

Dear Andrew

**Comments re. application S/1818/15/O1 – land off Rampton Road, Cottenham**

Cottenham Parish Council strongly recommends refusal of the above proposal on the basis that Cottenham is a minor rural centre incapable of sustaining a development of this scale in the chosen location so the adverse impacts of this development significantly outweigh the benefits. *NPPF 14*. In particular, rather than 'improving' as per *NPPF 9*, it will have a significant negative effect.

We have grave misgivings about the suggested design of the access points onto Rampton Road, which is already a busy road feeding traffic to the rest of the village and beyond via busy roundabouts. We believe that vehicle ownership and use has been seriously underestimated given local patterns of vehicle ownership and use in a minor rural centre and the proposed travel plan will not mitigate this. The increased intensity of traffic and lack of adequate segregation between pedestrians, cycles and vehicles, especially at these access points, will significantly increase accident risk at these points.

**In addition:**

**Affordable housing:** In principle Cottenham does need more affordable homes but not at the expense of an excessive number of market homes disconnected from the village environment. Even the so-called affordable homes won't be affordable for village residents as we have seen from other local developments. Due to the proximity to the edge of the village the development fails to be sustainable (*DP/1b* – minimise the need to travel and reduce car dependency) and *NPPF 34, 35, 37 and 38*.

**Pre-school places:** the development fails to meet *NPPF 72*. Cottenham has a known excess of demand over places which will get worse with the change of rules from 2016 and the proposal will increase that demand without doing anything about the supply.

secondary access (117 Rampton Road) would probably bear the burden of traffic, requiring some form of priority control. The proposed access by 295 Rampton Road is on the crest of a hill and is also very close to the existing property, therefore greatly affecting their amenity. Visibility turning right from this access is greatly impaired.

The Gladman travel plan is flawed and it is not appropriate in a rural location. We lack confidence in the plan to decrease the number of traffic movements. Contrary to **NPPF 32, 34, 35, 37, 38 and 39.**

**Conservation/village core:** **NPPF 131, 132, 134 and 138.** The distance of the development from the village core will lead to an increase in traffic and parking, therefore damaging the character of the village core and the views approaching the village from Oakington or Rampton. Also contrary to **Cottenham Village Design Statement and DP/1p, DP2/a and DP/3.2.** The development is incongruous to the built development of Cottenham – a developed core with only linear development on arterial roads. Contrary to **NPPF 17** and the **Cottenham Village Design Statement.**

**Noise/pollution:** Contrary to **NPPF 110, 123 and 58.** Although Gladman have made efforts to lessen the acknowledged traffic noise on the design of the new build there is nothing to lessen effects on existing residents on Rampton Road or indeed the rest of the village.

**Overloading of Primary School:** Contrary to **NPPF 72.** The new extension was built to cope with the current capacity. Any increase in capacity would need to be handled sensitively to limit damage to the cohesive role that the school plays in the village.

**Drainage:** **NPPF 102.** They have not taken into account the flood risk. Cottenham is a fen edge village and within the village is the Cottenham Lode, the main route from which surface water is taken from a large area (including Bar Hill, Oakington and, under some circumstances Northstowe) via the Catchwater Drain out to the Wash. We are particularly concerned about anything that adds water flow to the route and have serious concerns about the surface water management scheme to counter any potential flood risk.



