby towns than to access local shops, so not benefitting village commerce; this is not conducive to sustainability.
- Further development would add to the traffic, parking and congestion problems within the Special Conservation Area of the village. Residents would drive rather than walk to shops and village amenities, particularly as the return is an uphill journey. This would add to the serious problems with parking in the High Street.
- Cycling in Linton is difficult due to the narrowing of roads by parked traffic.
- There are no cycle paths in the Linton area, and little scope to create safe cycle routes.
- The bus services stated in the application give a very rosy impression of public transport - two services no longer run and the bus stops on the High Street near the Crown do not exist. The stop on Back Road is for Haverhill-bound traffic only, due to the one way system, and it is a long walk to the nearest stops, which are on Cambridge Road.
- Due to congestion and parking issues, the No. 13 services through the village are under threat. The frequency of bus services stated in the application appear rather optimistic.
- To catch a train you still have a car journey to Whittlesford or Audley End. The stated time to travel to these stations is unrealistic, especially at peak times. It takes 30 to 35 minutes to drive to Audley End and park, and significantly longer to drive to Cambridge station, which has very limited parking capacity.
- At worst, it can take 15 to 20 minutes to leave the High Street, due to traffic density and unhelpful junctions on the A1307.

Infrastructure

- Leisure facilities described in the application are overstated - we have one cricket field/football pitch on the Recreation Ground, the netball/basketball court is unusable, and the artificial Bowls Green is in disrepair. The skate park is decaying and needs to be replaced.
- The facilities at LVC are, in principle, shared with the village, but are often not open or unavailable.
- We have insufficient community buildings for playgroups, clubs and youth groups. There are few facilities for the adult and older populations.
- Our schools are filled to capacity. This is supported by evidence from Head Teachers and Governors from the Infant and Junior Schools, and Linton Village College. The Infant School in particular has no room for expansion, given its site in the conservation area.
- Our schools take children from outside the village, as expected for a minor rural centre, so places taken by new residents would have a knock-on effect on neighbouring settlements. Local children are already being bussed to schools an unreasonable distance from Linton.
- The Medical Centre is re-organising to link with others in the area, partly due to pressure on the services. There is no public transport between the linked surgeries.
- The Medical Centre has a pharmacy for those outside the village. Linton residents have to use commercial pharmacies.
- The Community Warden supports 25 households to remain living independently on their own homes; the cumulative developments would swamp the care that could be provided
- The noise from the A1307 is significant for the village and for the site. The road noise is amplified by the valley so amelioration is essential for the site and the village in general.
- Lighting on site and from car headlights would create light pollution for neighbours
- This application does not fully address the utilities including water and other physical aspects. Sewage and foul water handling is not mentioned at all; the drains within the village are at or near capacity, using Victorian 6inch pipes in the village centre. The other infill developments being built in the village will absorb any current capacity. We already experience blockages and overflow of foul water sewers.

Summary:

- This development would bring significant harm to the character of the landscape, the historic area and the environment that far outweighs any benefit the housing would bring
- Building here would adversely affect water soak-away, adding to the river water levels and increasing the probability of flooding to our Special Conservation Areas and commercial village centre, and to sites and villages downstream.
- The effects on an already busy and dangerous Back Road, a rat run, would be unacceptable.
- The number of houses in the development appears to be undeliverable.
- Building here is not compatible with Linton continuing as a village community - a major reason we live here - and does not address the actual housing needs of current residents.
- This site is not sustainable by the criteria applied in the NPPF and should be rejected.

Conditions:

Subject to the above objections, any approval on this site should include:

- A suitable scheme of flood prevention measures. Land upstream is needed to compensate for loss of public amenity and to increase the active floodplain to balance the loss of soakaway caused by this development
- Road safety and capacity are major issues.
- Measures to protect the landscape and protected road verges must be included.
- Noise attenuation from the A1307 is needed for the site and the rest of the village, even without the additional burden of this development. This must be sympathetic to the landscape and local character.
- Safe pedestrian and cycle routes to be put in place - pavements, paths, etc
- Provision of sufficient education places to cope with the cumulative expansion of population
- Archaeological investigation of this site is needed, along with suitable protection of finds.
- Protection of the ancient hedges and areas of significant flora.
- The maintenance of the SuDS .
- During construction the damage to Back Road would be considerable, routes through Linton would not be practical - just how would materials get to the site?

