

Minutes of the Planning Meeting

Held in the Village Hall, Recreation Ground, Cottenham on **Thursday 10th September 2015 at 7.30pm**

Present: Cllrs Mudd (Chair), Collinson, McCarthy, Morris, Nicholas, Richards, Ward, Young, Clerk (Jo Brook) and Assistant Clerk (Sam McManners)

In attendance: 10 members of the public

- 15P/142. Chairman's Introduction and Apologies** – apologies accepted from Cllrs Bolitho (work), Collier (ill), Heydon (ill). The Chair outlined to the public how the meeting would be conducted.
- 15P/143. Any Questions from the Public or Press – Standing orders suspended 7.32pm** Resident commented that now Northstowe was approved, any further developments in Cottenham are inappropriate. **Standing orders re-instated 7.32pm.**
- 15P/144. To accept Declarations of Interest and Dispensations** Cllr Ward declared pecuniary interest in planning application S/1815/15/FL (land owned near to location) and won't take part in any discussions.
- 15P/145. Minutes** – Resolution that the minutes (circulated to members) of the Committee meeting held on 3rd September be signed as a correct record. **RESOLVED.**
- 15P/146. Planning Applications for consideration**
- **S/1952/15/OL** – Outline application for the demolition of existing barn and construction of up to 50 dwellings with all matters reserved except for access, 39 Oakington Road, Cottenham

Chair outlined a letter received from CCC Highways, recommending refusal of the application in the interests of highway safety.

Cottenham is a minor rural centre incapable of sustaining a development of this scale, especially outside the village framework DP/4. The adverse impacts of this development significantly outweigh the benefits. NPPF 14. In particular, rather than 'improving' as per NPPF 9, it will have a significant negative effect. The additional traffic generated is sufficient in itself to refuse DP/3 2k.

We have serious misgivings about the access onto Oakington Road, which is already a busy road feeding traffic to the rest of the village and beyond via busy roundabouts. We believe that vehicle ownership and use has been seriously underestimated given local patterns of vehicle ownership and use in a minor rural centre and the travel plan is unlikely to mitigate this. The increased intensity of traffic and lack of adequate segregation between pedestrians, cycles and vehicles, especially at the access point, will significantly increase accident risk at this point which opens onto a limited visibility road subject to national speed limits. DP/3 1b.

Affordable housing: In principle Cottenham does need more affordable homes but not at the expense of an excessive number of market homes disconnected from the village environment. Even the so-called affordable homes won't be affordable for village residents as we have seen from other local developments. Due to the proximity to the edge of the village the development fails to be sustainable (DP/1 1 b – minimise the need to travel and reduce car dependency) and NPPF 34, 35, 37 and 38. Pre-school places: the development fails to meet NPPF 72. Cottenham has a known excess of demand over places which will get worse with the change of rules from 2016 and the proposal will increase that demand without doing anything about the supply. Contributions under DP/4 2.15 will be required.

Medical/day care facilities: the development will increase both the general population by approx. 3% which will increase demands on our already overburdened facilities. These facilities are located an unsustainable distance from the development site. The development fails to meet DP/1 1 m and DP/3 1f

Employment: the development fails to meet NPPF 17 and 19. Without local provision it will increase local commuter traffic. (DP/1 1b – minimise the need to travel and reduce car dependency).

Leisure: our current demand for leisure facilities outstrips supply. A 3% increase in population will only worsen this problem. The proposed development is located an unsustainable distance away from the core of the village. The development fails to meet DP/1 1 m and DP/3 1f. There is no meaningfully sustainable way for residents from established areas of the village to use any facilities onsite due to its remoteness. NPPF 58.

