

### Minutes of the Planning Committee

Held in the Village Hall, Recreation Ground, Cottenham on **Thursday 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2015 at 7.30pm**

**Present:** Cllrs Mudd (Chair), Collier, Collinson, Heydon, McCarthy, Morris, Nicholas, Richards Young, SCDC Cllrs Edwards and Harford, CCC Cllr Mason, Clerk (Jo Brook) and Assistant Clerk (Sam McManners)

**In attendance:** 14 members of the public

**15P/134. Chairman's Introduction and Apologies** – apologies accepted from Cllrs Bolitho (work). The Chair outlined to the public how the meeting would be conducted.

**15P/135. Any Questions from the Public or Press – Standing orders to be suspended** – Resident asked if any further points had been made since the public meeting. Answer, no. CCC Cllr Mason asked if representations from residents had gone to SCDC. Clerk confirmed that we'd been copied in on objections, all of which had been sent to SCDC. Question as to whether there had been communication with SCDC as to whether the other applications will be considered at the same time. SCDC Cllr Edwards confirmed that an application from Persimmon for up to 150 houses is forthcoming but is not at outline stage so can't be considered at the current time. **Standing orders re-instated.**

**15P/136. 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.* None received.

**15P/137. Minutes** – Resolution that the minutes of the Committee meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> August be signed as a correct record. **RESOLVED**

**15P/138. Planning Applications for consideration**

- **S/1818/15/OL** – Outline application for the erection of up to 225 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 Application, Land off Rampton Road, Cottenham.

Chair stated that we would use the 9 development principles as a guide for the meeting. We have received a letter from the Campaign for Rural England to object to the development. They state that the quantity of houses is out of proportion to the size of Cottenham. In the core strategy, ST/5, it states that developments should be restricted to 30 dwelling maximum. Chair highlighted the previous planning history of the site which stated sewerage/drainage issues. Only 400 houses were consulted about the development. CPC asked for further consultation and Gladman advertised in a newspaper that doesn't circulate in Cottenham along with a small article in the village newsletter. The flood risk assessment states that it is zone 1 however it is next to the catchwater drain which is classed as 3B. Cllr Heydon pointed out that apart from the number of properties and accesses everything else in the application was reserved and therefore we'd need to look carefully at these.

**Affordable housing:** The 'up to 40%' is an issue and we should insist on a minimum of 40%. Cllr Collinson stated that although Cottenham does need more affordable homes it should not be 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 which would make them unsustainable. Cllr Young pointed out that the site itself failed to be sustainable for the elderly – DP/1b and the same is true for younger families. Cllr Harford clarified that affordable houses from Moreton Close had been allocated using a 'cascade system' whereby they had to be offered to Cottenham residents first and then the next tier and so on.

**Pre-school places:** there is no indication in the Gladman package on how they would mitigate against the increase in numbers however they have said they'd be willing to discuss. Cllr Young quoted section 72 of the NPPF which says there must be a choice a provider.

**Medical/day care facilities:** the development will increase both the general population by approx. 10% but with a bias towards the elderly which will increase demands on our already overburdened facilities. There is nothing in the proposals to mitigate. CPC are meeting with NHS England shortly to get further details of their requirements. Cllr Heydon suggested asking for onsite medical provision with parking to mitigate the inadequate parking at the existing facilities. Cllr Morris mentioned that if people moved here then the needs are lessened elsewhere. These facilities are located an unsustainable distance from the development site. The development fails to meet **DP/1m**.

**Employment:** Cllr Morris stated that the reason Cottenham is classified as a minor rural centre is due to the lack of employment. If we become a rural centre we would lose the 30 houses maximum 'protection'. Cllr Young stated the development fails to meet **NPPF 17 and 19**. Without local provision it will increase local commuter traffic.

**Leisure:** our current demand for leisure facilities outstrips supply. A 10% increase in population will only increase this problem. While the proposed development is located close to many of the outdoor facilities in the village it's an unsustainable distance away from the core of the village. There is no meaningfully sustainable way for residents from established areas of the village to use the facilities onsite due to its remoteness. **NPPF 58**.

**Easier movement in/out/around the village:** Cllr Collinson thought that the accesses were utterly inappropriate and the changes to the roundabout were minor by comparison. The proposed development acknowledges that it will increase rush hour traffic by 20% 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 Gladman claim. **NPPF 39**. Cllr Heydon confirmed that the speed limit looked ok. However part of the problem was the cars travelling over 30mph in the zone around the proposed access. Additionally access by 295 Rampton Road is at the crest of the hill and very close to the house. Cllr Nicholas had visited the site and standing on that side of the road and looking right there are often vehicles parked which made visibility poor and therefore a danger to pedestrians and cars exiting the site even without an increase in numbers. Cllr Young stated there was considerable doubt about the pedestrian access and whether Gladman owned the land; this needs clarifying. The SCDC Landscape Officer is quoted as saying the site is a large cul de sac, badly connected to the village. Guided bus: there is no parking and we have no safe access via bike to Oakington. The principle road out is the B1049 and County have already raised concerns with the Histon junctions. Furthermore there is no effective bus service and the trip times shown bear no relationship to actual travel times (they are taken from timetables only). The location of the site is a disincentive to bus travel rather than an incentive. The Gladman 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 **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 fenland views approaching the village from Oakington or Rampton. Also contrary to **Cottenham Village Design Statement and DP/1p, DP2/a and DP/3.2**. 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**. Standing Orders suspended at 8.48pm. Resident spoke to say that the developer needed to look at the Endurance application which shows a possible link to the Oakington Road. Standing Orders reinstated at 8.49pm.

**Noise/pollution:** Frank stated that Gladman had acknowledged there would be an increase in noise and they have design of the houses takes this into consideration but doesn't help the existing residents on Rampton/Histon/Oakington Roads. Contrary to **NPPF 110, 123 and 58**.

**Overloading of Primary School:** If all 3 developments were to come through they would necessitate a second primary school. Contrary to **NPPF 72**. The new extension was built to cope with the current capacity. Cllr Collinson said that any increase in capacity would need to be handled sensitively to limit damage to the cohesive role that the school plays in the village.

**Drainage: NPPF 102.** Gladman have not taken into account the flood risk. Cllr Young mentioned that a substantial portion of the site drains towards Oakington Road. We also have a high water table in the village. Chair read out the SHLAA comments re. sewer/drainage. 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 and have serious concerns about the surface water management scheme to counter any potential flood risk.

**Loss of agricultural land:** Contrary to **NPPF 112.**

**Sewage:** Cllr Richards commented that there had been lots of problems with drains on Denmark Road. Although the main ones along the High Street had been upgraded there are still known problems in the area. Additionally there is no mention of whether there would be an additional pumping station.

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.**

- 15P/139. Invoices for payment** – To authorise C.J Murfitt Ltd invoice (B73052) dated 06/08/15 and sign cheque for £83,874.41 + VAT £16,774.88 Totalling £100,649.29. To authorise Goldfinch environmental Ltd invoice (0713) dated 16/07/15 and sign cheque for £850 + VAT £170 Totalling £1020.00 **RESOLVED**
- 15P/140. Date of next meeting** – 10<sup>th</sup> September 2015
- 15P/141. Close of meeting:** 9.12pm

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