Inconsistencies and inaccuracies in the applications are worrying and need further investigation.

Linton Parish Councils recommendation: To Object.

To refer to full Planning Committee at South Cambridge District Council.

Back Road, Linton s/0096/17/OL - Further LPC comments on Landscape amendment

The landscape character and setting would indeed be affected, as well as the long views over Chalk landscape to the listed Rivey Tower, and beyond. The visual effect on the landscape would be unacceptable.

There are also concerns relating to the impact line, as this covers the Medieval fish ponds and Moat at Little Linton; development would have a wider impact than first envisaged.

Please see the original comments sent by LPC.

The amendment does not recognise that Linton is in a river valley, the site of the development being on rising ground and very conspicuous from the approach roads from Hildersham and Cambridge. The site is also clearly visible from the A1307 and building here would be particularly conspicuous on the rising ground across the valley.

This area around Rivey Hill and Furze Hill contains sites of Special Scenic Interest, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, protected verges due to their significant flora, and is a good example of Local Character Landscape. There are many historic sites in the area (see comments on Archaeology)

The housing opposite the site is set low, well down into the valley, so that it minimises the landscape impact to the approach to Linton. This development, set well up the hill, would be prominent and harm the natural scenic character of the area.

The proposed woodland mitigation would be inappropriate in this area - the character landscape is of low hedges with intermittent copses on the upper reaches. Planting of trees would not screen the housing, but would increase the impact of the development once they had grown sufficiently to be a barrier. The screening trees and hedges would need to be managed and cared for - this could not be guaranteed once the properties had been sold and occupied.

Screening planting at the northern boundary is said to be compatible with that on the southern boundary. The southern boundary is a protected road verge noted for its wildflower species, with low hedging and just a few trees. Such boundary treatment would not screen the development, which would be clearly visible from the Rivey hill and Icknield Way.

Visual effects - From the south, housing would be seen across the river valley, or looking upward from The Woodlands and Back Lane. As such, the buildings would appear more imposing due to their being on rising ground.

The long views on the approach to Linton would be interrupted by housing and screening planting, marring the appreciation of our countryside.

The edge to the village is of soft contours and low hedging; housing would interrupt the character landscape and rural views.

The proposed housing does not preserve the character of the local landscape, fields, meadows and softer edge of this rural village. It would harm the character of the area and setting of the village. The visual effect on the landscape would be unacceptable and detrimental to the historic village

The statement acknowledges that there is an element of subjectivity in the assessment of landscape and visual effects, but this is the scenery that we live with every day. We deserve to have the landscape preserved and not harmed by inappropriate development.

Back Road, Linton s/0096/17/OL - Further comments on amended Ecology Submission

The development site is currently an arable field, sometimes with less than attractive crops but it does form part of the long views over rolling chalkland, with hedges and ancient woodland with a wide range of native species. It is part of the setting of the village, which nestles into the contours. Housing here would disrupt the setting and affect the natural scenery

Section 3.10 of the amended report states that *"All established trees on-site were inspected and assessed in terms of their potential to support roosting bats"*. There are no such trees on the site, but many outside the redline, in the ancient Rivey Wood just uphill of the site, not in ownership of the developer. It is here that there would be bats and other protected species (section 4.8), affected by the lights and bulk of the building disrupting their flightpaths.

In section 4.19 and 4.20, *"Verge 3, located off-site at the eastern site boundary of A2 runs adjacent to a bare track (public bridleway)"* This might not contain sufficient species to be meet the criteria for county importance. However, this track is part of The Icknield Way and the area has wider importance.

