

AGENDA REPORTS PACK

PLANNING COMMITTEE

17th November 2016

16P/208.



Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

Meeting held in the Village Hall, Cottenham on Thursday 10th November 2016 at 7.30pm

Present: Cllrs Mudd (Chair), Collinson, McCarthy, Morris, Nicholas, Richards, Ward and the Clerk

In attendance:

- 16P/198. Chairman's Introduction and Apologies** – apologies accepted from Cllrs Bolitho (work), Graves (work) and Young (work).
- 16P/199. Any Questions from the Public or Press – Standing orders to be suspended 7.34pm.** Malcolm Dee, Secretary and Trustee of Cottenham Charities had reservations about the proposals for the roundabout. It would be next to a Grade II listed building which probably has little in the way of foundations. The speed cushions in close proximity to the buildings would cause damage from vibrations. Resident 1 said that a proposed speed hump was on shown on the entrance of his driveway on Rampton Road. Wanted to know if the Parish Council had requested humps. Cllr Morris stated that they were not requested by the Parish or County. The proposed scheme was devised by the traffic consultant for Gladman. It was noted that heavy vehicles and most cars wouldn't be affected by the humps and that the locations are only provisional. It does show the lengths Gladman have had to undertake to mitigate the increased traffic. Resident 1 stated that the cycle path would also cause problems with the driveway. Resident 2 said that it was already difficult and dangerous to get in/out of driveways on Rampton Road. Standing Orders reinstated at 7.40pm.
- 16P/200. 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.* Cllr Collinson declared a non-pecuniary interest in S/1411/16/OL. He lives on Rampton Road near to one of the illustrative speed humps and therefore won't be involved in any discussions on them. Cllr Mudd declared a non-pecuniary interest in S/1411/16/OL – he is a Trustee of Cottenham Charities; as such he won't comment on the application and Cllr Morris will take over the Chair for this part of the meeting.
- 16P/201. Minutes** – Minor amendment made under 16P/193 S/2701/16/FL – Resolution to read 'to stipulate trading hours as per present to Case Officer'. Resolution that the minutes (circulated to members) of the Committee meeting held on 3rd November be signed as a correct record. **RESOLVED.**
- 16P/202. 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 (*Revised design and access statement to include re-location of care home, vehicular access to adjacent site, planting plan and detailed parameters, response to landscape comments*), Land off Rampton Road, Cottenham. Cllr Morris took the Chair outlined the background to the Gladman applications. The traffic counts have been played down so we have commissioned our own measurements using real estates in the village (Tenison Manor/Brenda Gautrey Way). The data shows more trips would be generated than in the

Gladman data which uses the 'TRICS' data (from estates in northern England and Ireland). The Histon Road measurements have been done twice and again the figures were higher than Gladman state. All of the traffic modelling has understated the problems and they have struggled to come up with a suitable solution. The proposed new Rampton/Oakington Road junction is 19m across and uses the current grass verges. They have had to add cycle and footpaths at the roundabout plus speed cushions to slow traffic. We are confident that County Highways will accept our data.

Traffic was one of the two reasons that SCDC refused the original application. The second reason was the effect on the open countryside (visual impact). Gladman have come back with a detailed line by line response to this reason. It's subjective so don't know which way it will go. If there is a 5 year housing shortage then Gladman will argue the application should be approved but only if it's sustainable.

There is also a flood risk. Rainwater won't drain as much due to hard surfacing replacing the current earth hence the need for a 'SUDS'. The balancing pond has to drain into the Catchwater Drain. The Old West Internal Drainage Board (OWIDB) require the flows to be a certain rate and their pumps can only drain at that rate. Gladman haven't proved how they can fix this problem and maintain the system long term.

