

## **Appendix 8 – Statement by Dr S Lawrence**



to final report for consideration of full meeting of South Cambs District Council in March 2014

---

prior to submission of Local Plan to Department of Local Government and Inspector.

---

This submission to Jo Mills for assured inclusion in the final report on the Local Plan 2014 contains a complete summary of the points of opinion on the proposed plan as prepared by officers of the Council in July 2013 and then through the consultation period until October 2013.

This summary of objections to the area of development named H/1(e) for the building of residential houses behind and attached to the existing development of Victoria Way Melbourn SG8..FE is presented in the following paragraphs :

- 1) As a preliminary point the complete availability of previous SCDC Planning Policy Meetings minutes, definitions of terms and therefore transparency is a prerequisite from all previous representations from the public and from the results of consultations of the officers of the council.
- 2) As a secondary preliminary point there have been raised several instances from public representations to the Council that the method of categorising and using acquired approval or nonapproval of particular aspects of the plan. For example the statement in the agenda for the meeting of 11th February 2014 that there were 179 supports and 51 objections to the development of H/1(e) means nothing either as a support for H/1(e) or as an objection to it. This reduction of individual previous instances of objection or support is an incorrect practice and this has been made clear to the council by members of the public within their representations and also been made clear by individual council members representing their own constituencies. This gross misrepresentation of support or objection is a serious failure on the part of the Planning Policy Office of South Cambs District Council and if and when the Local Plan 2014 is considered by the Inspector, I personally will raise this matter further at that time as I and others feel strongly about it.
- 3) The final presentation of H/1(e) in the agenda for the meeting of February 11th 2014 was as follows:

Melbourn -

Main Issues :

179 supports 51 objections including lack of medical and school capacity and traffic congestion.

Assessment :

Melbourn is one of the larger and more sustainable villages in the District. It is a suitable location for housing development and forms one of the better site options to meet the development strategy.

The site is separated from New Road by a recently completed rural affordable housing site whilst to the south is largely shielded from views by a shelter belt of trees and by hedges.

Site access will primarily be via an existing access road (Victoria Way) which serves the affordable housing and the village cemetery.

The site has attracted a majority of local support.

This presentation in the agenda is incorrect false and misleading in the following ways;

The site considered of H/1(e) was originally included in the pre-July 2013 plan with the other proposed sites for Melbourn, H7 and H8. This complete proposal was totally rejected by a vote of 86% within the village of a population of approx 4000. Since H/1(e) was included in this rejection this already indicates that the site of H/1(e) has been completely rejected by the large majority of the population of the village of Melbourn where the development is planned.

Melbourn is a larger village in South Cambridgeshire but due to considerable private development in the past five years it has now reached its' capacity for sustainable development as agreed by popular opinion of the residents of the village.

That it is 'a suitable location for housing development and forms one of the better site options to meet development strategies' is only the opinion of the officers of the policy planning department and not of the majority of local residents nor of the representative councillors.

That '... site access will primarily be via an existing access road (Victoria Way) which serves the affordable housing and the village cemetery..' this statement does not take into account the fact that additional housing to the rear of Victoria Way would mean a vast increase in the volume of traffic through Victoria Way onto New Road. The likely number of cars from the proposed new development would be approximately 100 which would mean that the new volume of traffic was three times that of the existing volume. Therefore Victoria Way as an access route to the new development is not viable. That '...the site has attracted a majority of local support..' is incorrect according to the reasons stated above.

- 4) The population density statistic is incorrect and false and the actual population density from such a development would be far in excess of the legal maximum.
- 5) There would be serious difficulties of integration of the population of the new development into the community from the point of view of school places, shopping capacity, work possibilities.
- 6) There are serious engineering and technical difficulties presented with the development of new houses at the rear of Victoria Way. These are enumerated as follows ;
  - a) The new site is on a sloped field which would require considerable engineering to provide adequate drainage and sewerage standards. Victoria Way has already experienced some minor slippage and subsidence due to water flowing down this slope. This difficulty will increase with increased changing rainfall levels.
  - b) Encompassing the number of houses envisaged on the site would be difficult again due to the nature of the terrain and would mean considerable engineering difficulties.

For all of the above reasons I and the majority of other residents in the village of Melbourn totally object to the development of site H/1(e) and will continue this objection through the Departmental stages and the Inspection stages. The only correct action is to remove this proposal of development of H/1(e) from the Local Plan 2014 before the Departmental stage and that it should be not even considered at the Inspection stage.

This is the full and complete submission of Dr Shane Lawrence to Jo Mills for complete inclusion in the report for the full Councils' consideration at the March 2014 meeting. I would like to request that a copy of the report be forwarded to me before the March meeting.

Dr Shane Lawrence

February 15th 2014.