Section 5.35 notes the use of the "bridleway" which runs on to Rivey Wood. The woods in this area are private property managed for game breeding and shooting, and already with issues regarding the dogs that affect the birds. The walking of dogs on-site only is unlikely with these wilder spaces for them to run: further pressure is expected on the ancient woodland and its inhabitants.

4.26, 4.27 Paines Pasture, an area of broadleaved woodland, located off-site runs adjacent to the northern site boundary, is considered to be of ecological importance at the Local level. The encroachment of housing to this area would be detrimental to this ancient woodland.

As stated in the application, this site is in flood risk zone 1, but this refers to river flooding, not surface water flooding, which is the actual problem here. We are not confident that the SUDS scheme would cope with the surface water that floods from the hill (section 5.20). This will lead to overspill at times when rainfall and surface water flooding are greatest, as the water does not ultimately lead to a natural watercourse. Open SUDS ponds will be a hazard to safety and health, even in dry weather..

Section 5.8 notes that *"the surface water drainage solution for the Site will be designed to prevent significant additional run-off from the Site into the River Granta"*. It is the surface water flooding, spilling down the hill, over the road and into housing that is the concern. Another concern is that these ponds would fill, then overflow; any wildlife that might have established in the pond or its margin will be regularly disrupted. Dry ponds will be breeding grounds for mosquitoes; we have Anopheles mosquitoes in the area which can transmit malaria - once known as a Fen Ague.

There are concerns with the proposed overall design and lighting interfering with wildlife and bat flight paths. The Council also has further concerns regarding the ancient hedge, woodland and effects on the Icknield Way. Once build could the legal obligations of wildlife protection law be enforced on residents? The mitigation measures proposed for the site would be outside the redline, are not owned by the applicant and are not deliverable.

Back Road development site s/0096/17/OL

Further LPC comments on the amended Archaeology Statement

The site comprising of fields on the North Western side of the village of Linton is of unknown archaeological significance, as it has not yet been surveyed. However, it lies in the proximity of the site at Little Linton which has been clearly shown to have been occupied since Prehistoric times. A great range of finds from Prehistoric to Medieval was revealed during work in the 1920's and then again in the excavations for a sewage pipeline from Linton into Cow Gallery Wood in 1992. The Little Linton site has yielded many monuments and items; possibly only revealed because this small area has been subjected to compulsory digs consequent to pipe laying, agricultural activity and building works.

Aerial photographs (1945) show evidence of a barrow cemetery both on and in the close vicinity of the site. Full evaluation of the site, especially in the area of the barrow cemetery would be needed before any consent is granted - it would not be enough to have this addressed by conditioning.

The highly visible Medieval Moat, Manor and fishponds (CHER 02413) TL 555 474 are in close proximity to the proposed development site TL 557 478 ?, and within the blue line drawn on the application plans as the "line of influence". Similarly when the Village College (TL555 470) was surveyed before building works, nine examples of occupation and detailed finds ranging from Neolithic to post-Medieval were identified (including: MCB19262, MCB18217, MCB18215, MCB19518). The finds include significant Saxon occupation evidence and inhumations (MCB18214).

Of note are the substantial inter-connecting roadways across this area. Primarily, the Via Devana (CHER 07970 TL 549 512) running throughout the entire Cambridge region but a particular stretch known as Worstead Street runs from the Chilford Hall site to the Gog Magog Hills a line which potentially crosses the fields in question. This is known locally as "The Roman Road".

Another road of importance is situated immediately adjacent to the site itself, which has yet to be examined for archaeology. This is the Icknield Way, an ancient roadway which runs from Norfolk to Wiltshire, and noted as a "track" in the application.

The village as a whole is laden with evidence of continual occupation for the past 5,000 years. Archaeological investigations to the south of Cambridge Road revealed evidence of Iron Age occupation (ECB2922) and Roman villa and Bathhouse (CHER 9841). Further Anglo-Saxon cemetery evidence is located to the south east at Bartlow Road (MCB16249).