There are some good things about the development i.e. 80 less expensive homes however the estate is isolated. In our last response we stated the development was in the wrong place, Rampton Road was wrong, the affordable houses aren't affordable and the development was the wrong scale. Gladman have improved the traffic situation but this impacts the almshouses. They also claim to have improved drainage and have attempted to counter the argument regarding landscape. Standing Orders suspended 7.57pm. Mr Dee wanted to know if the Cut figures take into account flows from Northstowe. Cllr Morris responded that there would only be flows in extreme floodwater circumstances. The Environment Agency are putting in a warning system apparently. There is still a risk to Cottenham and SCDC are becoming more aware. Sometime in the next 30 years there will be a major flood event and in the worse case scenario Cottenham would be cut off for a few days. Resident 3 asked about pedestrian access to the development. Cllr Morris stated that there was an access shown which isn't under the control of Gladman; we have previously flagged this issue. Resident 3 asked if Gladman were to come back with a proposal for just 50 houses would it get approved? Cllr Morris personally thought that it would. Resident 2 asked about safety of the access points. Cllr Morris said that it was up to County Highways not the Parish Council to prove the safety. The builder would make financial contributions as part of the S106 agreement (if approval granted) and speed reduction i.e. moving the 30mph zone would be a possibility. NB: the police aren't in a position to enforce the limits. People currently struggle to reduce speed from 60 to 30mph hence the suggested use of buffer zones to gradually slow traffic. Standing Orders reinstated 8.04pm.

Cllr Collinson said that Gladman made a lot about the site being sustainable due to being behind existing houses on Rampton Road. His understanding of sustainable is that it lessens traffic and this development didn't seem to do that. The roundabout is unsatisfactory, it is difficult to get out of existing driveways and there are often tailbacks. Cllr Collinson also had concerns about the close proximity to the almshouses. The cycle paths go directly past front doors which is dangerous. The effect on a listed building is unacceptable and the vibrations from the proposed speed table on Oakington Road would have an effect. Cllr Morris said that 'sustainable' is a word which nobody knows what it means. According to the NPPF it has to have economical and social benefits and limited environmental effects. Planners have to weigh up the good vs the bad. Cllr Collinson said that the 40% affordable housing shouldn't be taken for granted. Cllr Morris stated that they weren't affordable anyway in a Cottenham context. Cllr Collinson highlighted that on page 10 of the Travel Plan, section 3.2.6, it stated there were loads of services within 2000m of the development for 'walk

trips'. This is not considered sustainable. In the Design & Access Statement section 2.3.2 re. buses it says that the site is well served from bus services which is incorrect; the site isn't near any routes or stops. Cllr Mudd left the room at 8.14pm. Additionally it takes longer to get into Cambridge than stated. Cllr Mudd returned to the room at 8.15pm.

Cllr McCarthy stated that the application still mentions that it is ok to cycle to Oakington which isn't possible to do safely (no cyclepath connection). The Gladman development will increase the flow of traffic at the Oakington/Rampton Road junction but there will still be a bottleneck at the Green for traffic heading to Histon/Cambridge. Currently Gladman say they don't need to look at the Green. Cllr Morris ran through the existing traffic measurements and it is estimated that there will be an increase of 15-20%.

Cllr Nicholas commented that whilst the roundabout on first appearance looks ok it will have a knock-on effect through to Histon. The primary access is claimed to be that by Ramphill Farm; why would anyone use it when there's a closer access to the village near Lambs Lane? On one of the diagrams Gladman mentions having access via the Persimmon site which hasn't even come forward for a decision yet.

Cllr Richards said that the roundabout encroached onto the current pavement on the Rampton Road side and would narrow it considerably which could be hazardous.

Additionally articulated lorries would struggle to get round the roundabout.

Cllr Ward mentioned that the comment about a bus stop on Rampton Road was misleading; it only runs twice a day.

It was confirmed that the application was for 'up to 200 houses and up to 70 care places' therefore nothing above those figures could be built.

Cllr Collinson commented on the large number of children who currently use Rampton and Oakington Road to get to the schools; this would be increased due to the Endurance application. Cllr Morris responded that the developer will argue they are making the junction a safer environment.

CPC recommends refusal. **REFUSED.** NB: the application will go to the SCDC Planning Committee. We will use the same structure from the previous response and Cllr Morris ran through the reasons for refusal which will include the additional traffic analysis. Cllr Morris to check whether we have already mentioned the bus services as not being as described. Noted that there may be a danger that the SCDC Committee may find the lengthy response difficult to digest. Cllr Morris stated that the response is aimed at the Planning Officer but last time we also did a summary for the Committee Members. Cllr Collinson said it was also important for residents to respond too. The deadline is Monday 14th November.

- **S/2642/16/LB** – Re-pointing of external brickwork, 86 High Street, Cottenham. This is a retrospective application. The Council was disappointed that works were undertaken to a Grade II listed building in a Conservation Area without prior permission. The application states the building isn't in the Conservation Area which is incorrect. Pleased that the correct materials had been used and it is a vast improvement. CPC recommends approval.

