

S/4619/18/RM – Land East of Highfields Road, Highfields Caldecote, Cambridge CB23 7NX.

Comments from Cllr Dr Tumi Hawkins, District Councillor for Caldecote Ward

I object to this application in the strongest of terms.

1. This application is for 66 dwellings – even though the original outline permission S/2510/15/OL granted at appeal is for 140 dwellings. The permission granted did not envisage a phasing of site delivery, so the reserved matters should address all issues relating to all dwellings up to the approved number.

Condition 4 of the Appeal Decision Notice requires that the: ***Details of the dwelling mix of housing for the entire scheme hereby approved including market and affordable housing shall be submitted with any reserved matters application The details submitted shall provide the housing mix for all dwellings to be implemented on the site***

2. I am surprised that the Applicant has split the site, contrary to the proposal that they discussed at a meeting held with me and the Planning officer prior to their submission of this application.

The layout proposed seeks to bunch up the affordable housing, contrary to the requirement by SCDC to pepperpot these with the market housing. The proposed layout also seems different to the one that was discussed which had gone through the Design Enabling Panel.

3. Furthermore, in selecting 66 dwellings in a phase to the north of the site, the Applicant is potentially storing up significant problems for the part of the site that is close to existing houses, in particular in terms of drainage and layout issues.
4. This is a very sensitive site in the village especially due to the surface water flooding risk to the rest of Highfields. The drainage proposal for the site as proposed by Gladmans, and upon which the Planning Inspector granted the permission is outlined in Appendix 5 of the Appeal Notice.

Appendix 5: Surface Water Drainage Strategy by Lee Roxburgh Limited Drg No. 5933-01-01A. It proposed a series of ditches along the southern, northern and eastern boundaries of the site, in addition to the existing ditch on the western boundary of the site.

Condition 23 requires the applicant to provide details of the drainage proposal for the whole site. They have not done so, and have not followed the strategy upon which the outline application was granted.

By breaking the development into phases, the Applicant is also potentially

creating additional drainage problems for the rest of the site which slopes southwards away from proposed phase 1, and therefore increasing the likelihood of flooding of properties along Clare Drive/Damms Pastures.

5. The house types and styles proposed by the applicant are not acceptable to the community. The applicant was informed of the existence of the Village Design Statement (VDS) group, creating the VDS statement for the village, and were encouraged to consult and engage with this group so that the design of the development can be informed by the unique characteristics of the village. The Applicant however has chosen to date not to engage and in so doing ignoring a key design component to the crucial place making required for this sensitive site. It is therefore not compliant with condition 28 of the Appeal Decision Notice
6. There is insufficient landscape detail in the proposal, as required by Condition 6 of the Appeal Decision Notice

There are other issues that have not been sufficiently addressed by this application. It is unacceptable that a developer should flout the conditions attached to a development granted planning at appeal, especially not one that is so sensitive.

It is also particularly concerning especially after having met with the Elected Member and the Parish Council, heard concerns about the issues that were discussed extensively at the 3-day appeal hearing – which the Applicant seemed to be unaware of. But having then been fully briefed, should have taken the time and care to ensure that it addressed those issues carefully and considerately.

Linden Homes clearly have not done so in this case. This submission is completely unacceptable.