Easier movement in/out/around the village: the proposed development acknowledges that it will increase traffic on an already busy road. This traffic will then flow onto junctions with known congestion problems. They also haven't taken into account local car ownership so the estimated number of vehicles will be significantly higher than Endurance claim. Furthermore traffic volumes quoted are from a non-neutral month and will be higher. This in itself DP/3 2k is sufficient to refuse this application. The distance of the site from the village central facilities will increase parking NPPF 39. Pedestrian access does rely on significant improvements to speed management on Oakington Road and also the quality of pavements between the site and Rampton Road. The proposed new access would bring traffic onto Oakington Road with a national speed limit with limited visibility SW requiring some form of speed management over the section up to and including the slight bend. DP/3 1b&f and DP/4 1 apply. Increased traffic volumes are inconsistent with Cottenham village design statement H/2. The Endurance travel plan is flawed and it is not appropriate in a rural location. We lack confidence in the plan to decrease the number of traffic movements. Contrary to DP/1 1b, NPPF 32, 34, 35, 37, 38 and 39.

Conservation/village core: NPPF 131, 132, 134 and 138. The distance of the development from the village core will lead to an increase in traffic and parking, therefore damaging the character of the village core and the views approaching the village from Oakington. Also contrary to Cottenham Village Design Statement and DP/1 1p, DP/2 1, DP/3 2l & m and DP/7 1. The development is incongruous to the built development of Cottenham – a developed core with only linear development on arterial roads. Contrary to NPPF 17 and the Cottenham Village Design Statement.

Noise/pollution: Contrary to NPPF 110, 123 and 58. There is nothing to lessen effects of increased traffic on existing residents on Oakington Road or indeed the rest of the village. DP/3 2j, k & n.

Overloading of Primary School: Contrary to NPPF 72. The new extension was built to cope with the current capacity. Any increase in capacity would need to be handled sensitively to limit damage to the cohesive role that the school plays in the village. DP/1 1m, DP/4 2 15.

Drainage: NPPF 102. They have not taken into account the flood risk. Cottenham is a fen edge village and within the village is the Cottenham Lode, the main route from which surface water is taken from a large area (including Bar Hill, Oakington and, under some circumstances Northstowe) via the Catchwater Drain out to the Wash. We are particularly concerned about anything that adds water flow to the route.

Loss of agricultural land: Contrary to NPPF 112.

CPC unanimously recommend refusal of this application. **REFUSED.**

Resolution that a response is compiled via a drafting committee (consisting of Cllrs Morris, Mudd, Clerk and Assistant Clerk) as to why the application has been rejected. **RESOLVED.**

- **S/1490/15/FL** – Installation of twin wall flue system to the side elevation, 19 Telegraph Street, Cottenham. CPC recommends approval. **APPROVED**
- **S/2062/15/VC** – Erection of 2 bungalows, Land adjacent to 39a Victory Way, Cottenham (variation of condition; access to be widened to 5m). CPC recommends approval. **APPROVED**
- **S/2073/15/FL & S/2160/15/LB** – Take down and rebuild damaged sections of front garden wall of listed building, including: re-using existing and reclaimed bricks, new copings & foundations,

re-setting existing metal garden gate posts, 333 High Street, Cottenham. CPC recommends approval. **APPROVED**

- **S/1815/15/FL** – Demolition of B8 Industrial Units and Erection of 10 dwellings (AMENDMENT), Unit F2, Broad Lane Industrial Estate, Broad Lane, Cottenham. CPC recommends approval. **APPROVED** with condition that driveways to houses be widened. Cllrs Ward and Young abstained.

Decisions made by SCDC

Approvals

- **S/1707/15/FL** – 2 dwellings and garages, 182 High Street, Cottenham
- **S/1480/15/FL** – Dwelling and garage, r/o 143 High Street, Cottenham
- **S/1715/15/FL** – Outbuilding, White Hart, Twentypence Road, Cottenham

Refusal

- **S/1248/15/FL** – Erection of 4 dwellings, Land north west of Ivatt Street, Cottenham
- **S/1721/15/FL** - First floor rear extension, 15 Histon Road, Cottenham

Tree Orders – for information only

- 307 High Street – Eucalyptus: crown reduce to previous pruning points
- 41 High Street – T1 Eucalyptus: remove 3no limbs closest to adjacent house. T2 Eucalyptus: shorten crown over lane and above corrugated iron roof by 60% to reduce weight and risk of limb failure
- Co-op car park at 273 High Street – Conifer against the corner of car park fence: shape to make narrower and reduce height

15P/147. Date of next meeting – 24th September

15P/148. Close of meeting - 8.28pm

Signed _____ (Chair) Date _____