APPROVED.

16P/203. Date of next meeting – 17th November

16P/204. Close of meeting – 8.50pm.

Signed _____ (Chair) Date _____

16P/209. Planning Applications:

- [S/2876/16/OL](#) – Outline Planning Application for residential development comprising 154 dwellings including matters of access with all other matters reserved, Land north east of Rampton Road, Cottenham
- [S/2779/16/FL](#) – Erection of new dwelling, including landscaping and demolition of existing outbuilding, 132 Rampton Road, Cottenham
- [S/2894/16/FL](#) – Erection of new dwelling, including landscaping and demolition of existing outbuildings, 132 Rampton Road, Cottenham
- [S/2838/16/FL](#) – First floor extension over existing ground floor kitchen, 54 Lyles Road, Cottenham
- [S/2852/16/FL](#) – Single storey front extension with internal alterations, 21 Pelham Way, Cottenham
- [S/3016/16/RM](#) - Application for approval of reserved matters (Appearance, landscaping, access, layout and scale) for 271 residential units, including play areas, parking and necessary infrastructure following outline planning permission S/0388/12/OL. The outline application was EIA and an environmental statement was submitted, Parcel H12, Phase 1, Northstowe, Station Road, Longstanton

SCDC Decision Notices:

Approved:

- [S/2329/16/FL](#) – Demolition of existing garage and erection of single storey rear extension, 84 Histon Road, Cottenham
- [S/2346/16/FL](#) - Replacement of existing training tower with new tower, Fire station, High Street, Cottenham

16P/210. Enforcement update

Ongoing:

Jolly Millers – Tree Officer has issued a voluntary replanting notice with works to be undertaken between Oct 16 – March 17. CPC to report to Ian Lorman on status of works in January 2017.

Three Horseshoes – Owner will shortly receive letter from Enforcement requesting that the wall is repaired as soon as possible. Charlie will let us know when he has received a timetable for the works. As to the storage of bricks these are to be used in connection with works on site therefore no further action can be taken. Owner has confirmed that works will be done to the wall in due course. Anticipates that the driveway works will be completed in the next 12 months.

Co-op – The additional two signs to the front fascia, security bollard advertising and the free-standing advertising units all require advert consent. A letter has been raised by Enforcement and retrospective application will be submitted.

50 Lambs Lane – The cars are not in breach of planning and currently the garden does not justify a S215 amenity notice. The informal advice on this case is that the Parish should raise a general letter of concern to the owner. This could then be used at a later date should the site deteriorate. Clerk has queried how much worse the site would need to get before a S215 would be justified. Waiting response.

Old Labour Hall – issue of rear garden has been raised. Not bad enough for a s215 notice but we can write to the owner ourselves requesting that they tidy it up within a reasonable amount of time. Failure to comply could result in a Community Protection Notice being issued but Enforcement would need a copy of the letter as part of the evidence. Clerk has now written via Enforcement. **NB: resident has reported window open to rear of property again and children are breaking in; police notified too.**

CVC – 3 trees removed from the front of the property. Has been agreed that these will be replaced, preferably with something more climate suitable and disease resistant. Potentially up to 6 half or full standard trees will be planted (6-8ft tall). Richard Rice (CCC) working with Ian Lorman (SCDC) regarding replacements.

Gothic House – further damage to stonework with bits falling onto the pavement causing potential hazard for pedestrians. Building Control are requesting similar repairs to those done previously. Enforcement to speak to Conservation to see what can be done long term. **Clerk has chased (now 2 months and no work done). Suggestion that building should be added to Heritage at Risk Register. Waiting response. Downstairs window has been broken and potential hazard.**

Barbers – new shop replacing the old sweet shop on High Street. Signage has been installed without permission. Retrospective application to be submitted.

Broad Lane Industrial Estate – Unit M has installed a chimney-type structure without permission which is highly visible to residential properties directly bordering the estate. Enforcement have spoken with one of the owners of the business Clearglass who have leased the building. The structure is not a flue or chimney but an air extraction system to ventilate a paint spray booth installed inside the building. The booth is not operating at the moment and will only use water based paints. Enforcement have advised the owner that planning permission is required for the installation of the extraction system and he has confirmed that a retrospective application will be submitted. Residents have submitted a video which shows level of sound generated from the system. **EH are conducting sound monitoring w/c 31st Oct. Application has apparently now been submitted to SCDC.**

16P/211. Local Green Space designation

Dear Parish Council

We would like to ask your Parish Council for assistance as the District Council prepares its statement for the upcoming South Cambridgeshire Local Plan examination hearing regarding Local Green Space(LGS).

