

Appendix 4

Summary Proof

1.0 This proof of evidence is presented to the Public Inquiry, scheduled for 5 days commencing on 24th-27th May and 30th May 2022. For the avoidance of doubt, matters of 1) Design will be dealt with by Gary Young of Place 54 Architects Ltd; 2) Matters of Surface Water Drainage and Flood Risk will be dealt with by Kate Mackay of WSP. My proof should be read in conjunction with theirs.

1.1 My evidence is structured as follows:

- Whether the Appeal Proposal would be contrary to 1) Policy HQ1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018, 2) Fulbourn Village Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2020 3) National Planning Policy Framework 2021 [as read as a whole] and would be harmful to character and appearance of the area (Reason for Refusal 01).
- Detailing Local Plan Policies in relation to matters of drainage and flood
- To provide an assessment of the planning balance of the Appeal Proposal.

2.0 My evidence

- 2.1 I consider that the Development Plan is underpinned by policies which seek to deliver well-designed developments that preserve or enhance the character of the area.
- 2.2 I have assessed the proposed development in relation to Block A & B to be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. This assessment is made on the basis there is no increase in land levels. If it is found that the land levels would be increased, then I agree with the Council that the identified harm would be exacerbated and the weight to be attached to the harm will increase.
- 2.3 The proposed development in relation to Blocks A & B would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area by virtue of the scale of development in this location. The development would thereby be in conflict with the Development Plan, Supplementary Design Guide and National Planning Policy Framework. It is argued that an improved design could be achieved in this location whilst reflecting the parameters of the Outline Permission.
- 2.4 In terms of surface water drainage and flood matters, the case at the time of writing this proof is that the development would be contrary to Policies CC/7, CC/8 and CC/9 which require developments to incorporate suitable sustainable drainage scheme to ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere.

3.0 Conclusion

- 3.1 I have weighted the public benefits as set out in my proof of evidence. However, I do not consider that they are sufficient justification to outweigh the harm identified. Overall, I consider that, from the available evidence, there are no material considerations which indicates that the Appeal Proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan, and therefore that the appeal should be dismissed.