Other nearby listed buildings, within easy walking distance of the site, not including the Special Conservation area:

- II Wardens House to North of the Village College
- II Linton Village College
- II The Gazebo to East of Little Linton Farmhouse
- II Symonds House
- II Little Linton Farmhouse
- II Two Barns to East of East West Range of Barns West of Little Linton Farmhouse
- II Barn to North of Little Linton Farmhouse
- II Barn to West of East West Range of Barns West of Little Linton Farmhouse
- II The Peste House, Symond's Lane.
- II Clapper Stile to north-west of the Village College and west of the Recreation Ground

It seems that wherever the archaeological surveys look in the immediate area of this site, and even in the broader area of the village, there are multiple finds of historic interest ranging across the

complete historical time span. The site of Linton village has been continuously occupied for 5,000 years and a complete archaeological survey of the highest possible intensity is required on this site if significant artefacts are not to be lost under insensitive development.

Full evaluation of the site, especially in the area of the barrow cemetery is essential before considering any building consent is granted - it would not be enough to have this addressed by conditioning.

**s/0096/17/OL Linton Back Road development site-
Further LPC comments on the amended Transport Statement**

The Gladman's development site lies on the North Western side of Linton village. It is only accessed by Back Road which becomes a single track lane less than 4m wide (3.6m) at its narrowest and on average 4.07m wide as it leaves the village towards Cambridge. The data provided by Iceni for Gladmans have surprised local residents but they have given flesh to the suspicions about how the traffic uses the Linton streets during the rush hours in the morning and evening. The developers are selling the traffic situation in Linton as one thing and we residents are seeing and experiencing something completely different.

The A1307 is the main through route for traffic from Suffolk and Essex to move into the Cambridge area, including commuter routes for the South and HGV routes to sea ports. The A1307 is a notorious and dangerous highway; where it passes through the village it dissects Linton across the top of our High Street. The numbers of vehicles have been measured regularly and found to be well in excess of the allowed limits for an S1 category road (latest measure Sept 2016) especially for the proportion of HGVs using the road. The data recorded by Iceni for Gladmans show that in the recorded 90 minutes morning rush hour 1042 vehicles (45 HGV) passed through the junction directly towards Cambridge and the A11. This was added to by 158 vehicles filtering into the traffic flow from Linton High Street, including 9 HGVs. This is the route promoted by the developer as favoured for the development exiting the village.

The truth shown by the Iceni report for Gladmans is that more vehicles chose to leave the village via the single carriageway of Back Road than through the junction where the High Street meets the A1307. In the morning, the data show 177 (5HGV) leaving the village via Back Road as opposed to 158 (9HGV) at the High St junction. The explanation for this difference may lie more in the lack of queuing on Back Road than the convenience of the road, it being only a narrow winding single carriageway. In the evening the difference is much more profound with 351 (15 HGV) coming into Linton on Back Road; nearly 7 times as many as enter the village at the A1307/High St Jn= 56 (4HGV).

Queueing times for the stream High St towards A1307/Cambridge a.m.

Time	No. Vehicle
------	-------------

8:00	3.1
------	-----

8:15	17.3
------	------

8:30	30.0
------	------

8:45	15.6
------	------

Average delay 8:15=5.58min; 8:30=4.44 min

The vehicles arriving in Linton on Back Road from the Cambridge direction could only arise from either a junction with the A1307 at Abington or a junction with the A1307 at Hildersham or from within the village of Hildersham. An additional survey by Iceni for Gladmans have shown that these junctions are being used to access Linton. In the morning 151 (1HGV) leave the Back Road at Abington to join the A1307 towards Cambridge and 21 (0HGV) leave the A1307 to join Back Road

towards Linton. 19 Vehicles (0HGV) leave Hildersham toward Cambridge on the A1307 and 19 leave Hildersham towards Linton on the A1307. Thus in the morning the majority of vehicles recorded leaving Linton on Back Road seem to access the junction with the A1307 at Abingdon.

