

Minutes of the Public Meeting

Held in Cottenham Village College on **Tuesday 1st September at 7.30pm**

Chaired: Frank Morris, Chair of Cottenham Parish Council with minutes taken by the Parish Clerk, Jo Brook

In attendance: 127 members of the public

Introduction:

Mr Morris outlined the holding that Gladman have on the land off Rampton Road, which is considerably more than the current outline planning application. The purpose of the public meeting is for Cllrs to listen to resident comments regarding the application which is being reviewed on Thursday 3rd September at 7.30pm in the Village Hall.

Q. What is the size of the site itself and what is the larger outlined area?

A. There is potential for Gladman to develop on a larger site. The other applications in the vicinity will be looked at sequentially by SCDC and tonight is only to look at the Gladman proposal.

Q. Has the lack of Northstowe the cause of Cottenham having these planning applications?

A. There isn't a Local Plan for South Cambs which leaves us open to speculative developers. If the development isn't sustainable then it won't get planning permission.

Q. Is the village design statement relevant?

A. Don't know at the current time.

Q. Is the site being built on greenbelt?

A. No.

Q. Is the proposal for a care home or care apartments?

A. Apartments. However we can't be sure of the final design because this is an outline application only. Gladman are only promoting the site and will then put it out to tender.

Q. Is the site agricultural land?

A. Yes.

Mr Morris ran through the planning process. The development principles of the Neighbourhood Plan process shown in the presentation were tested at the FEFF; there are 6 positives and 3 caveats.

Q. Affordable houses; do they stay affordable?

A. There may be controls on the future selling on or rental but this can't be determined at the current time.

Q. Where is the quality of life in the development principles?

A. It principles are a bit of everything across the spectrum. The responses to the survey itself were very different depending on your viewpoint. Some people had very strong views about affordable housing whereas others were more concerned about the primary school.

Q. Where is the status quo?

A. This may be a luxury we don't have!

Principle 1: More affordable homes

Q. Where did the figures come from regarding the number of affordable houses needed?

A. SCDC.

Q. What is the definition of affordable?

A. 80% of market value.

Q. What is the number of actual people requiring affordable housing?

A. Don't know.

Comment from County Cllr Mike Mason: The 'up to 40%' should be viewed with suspicion. Most developers are negotiating this down when it comes to the detail.

Q. Is it true that big corporations i.e. Astra Zeneca bought the affordable housing on the Beach Road site?

A. Don't know but there were restrictions in the S106 agreement that the houses should have gone to Cottenham people or those with links to the village.

Principle 2: More pre-school places

Q. How much did the Beach Road development help us?

A. Not sure but in the future the controls of where S106 money is spent are tighter.

Principle 3: Better medical/Day Centre facilities

Q. Who will fund the new medical centre?

A. Gladman would need to contribute.

Q. Is there a way of getting what the village needs in terms of additional facilities without the extra development?

A. A Neighbourhood Plan would do this and we can do it another way i.e. increase the precept, grants etc.

C. We need to look at those with special needs, diabetes, mother and baby groups etc. and not just the elderly.

Principle 4: More local employment

Q. What is the local population currently?

A. Approximately 6,400 and 2,700 households.

C. The development is 15 minutes' walk from the village centre/facilities so people may use cars to go elsewhere.

Q. Would there be a higher risk of flooding due to the increase in building?

Q. These days developments are better geared to cope and the Northstowe approach to flood management is the best seen in this area.

Q. If you want to increase employment then surely you need to increase businesses?

A. Gladman haven't addressed this properly, only on a temporary basis during the course of the build.

C. There has already been an effect on electricity supplies in the village over the past 20 years with the number of power cuts increasing.

C. The sewers on Rampton Road are already bad.

Q. Don't we need to consider the Endurance application at the same time as this one?

A. We need to look at the combined consequences.

C. Need to look at how Northstowe will affect us before we can deal with this application – can't second guess the number of people travelling there to work for example.

Principle 5: Improved leisure/recreational facilities

Q. What percentage of income coming into the council is put towards leisure?

A. Details of all budgetary items are available on our website – all figures are published and are transparent.

C. We need to think about how the Gladman leisure facilities would affect traffic management on Rampton Road – would need a crossing to get to Les King Wood for example.

Principle 6: Easier movement in/out/around the village

Q. Where is the access going to be on Rampton Road?

A. One near the village perimeter and the other via a property purchase.

Q. Would they need planning permission to demolish the property?

A. This would probably for part of the main application.

C. There will be huge queues cause by traffic turning right out of the development.

Q. What is the access road billed as secondary access?

A. This is done as a consequence of their pre-application advice. If building more than 100 houses there must be 2 access roads. They are stating that the second access road would take 50% of the vehicles.

Q. I have reservations about the access on the hill being a major junction due the lack of visibility. This is unsustainable.

A. It is the degree of how unsustainable it is.

C. It is already dangerous getting out of driveway on Rampton Road and the road can't cope with the size of the agricultural vehicles.

