Ref: S/2413/17/OL

As residents of Rampton Road we wish to object to the recent this planning application by Gladman for development of land off Rampton Road, Cottenham.

Secondary Access at 117 Rampton Road
This application describes two access points with the Secondary access at the site of 117 Rampton Road (Design and Access Statement 3.8 fig 20). We have previously expressed our objections to this in other applications by Gladman but this further application does nothing to address these concerns.

The secondary access is significantly closer to the village and to routes south for Cambridge, A14, M11 etc than is the primary access. People will ignore ‘road hierarchies’ (Design and Access Statement 5.3.1) and will naturally take the shortest and quickest route, so this will become a rat-run and the de facto primary access. Why would anybody use the actual primary access unless heading out of the village towards Rampton and Willingham? There are no measures within the application that will enforce the secondary access as a secondary access, for example by use of bollards to restrict access to emergency vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists only. It will be intolerable for residents neighbouring and opposite to have the majority of the considerable vehicular traffic generated by the site to be entering and leaving at this point, at all times of day and night. We have concerns due to the increased noise and potential loss of on-street parking due to proximity to the junction, and we are also concerned for our safety when exiting our property opposite the junction.

Increases in Traffic Volumes
Data from the application’s Traffic Assessment indicates by 2020 a 30% increase in AM peak hour traffic towards the village of which 18% (101 vehicles) will be generated by the site. Evening peak hour increase of traffic away from the village is 29% of which 17% is contributed by the site.

These increases are intolerable and unacceptable. Rampton Road is already a very busy unclassified road and we are concerned by the additional noise, vibration, emissions and congestion generated.

This development will be ~1 mile from village amenities on the High Street such Post Office, Co-op etc, so despite the application claiming to promote sustainable transport, these residents are far more likely to take the car than walk or jump on a bike, so we would expect off-peak traffic generated by the site to be significant too, with an impact to the village as a whole of increased noise, congestion etc.

Impact on other Amenities
We are also concerned by the strain a development of this size will place on other village amenities that are already stretched: pre-school, Primary School, GP etc. The Primary School has already been recently extended to meet current demand and we believe it to be the largest in the county. Is it appropriate to expand it yet again?

(continued)
Finally...
We appreciate the need to find sites to meet the housing shortage, but Cottenham has already contributed towards that by the several developments that have expanded the village substantially in recent years. Our view is that it is better to meet the housing need through creating purpose built communities supported by a planned infrastructure rather than by opportunistically tacking ad-hoc developments piecemeal on to the periphery of an existing village that no longer has the infrastructure to support it.

Mike & Sue Brown