A survey conducted by Iceni for Gladmans has shown that in the evening 311 vehicles (2HGV) leave the A1307 at Abington and 21 (0HGV) leave the A1307 at Hildersham which become 34 leaving Hildersham onto Back Road. Therefore the evening traffic recorded in Linton on Back Road appears to have originated from the A1307 at Abingdon.

The central part of Linton village has a one way system which funnels traffic down from the North East side of the village towards the High St/A1307 Junction, via the Coles Lane /Back Road intersection which has been missed off the Iceni report for Gladmans. This intersection in the one way system is the only route onto Back Road from Horseheath, Bartlow Roads and High St until the Symond's Lane junction near the development site. The numbers of vehicles using the Coles Lane/ Back Road junction have to be inferred, but:

A.M. 287 vehicles come down the Horseheath Rd (5HGV) joined by 145 from Balsham Rd (7HGV) , 218 (11HGV) passing the Symond's Lane Jn near the Dog and Duck. These are joined by others, so that 246 (12HGV) hit top of High St. , where they queue to join the A1307. There are no data for traffic from Coles Lane feeding into Back Rd at the junction near the Cemetery .

$432 \text{ at Jn 3} - 218 \text{ at Jn 5} = 214 \text{ lost at Coles Lane.}$

138 recorded Back Rd before Symonds Lane

$214 - 138 = 76 \text{ down Back Rd towards Post Office and Balsham Road.}$

At Symonds Lane Jn $127 + 48 = 175.$

Therefore: Coles Lane and the High St Junction with A1307 are feeding the majority of the traffic out of the village in the morning. The bulk of the numbers come from the Horseheath Rd and feed down through the one way system in the High St before separating to take either High Street jn or Back Road route out of the village. Thus the Coles Lane junction with the one-way part of the High Street becomes the key junction in the analysis and yet it has not been included in the data.

The next most important junction is the Back Road junction with Coles Lane at the cemetery and that has not been included either. It has struck me as odd from the very start that the analysis should include a short cul de sac at Hillway, but neglect the key throughway junction used by all the traffic leaving the village on the West side.

P.M.

351 vehicles come down Back Road (15HGV) into Linton village.

318 (8HGV) turn up Horseheath Rd at Fire Station jn (jn 3) 158 (1HGV) turn down High St. 107 (3HGV) Turn out at High St A1307 jn (jn 6) 101 (1 HGV) Turn towards Balsham at Back Rd jn this is another route towards Horseheath road via the farm vehicle access road at Wheatsheaf Way.

The flow of traffic in the evening is very much through the village from Back Road and out towards the Horseheath and Barlow roads and their junctions with the A1307 flowing towards Haverhill.

Other issues

Other traffic issues concern the times the data were collected. The figures for AM peak hour in terms of number of observed vehicles is from 7am to 8am, although the proportion of HGV's starts to go up from 8am. Within the village there are other peaks near school opening and closing times, the development site traffic would add to this due its distance from the schools and lack of pavements from the site into the village.

Within the village, the traffic flow issues are exacerbated by parked cars - effectively the High Street is a single lane for much of its length between Symond's Lane and the A1307 junction, the main through route. The rest of the High Street is part of the one-way system.

Similarly, Back Road is part of the one-way system from Coles Lane to Balsham Road junctions, the stretch from Coles Lane junction out of the village towards Hildersham being effectively single lane due to parked cars.

There are inconsistencies in the Transport Assessment Addendum. In addition to the confusing junction names, as described in Parish Council comments, other issues include:

the date of the traffic survey is listed in different places within the report as being on 3rd March, 2nd March, 2nd February and 1st March;

the scenarios presented are described in different places as 2017 observed and 2016 observed, also referring to 2021 base and 2021 development case as well as 2022 base and 2022 development case, elsewhere.

One substantive point relates to the capacity analysis of the A1307/Hildersham Road junction. The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (TA23/81), www.standardsforhighways.co.uk/ha/standards/dmr/ta2381.pdf, in section 7.3 states that an RFC (Ratio of Flow to Capacity) of 85% should normally be used for appraising junctions, not the 100% theoretical maximum capacity used in the report.

