

FULBOURN PARISH COUNCIL

C/o The Fulbourn Centre, Home End, Fulbourn, Cambridge CB21 5BS

Telephone/Fax: 01223 881042 email: clerk.fpc@btconnect.com



31st October 2014

Andrew Fillmore
Principal Planning Officer
South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cambourne Business Park
Cambourne
Cambridge
CB23 6EA

Dear Mr Fillmore

S/2273/14/OL

Outline Planning Application for 110 dwellings at Teversham Road/Cow Lane, Fulbourn – Reasons for our recommendation to refuse.

1. Hutchison Wimpoa/Castlefield are only seeking approval for the road access, all other details such as layout, style and even number of dwellings are "reserved matters" and will only be defined (and could well change) at the detailed planning application, at which only the council planning officer will have the opportunity to object, not the PC and the public. All the information about ecology, park areas, surface water flooding mitigations, etc are all just indications of what could be done, not what the developer is committed to doing. As these factors are so important to the ability of the plan to meet the planning policy they should be firm commitments in this outline planning application.
2. The outline 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 addition to access.
3. There is nothing in the application that indicates Hutchison Wimpoa has control or resource to deliver policies to demonstrate the policy tests are fully met.
4. There are no commitments to the environment, merely suggestion to what could be done.

5. Section 106 planning obligations need to be stated.
6. 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.

Character, Context and Visual Impact

7. 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. 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.

8. 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.

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.

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.

Local Plan Emerging Policy

13. The outline planning application is in contravention of emerging local policy classifying Fulbourn as a Minor Rural Centre as Fulbourn does not satisfy the criteria to remain a Rural Centre.

14. This housing is not required to help meet SCDC/Cambridge City Draft Local Plan housing targets or the 5 year housing land supply as these obligations are met in the Memorandum of Understanding between Cambridge City council and South Cambs. This was in place when the application was made and should be included in the application.

15. The two fields plus Poor Well and the old Pump House garden to be designated Local Green Space. The land has for decades been exclusively used by the local community for leisure activities and is considered a public amenity space.

Water Management, Flooding and Sewerage

16. Sewerage has not been considered in the planning application

17. 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.

18. The 100 years plus 30% surface water provision is inadequate. The site must be future proofed.

19. The consequential flooding of the surrounding area has not been considered. This technically difficult, wet site, prone to surface water flooding and with high ground water levels, will become an area of relatively dense housing surrounded by marsh, water retention basins and accessed by boardwalks, creating an unsuitable environment and difficult and expensive maintenance conditions. . The storage areas, if breached, could exacerbate the effects of flooding both on site and the surrounding area.

20. 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.

21. The management company responsible for maintain the site and drainage features must be fully endowed to make sure it continues in perpetuity.

22. 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.

23. 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

24. 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 mitigation must be done within the development site itself.

Effect on Amenities

25. Fulbourn Primary School is full and would need to be substantially enlarged to cope with a further influx of school age children.

26. Fulbourn Health Centre is full up and would need to be substantially enlarged or consideration given to the effect of other developments on healthcare facilities in the surrounding villages such as Cherry Hinton.

27. The Tesco superstore is not a village amenity and should not be taken into account as such.

Site History

28. The site has previously been considered in detail and rejected as unsuitable for housing development by South Cambs following their 'Call for Sites', part of the Draft Local Plan process on three previous occasions. Nothing has changed to reverse or invalidate these rejections.

29. The site is outside the village development boundary so these proposals are contrary to the current Development Plan. Any development would be unsustainable development on greenfield land in an unsuitable location and would cause material harm to the village and surrounding area, including the adjacent Conservation Area.

Affordable housing

30. No commitment is given by the developer to satisfy the important issue of providing the statutory percentage of affordable homes.

Future development

31. The effect of future completion of up to 340 new homes at the Swifts and the Ida Darwin site, plus an extra care facility and their effect on the village must be taken into account in considering this application. The wider village infrastructure is in danger of being overwhelmed with further traffic in the High Street and at the School and Health Centre.

Yours sincerely