During the preparation of the Local Plan all Parish Councils within the district were given the opportunity to submit sites within their area for consideration as 'Local Green Space'. This was a new designation which allows local communities to identify important green areas and rule out new development other than in very special circumstances, rather like the Green Belt.

Sites in Cottenham were submitted by the Cottenham Village Design Group during the consultation on the Local Plan. These were open space sites identified in the Cottenham Village Design Statement SPD. All the sites were assessed by the Council and as a result some LGS was designated within your village. I have attached a map of your village showing the proposed sites.

As you will be aware, the planning Inspectors examining our draft Local Plan published a new programme on 21 October that includes a timetable for hearings for the next blocks of South Cambridgeshire specific matters. These blocks of hearings will start in January 2017. These include Matter SC4: Natural and Historic Environment to be held from 17-20 January 2017 which will consider proposed LGS designations.

The latest Hearings Programme and the Matters and Issues document are available at the following link - www.scams.gov.uk/local-plan-examination

As part of the examination the Inspectors have asked a number of questions relating to representations that have been made about some particular LGS designations in the Local Plan. Some respondents have objected to a site being proposed as a LGS and others have suggested amendments to the boundary of a proposed site. THE LIST OF SITES AND THE INSPECTORS QUESTIONS IS ATTACHED TO THIS EMAIL. The questions relating to the LGS in your village is on page 3 of the Matters document - SC4C. The questions are as follows:

- x. Should the LGS boundary of the Recreation Ground and Playing Fields, Cottenham be amended so as to exclude the land comprising an extension to the recreation ground on the grounds that the site is featureless and is not demonstrably special to the local community? (NH/12-049)
- xi. Should the boundary of the LGS designation for Land in Front of Village College, Cottenham be amended so as to exclude the residential garden land and College Farm to the north-west of the site which already benefits from designated heritage asset protection as it is within a conservation area? (NH/12-050)

Only the Council and those who objected to the LGS designations and have asked to appear at the examination will now have an opportunity to submit further information to the Inspectors in the form of a Written Statement. As you are not an objector we would like to offer you the opportunity to assist us with our Written Statement, by providing information on the LGS within your village in particular:

- Could you confirm if you still support the designation of the particular LGS sites within your village that are referred to in the questions above? - The Recreation Ground and Playing Fields (NH/12-049) and the Land in Front of the Village College (NH/12-50)

- If so, could you provide reasons as to why these areas of green space proposed in your village should be identified for special protection? I have attached to this email a note about what criteria the Council used to assess LGS which could help you indicate why these areas are special.

The Recreation Ground and Playing Fields (NH/12- 049) - I am aware that in preparing your neighbourhood plan that a new village hall site is being proposed in the vicinity of the recreation ground and would be grateful if you could confirm whether your proposed site is within the boundary of the proposed LGS. If this impacts on this LGS we ought to make the Inspector aware of it. The objection to this LGS is from Cambridgeshire County Council who wish the boundary to be amended (Rep no 64933 - <https://scambbs.jdi-consult.net/localplan/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=64933&searchtype=Respondent>

Land in Front of the Village College (NH/12-50) - The objection to this LGS was from the landowner of a private residential property that wished his garden to be removed from the LGS. (Rep no 64981 - <https://scambbs.jdi-consult.net/localplan/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=64981&searchtype=Respondent>) The Council considered this objection and in a report to the Planning Portfolio Holder at his meeting on 10 March 2015 it was agreed to submit a modification to the Local Plan Inspectors to exclude the residential gardens in this LGS.

The District Council's Written Statement including this issue has to be submitted to the planning Inspectors by 25 November 2016. The Inspectors will be considering whether the proposed LGS should be retained within the Local Plan including consideration of whether they are all locally special.

We would be happy to receive the Parish Council's views so they can be included in our response and help to support the proposed designation of LGS in your village. Please could you send us your comments by 18 November 2016. I recognise that this is a tight deadline. If you would like to respond but this timescale causes you any difficulty please let me know.

If you wish to discuss this matter further please do not hesitate to contact me.

Alison

Alison Talkington | Senior Planning Policy Officer