

**Cottenham Parish Council
Planning Minutes**

Held in the Village Hall, Lambs Lane, Cottenham
On Thursday 17th April 2014 at 7.15

Present: Cllrs Rowley (Chair), Berenger, Collinson, Mudd, Nicholas and Jo Brook (Clerk)

Attending: 1 member of the public

14/116. Any Questions from the Public or Press – Standing orders to be suspended – Rick Bristow attended as a member of the public and made various points:

The statement from Mr Hargreaves, March 2014 (page 1, para 2) states that the land was acquired in 2005. This is incorrect and the land was owned and occupied by the extended Boswell family at least until the early summer of 2010.

Page 2 para 2 is also inaccurate - states that Mr Wall & family lived on 1 -3 Pine Lane from 2008 to 2013. There is evidence on file to the contrary and the pitches in 2011 were abandoned.

Page 3 para 1 – foul drainage from pitches 4 &5 is connected to the sewer on Setchell Drove and, should the request be made, pitch 3 could likewise be connected. Two points:

(i) Boswell had septic tanks installed at pitches 1 and 4 because access to both Setchell and Orchard Drive sewer pipes was denied (see SCDC Foul Water Survey map 12/1/2005) without a subterranean right of way under Park Lane and the road owned by Joanna Gordon - Clarke

(ii) if 4&5 have been connected then SCDC must satisfy itself on this for reasons of Environmental Health and safety

Site Map showing Pine Lane pitches in pink (Victoria View and Pine Lane in blue): Pitch 1 is shown to incorporate part of, and therefore closes off, Victoria View Road. This is clearly unacceptable and the boundary must revert to the correct border shown on the SCDC maps for two reasons: a) emergency services might require access to the open land of Victoria view and beyond at any time for reasons of fire or Traveller health and b) because access is denied to pitch 12 Victoria View which still permits occupancy to two named persons

Plots 1-6 Pine Lane: Approval was given in October 2003 subject to conditions including: a scheme of works; named persons only condition 2); a turning circle

Pitches 4 & 5 were granted change of use to residential at appeal in August 2012 BUT this was allowed because the Inspector was led to believe that Pine Lane and Park Lane was effectively a through road.

May 2013 SCDC planning committee meets to consider the removal of condition 2 on pitches 1 -6 Pine Lane but:

(i) SCDC officers withdrew the application on the morning of committee (8th May) because they had “just discovered” [almost 10 years on] that the conditions of the 2003 approval had not been met, thus there was no planning permission thus removal of condition 2 was impossible.

(ii) CPC wrote in complaint to SCDC and was told during correspondence/conversation that: Mr Wall was not occupying pitches 1,2 or3 and had been advised not to do so by virtue of the fact that such action would be unlawful and would engender enforcement action.

May 2013: a wall is built across Park Lane at pitch 1a or 2 meaning that Pine Lane is again a cul-de-sac.

By July 2013 conditions applied to pitches 4 & 5 have not been met. CPC is advised by SCDC that unless conditions are met by December 3rd 2013 enforcement action will be taken. In fact SCDC fails to enforce and, instead, encourages Mr Hargreaves to submit a planning application 21st March 2014.

All of the pitches are then unlawful due to breaches of conditions. There is an obvious damage to the open countryside but it has to be weighed against need. Cllr Berenger asked if CPC had

supported the need for sites and whether it was our responsibility to take on more? There were 33 official sites and there are now 50. As regards the need CPC have encouraged District to make provision but they have turned a deaf ear in putting sites elsewhere. Cllr Mudd asked if the photos of the day rooms were already in situ and Mr Bristow confirmed that they were. There should be no occupancy of pitches 1, 2 and 3 and District has failed to enforce this. They have not had any planning permission since September 2004 and any occupancy is therefore unlawful. Pitches 4 and 5 are likewise occupied unlawfully by virtue of the failure to meet planning conditions set in August 2012. CPC need to request that the turning circle is reinstated and the road is returned to a through road. CPC should also request that plot 1 is returned to its original condition. Mr Bristow left the meeting at 7.45pm.

14/117. Standing Orders re-instated - Chairman's Introduction and Apologies – Cllrs Bristow and Richards

14/118. Declarations of Interest To receive disclosures of pecuniary and non-pecuniary interests from Councillors on matters to be considered at the meeting – none.

14/119. Planning Applications for consideration

- S/0638/14/FL – Use of land for 3 gypsy and traveller residential pitches comprising double pitch with 4 caravans, of which no more than 2 would be static caravans, and 2 dayrooms (plot 1&2); single pitch with 2 caravans, of which no more than 1 would be a static caravan, and dayroom (plot 3); and double pitch site with 4 caravans, of which no more than 2 would be static caravans, and amenity building (plot 4&5) - 1-5 Pine Way, Smithy Fen, Cottenham – Cllr Nicholas thought that plots 1, 2 and 3 were blocking the open countryside and appear to 'stretch' the site. It should be pointed out that there should be an area of open space in the middle of the site and it needs stressing that the number of pitches have increased considerably. Access must be maintained for emergency services and very recently there was a case of a fire engine being impeded. Cllr Collinson commented that we needed to use the information from Mr Bristow as the basis for our response. The Boswell application could be a problem. This development forms an unwelcome and unsafe use of the open countryside and it could cause serious safety issues. Cllr Nicholas said that if the recent appeal went against District then it could be a big victory. The number increase with poor access should be emphasised. The site is also unsustainable with a poor access road. Cllr Berenger mentioned Highways access and the increase in traffic to the site. CPC recommends refusal. Agreed unanimously.
- S/0702/14/LB – Rebuilding of single storey extension – The Old Rectory, 2 High Street, Cottenham – CPC recommends approval. All agreed.
- S/0647/14/FL – Rebuilding of single storey extension – The Old Rectory, 2 High Street, Cottenham – It doesn't appear possible to refurbish the existing extension and the D&A statement gives details in the engineers report. Cllr Collinson expressed his dislike of the roof lights and that they were out of keeping. It was generally agreed that the proposed extension should be as similar to the existing one as possible. CPC recommends approval. All agreed.

Tree Orders

- 10/12 Margett Street – Large copper beach in garden of 12 Margett Street – crown lift approx. 2.5m, prune back overhanging branches over stables at No. 10 to boundary to clear building by 2m. Shorten remaining extending limbs to balance only, remove major dead wood –CPC would like confirmation that the owner of the trees are happy for the whole tree to be treated.
- 43 High Street – Fell spruce on left hand side of new garden. White willow on right hand side, pollard at 3m and reduce ivy 1m below pruning cuts. Refer to Trees Officer.

- 44 Corbett Street – Fell Robinia Frisia in rear garden (infected with honey fungus). Refer to Trees Officer.

14/120. Close of Meeting – 8.15pm

Signed _____ (Chair) Date _____