

**Planning Committee Meeting Minutes**

Meeting held in the Sports Pavilion, Cottenham on **Thursday 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2016 at 7.30pm**

**Present:** Cllrs Mudd (Chair), Graves, Morris, Nicholas, Ward, SCDC Cllr Harford and the Clerk

**In attendance:** 3 members of the public

**16P/104. Chairman's Introduction and Apologies – apologies accepted from** Cllrs Bolitho (personal), Collier (personal), Collinson (sick), Richards (holiday) and Young (work).

**16P/105. Any Questions from the Public or Press –** Standing orders to be suspended at 7.31pm. Resident living opposite 113 Rampton Road spoke regarding the Gladman application. Very concerned about the secondary access in particular and he has spoken to Andrew Filmore about it. Cllr McCarthy arrived at 7.32pm. Resident wanted to find out the difference between the primary and secondary access – concerned that if the secondary access isn't restricted then it will become the default access for most vehicles. Currently he already struggles to exit his driveway and the location of the secondary access would make this situation worse. Standing orders reinstated at 7.35pm.

**16P/106. To accept Declarations of Interest and Dispensations –** *i. To receive disclosures of pecuniary & non-pecuniary interests from Councillors on matters to be considered at the meeting. ii. To receive written requests for dispensation. iii. To grant requests for dispensation as appropriate.* No declarations.

**16P/107. Minutes –** Resolution that the minutes of the Committee meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> June be signed as a correct record. **RESOLVED.** It was agreed to bring the Gladman application forward on the agenda.

**16P/108. Planning Applications:**

- **S/1411/16/OL** - Resubmission of application S/1818/15/OL - Outline application for the erection of up to 200 residential dwellings (including up to 40% affordable housing) and up to 70 apartments with care (C2), demolition of no.117 Rampton Road, introduction of structural planting and landscaping, informal public open space and children's play area, surface water flood mitigation and attenuation, vehicular access points from Rampton Road and associated ancillary works. All matters reserved with the exception of the main site accesses, Land Off, Rampton Road, Cottenham. Cllr Morris stated 4 issues with the application:
  - 1) that Cottenham is the wrong place for the development – the lack of 5 year housing supply doesn't alter the fact that Cottenham is the wrong place for large scale development.
  - 2) Rampton Road is the wrong location – there will be a 20% uplift in traffic. The location relative to the core of the village doesn't fit from a sustainability point of view and doesn't enhance or maintain the location as per the NFFP requirements.
  - 3) the scale of the development is wrong – under the current local plan Cottenham is still a minor rural centre and therefore developments should be restricted to no more than 30 homes in one cluster. Flood risk – we have learnt more about the potential risk and the Lode can't cope. Potentially the village would be cut off for several days and therefore the development is untenable unless the Lode is strengthened. The reduction from 225 to 200 houses doesn't make any difference to this fact.
  - 4) the affordable houses won't be affordable.

Concerns were raised that the development had the potential to be added to in the future and the moving of the primary access further down Rampton Road.

The proposed cycle path can't be accommodated because the pathway is too narrow. The travel plan and trip generation figures have been tweaked however all information regarding access to Waterbeach and Cambridge is incorrect – Waterbeach is beyond the acceptable national level re. cycling distance. The figures regarding junction traffic levels are horrendous. Gladman are still in negotiation with County regarding the Rampton/Oakington Road junction. They have offered money towards junction improvements in Histon. Gladman accept that the areas are above capacity and if our predictions are correct there will be complete gridlock in the village. It was queried why they had

move the primary access; originally opposite Ramphill Farm. On the second access there don't appear to be any bollards to restrict access.

Major fears raised about flooding/drainage despite increase in size of the balancing pond. Cottenham Lode is currently understood not to be able to withstand a 1 in 100 year flood event. While only a small number of houses in Cottenham would be directly affected, all 5 arterial roads would be impassable for several days with severe consequences. Those homes might also suffer loss of power and communications during such an event. This proposed development takes this flood risk too lightly. The run-off from this development is proposed to be well above the level that the Old West Internal Drainage Board's pumps can deal with. And it is those pumps which must prevent an overflow of the Catchwater Drain, into which the outfall from this site must pass, on its way to the Cottenham Lode.

CPC recommends refusal. **REFUSED**. Would like the application to go to Committee. Cllr Morris to draft response document and circulate. IDB response to be chased. Standing Orders suspended at 8.06pm. Resident asked for clarification of the process regarding the appealed application. SCDC Cllr Harford clarified that the situation was similar to Foxton and that 2 refused applications for the same site were heard at the same time by the Inspector (in this case both were dismissed). Gladman can submit as many applications as they want at the same time as long as they are materially different i.e. there's a reduction in numbers. Standing Orders reinstated at 8.08pm.

- **S/1390/16/FL** – Provision of external wall insulation, 358 High Street, Cottenham. CPC recommends approval. **APPROVED**.
- **S/1272/16/FL & S/1273/16/LB** – Extension and alteration, 109 High Street, Cottenham. The extension would appear contrary to section 4.10 of the SPD document on Listed Buildings which quotes Section 3.13 of PPG15 ("every building has a finite capacity for extension. Therefore, when considering the purchase of a Listed Building, it is better to determine if the existing building meets the current needs as opposed to assuming that the building could be extended further. The individual needs of a particular owner should not impose on the needs of the building"). CPC recommends refusal. **REFUSED**.

#### **SCDC Decision Notices:**

##### **Withdrawn**

- **S/1203/16/VC** – Removal of condition 2 (agricultural occupancy) contained within planning permission S/1217/87/O, 100 Histon Road, Cottenham

##### **For information**

- **S/1447/16/PN** – Prior notification of erection of farm building for storage, Cuckoo Hill Farm, Oakington Road, Cottenham

#### **HM Inspectorate:**

##### **Appeal allowed**

- **S/2713/15/RM** – Reserved Matters Application for Access, Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale following approved Outline Consent for the Erection of a Dwelling and Garage (S/0900/15/OL), Land rear of 31 Histon Road, Cottenham

**16P/109. Enforcement** – consider updates from Enforcement Officers and additional suggestions for enforcement. Clerk to speak to Enforcement regarding a Section 215 notice for 50 Lambs Lane.

**16P/110. Date of next meeting** – 7<sup>th</sup> July. Cllr Wards gave apologies in advance.

**16P/111. Close of meeting** – 8.30pm.

Signed \_\_\_\_\_ (Chair) Date \_\_\_\_\_