Q. Are we certain that the property being demolished to provide the second access has been purchased?

A. We don't know for certain.

Q. Has the application indicated that Gladman own the land to achieve the off-road route to the school?

A. They offer to improve the pavement but they will probably try to get permission later to another site.

Q. Has Gladman considered the effect on intra-village roads?

A. They have produced a traffic assessment document.

Q. Is it a consideration that the public transport isn't good in this village? Quite often 2 buses turn up at the same time and therefore go before their scheduled time.

A. SCDC have rated us in the first tier of sustainable transport! They go on frequency of the service.

C. My son got knocked down on Rampton Road and I'm concerned about the increase in number of car movements. The road is not safe.

Principle 7: Compromise conservation area/village core

C. There is a need for better guidelines for the sharing of cycle/pedestrian paths – a friend was knocked down by a cyclist on Rampton Road.

C. Gladman say the guided bus at 3km away is achievable on a road with no cycle path. Completely unachievable.

Q. What about Histon? It currently takes me 1 hour to do 8 miles. Have they been formally consulted?

C. Histon confirmed that Cottenham Clerk had been keeping them up to date.

C. Need to look at the effect of building on a high ridge – the site will be very visible on village approaches.

Q. Could they not be expected to build a bypass looping round the site all the way to Histon? This would remove a lot of through traffic. Is it not something that should be considered as per Longstanton?

Q. Surely SCDC and CC should put substantial money into the infrastructure.

A. CC have no money for building additional roads/a bypass.

C. High Street parking – some of the people living on the development (particularly the care apartments) will need to drive because they are not able to walk long distances.

C. Most people will drive to the Co-op which will cause gridlock.

Q. Is there not provision for another village store?

A. It can be suggested – this application is just a concept at this stage so could change.

Principle 8: Increase noise/pollution

C. The increase looks more like 20% not 10%.

C. Noise levels on Rampton Road are already high – if walking you can't hear a conversation.

Q. Sewerage facilities: with 1/6 increase will there be a new pumping station?

A. Anglian Water have an obligation to deal with that.

Principle 9: Overload Primary School

Mr Morris stated that in the past the village has resisted a second school; has this changed?

Q. What is the purpose of the current school extension?

A. To take the existing pupils.

C. Cottenham is one of the biggest primary schools in Cambridgeshire.

C. The pre-application advice from County is that CVC can't cope with an increase in numbers either.

Q. Are pupils at the primary school from the village or outside?

A. The majority are from Cottenham but we have some from Rampton. Don't know about other villages.

Q. Have parents at the school been informed about this development?

A. Only via the planning process.

Q. Is the second bullet per year or a total?

A. A total.

What have we missed?

Q. What does this development do to existing property values and what is the effect on agricultural land?

A. This isn't a planning consideration. Government policy is to build more houses almost at any cost.

C. The location won't integrate well with the rest of the village – may end up isolated.

Q. Not enough has been made of Northstowe. Why will we need this development?

A. It should be building now but Gladman think they can provide houses quicker – by 2017.

C. Rex Collinson (Parish Cllr) clarified that the local authority is required to have a 5 year housing supply. SCDC can't currently demonstrate this supply which is why the developers are seizing on these opportunities. Mr Morris confirmed that SCDC currently have applications for 2500 houses. There is now another application at pre-application stage for Cottenham for a further 150 houses on Oakington Road.

Q. How many houses were built at Tenison Manor and Brenda Gautry Way?

A. Approx. 250 for TM and 150 on BGW.

Q. Is there any way to stop this development?

A. There might be. If you go back to the NPPF the development has to be sustainable. Eric Pickles said that the NPPF applies and that the development must be sustainable. The key thing would be to show that it isn't sustainable. CPC would need to put a case together to give to the Case Officer at SCDC. He may make conditions which Gladman may not like and therefore appeal.

C. Mr Collinson said that residents can have a say in the process. As well as writing to SCDC you can go to the SCDC Planning Committee meeting and even the appeal hearing (if applicable). So don't sit back and think you can't do anything.

C. Kate Heydon (Parish Cllr) thought that the deadline for comments was midnight tonight. Resident confirmed that he had spoken to the Case Officer who said that SCDC would accept comments for the next week.

C. County Cllr Mason thought that the unsustainability argument could be applied to 7 of the principle development points. There is case law to challenge the 5 year supply. He was disappointed because residents had already been consulted of this site via the LDF consultation and it was categorically rejected. If you want then consult again on the LDF because if the development goes ahead it would be against the wishes of residents. Cottenham is too far out from Cambridge to be considered and there are still brownfield sites available in the City to accommodate additional houses.

Q. The developers have a huge amount of money to fight their corner. Does CPC have enough firepower to respond?

A. We have sufficient resources available but we also have vacancies for 2 further councillors at the moment should you wish to join us!

With no further comments residents were thanked for attending and reminded that the application will be reviewed on Thursday 3rd September.

Meeting closed at 9.15pm.

Resident thanked CPC for hosting the meeting and the Clerk for taking the minutes.