

21st March 2016

Andrew Fillmore
South Cambridgeshire District Council
South Cambridgeshire Hall
Cambourne Business Park
Cambourne
Cambridgeshire
CB23 6EA

Dear Andrew

Gladman planning application (S/1818/15/OL) – further comments from CPC

Further to our letter of 04th September 2015 Cottenham Parish Council has undertaken a community survey as part of the Neighbourhood Plan process. This questionnaire-based survey was completed by over 20% of the residents of the village aged over 16. The advice we have from the market research company employed to assist us in this work is that the results are sufficiently robust statistically to represent the views of the entire village population. Some of the emerging findings are relevant to this planning application and reinforce some of our earlier comments. They are detailed below:

1. The survey indicated that 45% of residents already have concerns about the volume of traffic and speeding in the village. 84% of respondents feel that development will bring more traffic and as such the additional traffic generated is sufficient in itself to refuse DP/3 2k.
2. 63% of residents wanted to see improvements in public transport links to Cambridge with only 11% currently using the bus 4 or more times a week. Bus services run at 20 minute intervals and a shorter journey time to Cambridge was the single most-cited (78%) incentive to use bus services more. This issue is not sufficiently addressed by the Travel Plan.
3. The survey indicated that 66% of residents were not in favour of large developments and, as we have commented previously, built on the periphery of the village environment. As such the development fails to be sustainable (DP/1 1 b – minimise the need to travel and reduce car dependency) and NPPF 34, 35, 37 and 38.
4. 90% of respondents considered that preserving the character of the village and Conservation Area is important. This very real perception of residents and the need for protection is supported by NPPF 131, 132, 134 and 138.
5. In the survey the need to increase pre-school provision was identified by 44% of respondents. The development fails to meet NPPF 72.

6. Increased pressure on Medical facilities was identified as a significant problem by 75% of residents. Also as previously commented these facilities are currently located an unsustainable distance from the development site. The development fails to meet DP/1 1 m and DP/3 1f
7. The survey identified that 57% saw the development of local employment as being important. The development fails to meet NPPF 17 and 19. Without local provision it will increase local commuter traffic. (DP/1 1b – minimise the need to travel and reduce car dependency).
8. Leisure facilities were seen as inadequate by 68% of residents in the survey. The proposed development is located an unsustainable distance away from the core of the village. The development fails to meet DP/1 1 m and DP/3 1f. There is no meaningfully sustainable way for residents from established areas of the village to use any facilities onsite due to its remoteness. NPPF 59
9. A clear view (62%) from the survey is the value of having one primary school serving the whole village. Alterations to this structure are perceived as having a detrimental effect and overloading of a Primary School is contrary to NPPF 72. The recently-completed extension was only built to cope with the current capacity of 630; already one of the largest in Cambridgeshire. Any increase in capacity would need to be handled sensitively to limit damage to the cohesive role the school plays in the village. DP/1 1m, DP/4 2 15.
10. Residents were also asked to consider that if development did take place what benefits could arise. Of the benefits that residents listed, the current development proposal would make a negligible contribution that would be significantly outweighed by the adverse impacts of the proposals. Indeed the 2030 vision that residents have for the village is that it should be an attractive village (59%) accessible(57%), improved access around and out of the village, rural and not suburban (95%). The development would have a detrimental impact in village amenity in this regard. In the survey, most residents (68%) are concerned about the potential loss of the village's character as a result of development.

In addition, our assessment of the Transport Plan indicates that traffic generated will be significantly higher than can be predicted from a TRICS analysis due to the difficulty of replicating the particular characteristics of an affluent village adjacent to a unique fast-growing city like Cambridge, especially its north and west. Many of these jobs are in high technology and related services requiring long hours by a committed, work-force which cannot be supported by slow bus services. The development is likely to create severe traffic issues and is therefore contrary to DP/3 2k.

An added complication is the likely reversal of significant traffic flows on Oakington Road when its access to the A14 is closed in the planned development; a change which is likely to bring more traffic NW up Oakington Road, adding to the congestion on Rampton and Histon Roads.

I have attached a copy of the full findings of the Neighbourhood Plan for your information.

Regards

Jo Brook
Clerk