

LINTON PARISH COUNCIL



Clerk: Ms Kathryn Wiseman, The Village Hall, Coles Lane, Linton, Cambridge. CB21 4JS.

Email: enquiries@linton-pc.gov.uk

Telephone: [REDACTED]

Chairman: Ms. Merrie Mannassi

www.lintoncambridgeshire-pc.gov.uk

FAO Rebecca Ward
South Cambridgeshire District Council
Planning and New Communities
South Cambridgeshire Hall
Cambourne Business Park
Cambourne
Cambridge
CB23 6EA

22nd August 2019

RE: Draft comments on Planning Application S/2501/19/RM – Land North and South of Bartlow Road, Linton.

Dear Ms Rebecca Ward,

Thank you for your consultation on the above application. This is our initial response and more detailed objections will follow when we have the missing documentation:

Holding Objection -

We respond with a holding objection for reasons including the following:

- The submission does not provide sufficient information to fully assess the impact of the development.
- The Design and Access statement has not been provided to Linton Parish Council in paper form, nor is it available on the website (up to the date of the LPC planning meeting)
- Several other reports and assessments are not available, which will be listed later.
- The reasons for refusal of the initial RM application have not been adequately addressed.

Comments

The OL plan s/1963/15/OL was approved when there was no extant Local Development Plan, the 5-year housing land supply was not confirmed and the planning balance was very different. Linton has not been allocated any housing in the current nor in the previous LDP, so should never have been subjected to that application.

The LDP has been reviewed by the Inspector twice and due to the hierarchy for development, this site was not included in the calculations for the land supply, and omitted as not being suitable for residential development. This was not an anomaly; the site was not allocated in the LDP, and the LDP takes precedence in current planning considerations.

Despite this, infill housing, replacement housing, conversions and applications in the pipeline will have added around 50 homes since the first OL (not including Bartlow Road and Horseheath Road applications) so Linton is doing its share to meet the 5-year housing supply.

This is the second RM application related to s/1963/15/OL, the first s/2487/18/RM having been refused by SCDC. The refusal of the first RM application has now been appealed, but with additional

amendments, of which LPC was not aware and had not commented upon. This application appears to be similar to the appeal submission with its amendments.

This application should not be considered acceptable as a result of its size (more than 30 houses in a minor rural centre), being outside of the village framework boundary, not considered suitable by SHLAA and not being an allocated site in the LDP. The application is within the scope of the emerging Linton and Hildersham Neighbourhood Plan and again not considered suitable; 2 drafts have already been submitted and should form part of the decision-making process. It is clearly not a sustainable development by the criteria applied in the NPPF and has not proved to be deliverable.

The decision by SCDC on the outline development was based only on the principle of some houses, two accesses and the promise of some alterations to the A1307. This application appears to be notably different to the scheme provided then, including the indicative site layout and generic housing design. The tree planting and landscaping bears little resemblance to the indicative plans. The extent of flooding had been underplayed and the requirement by condition that housing be above the known levels of flooding (and based on revised EA maps and the SCDC maps included in the 2010 LP) has not been heeded.

There is now a robust LDP in place. The 5-year housing land supply can be met without the inclusion of this site; there is no longer a presumption for approval of speculative development. The planning balance is very different and local concerns should be given their due weight.

Documents not available for consideration include:

Design and Access Statement - not supplied in hard copy and cannot be opened on the website
Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
Flood Risk Assessment
Porosity and Infiltration Testing
Archaeological Evaluation - the findings of the investigation have not been submitted
Energy and Sustainable Design statement
Health Impact Assessment
Growth and Development Assessment
Noise Assessment
Geo-Environmental Assessment
Utility Assessment
Statement of Community Involvement

Reasons for refusal

The developer considers that they have addressed the reasons for refusal. LPC do not agree that these have been adequately covered. Here are a few reasons;

Reason 1 -

- The terraced nature of the dwellings has not been addressed - there are now more terraces (16 against 13 previously) along with retaining walls, platforms, steps and other engineering structures. The terraced nature remains as visible and intrusive features (although judicious shading of the illustrative drawings seeks to minimise this).
- The terraced nature of the dwellings does not impact on Bartlow Road nor from within the site, but on how the development will be seen in the landscape, over the wide views, across the river valley, and occupying the valley as seen from the A1307.
- Dropping slab levels creates difficult gradients for traffic between Bartlow Road and their drives - around a 1:10 slope.
- This slope also making flooding from the road into garages and homes much more likely.
- Lowering a few plots has minimal impact on a site that has a build-up to create these platforms - potentially up to 6.5m across the area where the platforms are most prominent.
- Lowering the slabs two plots by 400mm (not 400m, as in the submission...) will have little effect on the prominence of the housing in the landscape - they remain as 2/2¹/₂/3 storey

houses, out of character with the area and context and very visible in the wider landscape They would remain very obtrusive, including on the skyline from the village. This against the NPPF which states that buildings should not intrude upon the skyline except specifically agreed features - towering housing on rising ground would not meet this criterion

- The gradient of the gardens would not impact on the terracing. The gradients of public paths is more concerning for reasons of accessibility for pedestrians, the disabled and for road safety
- In this application, as before, the developer has failed to take into account our major objections to the design of this site - the houses are too high, prominent in the landscape and with designs insensitive to the nature of the rural site and entrance to the village.
- The effect of this development on the wider landscape, the surrounding fields and public open spaces, the setting of and views from the village, from across the river Granta, etc. has not been evaluated. There has still been no evaluation of the effect of housing on the northern site and no evaluation of the effects on the skyline from significant viewpoints.
- A "Green Link" is a path to the other site, not a feature to reduce impact, crossing the road in the 50mph zone and too near to the entrance to the GCP/City Deal transport hub

Reason 2 -

- The affordable housing remains clumped in the centre of sites.
- Those in the southern site are in the areas most affected by surface water run-off.
- The surface water flooding has been known since Mediaeval times following the removal of woodland up the slopes. This was revealed by the channels found in the Archaeological investigations. Housing in the centre of the site is most vulnerable to pluvial flooding.

Further Comments

Further comments will follow, including comments on the following:

Landscape and visual impact

Flooding and surface water drainage

Layout and Design

Housing Mix and Housing Needs Assessment

Archaeology

Ecological Assessment

Transport and roads

Sustainability

Health Impact

Community involvement

This is not a sustainable development, does not meet village needs, does not protect or enhance the valued landscape and does not to meet the criteria of the NPPF or the Design Guide.

The reasons for refusal remain sound and have not been addressed by the amendments to the previous application. It remains materially unchanged from the application that was refused.

Yours Sincerely,


Kathryn Wiseman
Clerk and RFO to Linton Parish Council