The basis for the analysis of traffic growth and impact of this development is questioned. The predicted growth of junction use 2021 is approx 10% increase across all junctions. However, the figures suggest an 18% growth, if including committed development (growth plus developments agreed, but not including expected infill housing, and Horseheath Road planning application). Approved developments at Balsham and other villages would access the A1307 through Linton, further adding to traffic.

Data would be needed for the Horseheath Rd and Barlow Road Junctions with A1307 to correctly assess through traffic and the impact of additional traffic from this development.

It is to be noted that Back Lane from Symond's Lane to Abington is unlit. This narrow, winding lane - basically a cart track with a tarmac surface - is also a designated safer cycle route, and part of the "Greenways" strategy to promote cycling.

The width of Back Road (edge to edge of tarmac) for a substantial stretch is less than the 5m stated, 3.6m in parts and around 4m approaching Hildersham. The protected verges are currently being encroached upon - more traffic, especially HGVs would only lead to further damage.

Drivers try to avoid queuing or slow traffic on the A1307 by cutting through Linton using the Back Road - Bartlow/Horseheath Road or High Street - Bartlow/ Horseheath routes. The massive expansion of Haverhill, approved or applied for, will again add to the traffic problems of Linton.

Queuing traffic on High Street, idling traffic held up in congestion, etc, will create build-up of air pollution, additional to that of the slow and queuing traffic on the A1307, particularly around the top of the High Street. This will be worsened by additional traffic create by further development of Linton.

Conclusion

The basis of the traffic data analysis is flawed, data collection incomplete, presentation of results and identification of junctions is misleading.

From the traffic issues raised we conclude that this development is inappropriate for Linton and not sustainable.

Back Road (Hildersham/Back Road crossroads The Old Rectory, Hildersham)

To Pumping Station House, Back Rd, Linton, Cambridge CB21 4LQ (ca. 860 ms.)

Width from tarmac edge to tarmac edge: various locations taken 20.5.2017, 4.30 pm

Jean Kelly – jeshere1@yahoo.com

Enid Bald – enidsmith20@talktalk.net

	Location	Width – Metres	Width – Imperial
1	Hill Lodge (Hildersham/Back Road crossroads)	4.8	15 ft 9 ins
2	Hildersham allotments footpath/Back Road	4.24	13 ft 9 ins
3	250 yard sign	4.2	13 ft 8 ins
4	(Half-way between 250 yard sign and telegraph pole)	4.4	14 ft 4 ins
5	Telegraph pole and manhole cover	4.05	13 ft 2 ins
6	Between telegraph pole and large wooden gate	3.9	12 ft 8 ins
7	Large wooden gate	3.9	12 ft 8 ins
8	Large pothole	3.96	13 ft
9	Unidentified location	3.66	12 ft
10	BMC telephone cover	4.14	13 ft 6ins
11	Unidentified location	3.6	12 ft 10 ins
12	Unidentified location	4.5	14 ft 8 ins
13	Unidentified location	4.03	13 ft 2 ins
14	Unidentified location	4.03	13 ft 2 ins
15	Large haystack (Linton end)	4.05	13 ft 4 ins
16	At two telegraph/electricity poles (on opposite sides of Back Road)	4.1	13 ft 5 ins
16	Between two telegraph/electricity poles (on opposite sides of Back Road), pole to pole	7.25	23 ft 8 ins

Google Earth sites 1 to 16

https://www.google.co.uk/maps/@52.1171257,0.2577732,3a,75y,90h,91.86t/data=!3m6!1e1!3m4!1s3!ADuN0U_og!RoFy22vluQ!2e0!7!13312!8i6656

<https://www.google.co.uk/maps/@52.1119511,0.2662875,3a,75y,111.61h,94.53t/data=!3m6!1e1!3m4!1svvg6vQNAdWqDrfphAvZAgw!2e0!7!13312!8i6656>



LOCATIONS OF BACK LANE
MOTORHOMES (APPROX)