

## **MATHS Presentation to DMC August 27**

- 1. Thank you for providing us with the opportunity to speak and for visiting our village yesterday.**
- 2. We agree with virtually all of the Council's principles, policies and criteria. Unfortunately, this application does not come remotely close to complying with these.**
- 3. Ours is a small, rural village of just over 600 people. The Local Development Framework VERY clearly states that developments will ONLY be considered in small villages in 'exceptional' cases. No such 'exceptional' case has been made. The application did not meet the requirements of CS1 last time and still does not.**
- 4. The 2009 Core Strategy states clearly that "settlement envelopes have been defined to enable the clear, unambiguous and consistent application of policies in the control of development". Contrary to the Case Officer's report, 16 of the 18 dwellings in the proposed development are outside the current Settlement Envelope.**
- 5. The infrastructure, in CBC's own words, is 'poor'. This was given as a reason for potentially rejecting our village altogether as an option in the 2009 CBC Sustainability Appraisal report. No meaningful upgrade to the infrastructure, but we do now have more houses.**

- 6. The A603 is a traffic nightmare. The junction with Blunham Road (next to The Guinea) is probably the most hazardous. 64 properties exit onto Blunham Road. 18 additional dwellings represent an almost 30% increase at what is already a completely unacceptable junction with wholly inappropriate traffic flow for a road of this kind.**
- 7. Moreover, all the school children would have to cross the new access road to the proposed development.**
- 8. The Site Assessment Technical paper highlighted real problems with this village. Drainage and waste water were given an amber RAG rating. Noise from the road – levels beyond what would be legally acceptable in a factory - cited as another detrimental factor. We cannot see how conditions under Policy CS2 could possibly mitigate the impact on the rest of the village – not the development itself – resulting from the new development.**
- 9. Scale and character. The application still clearly contravenes policies CS1, CS14 and DM3. On heritage, the previous application failed to meet the requirements of CS15 and DM13. There are 28 listed buildings in the village, some of them adjacent, or in very close proximity, to the proposed development. The application clearly fails on these grounds as well.**

- 10. Refusing the previous application, the DMC referred to the number of objections and the “rousing response”. Subsequent changes to the application are minor (re-organising the deckchairs on the Titanic), the objections more numerous, and we have submitted factual evidence based on the Council’s own standards.**
- 11. Local government often complains that local decisions are overturned or ignored by Central Government. Almost 50 residents from Moggerhanger have turned up today – there would have been virtually double if it had not been a working day. This reflects the weight of local opinion and we ask you to reject this application.**
- 12. We have considered all our options depending on the outcome today. If you refuse the application and the Developer appeals to the Planning Inspector, we will immediately make a Section 6 application, giving us full rights of written and oral evidence. We would then be standing alongside the Council defending its decision.**