

### Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

Meeting held in the Village Hall, Cottenham on Thursday 10<sup>th</sup> 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 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 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 Rampthill 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 14<sup>th</sup> 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** – 17<sup>th</sup> November

**16P/204. Close of meeting** – 8.50pm.

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