

Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

Meeting held via Zoom on Thursday 7th January 2021 at 7.30pm

Present: Cllrs Morris (Chair), Bolitho, Graves, Jones, Loveluck, Ward, SCDC Cllrs Gough and Wilson and the Clerk

In attendance: 11 members of the public

21P/001. Chairman's Introduction and Apologies – Standing apologies for Cllr Collinson (illness).

21P/002. Any Questions from the Public or Press – no comments at this time.

21P/003. To accept Declarations of Interest and Dispensations – none given.

21P/004. Minutes – Resolution that the minutes of the Committee meeting held on 3rd December 2020 be signed as a correct record. Proposed Cllr Graves and seconded by Cllr Ward. **RESOLVED.**

21P/005. Planning Applications:

- **20/04906/OUT** - Outline planning application for the erection of up to 34 new residential units as a Social Housing Rural Exception Site in the Greenbelt with all matters reserved except for access from Histon Road, Agricultural Building And Land To The Rear Of 38 Histon Road, Cottenham. Item brought forward for the benefits of residents attending. Cllr Morris clarified the definition of a rural exception site. This site is a bit big to be considered as one. Located partly in the greenbelt which has tighter restrictions. Noted that to qualify for a rural exception site it should all be affordable housing. The developer will have to submit detailed information to justify why the development is only viable with 3 market value homes. There also have to be special reasons for breaking greenbelt and development framework rules. Currently the need for affordable homes in Cottenham is a negative figure and we have an excess. There is however a deficit of locally affordable homes (@ 60% market value); as per the Neighbourhood Plan, only these locally affordable homes should be considered in the greenbelt. Resident 9 joined the meeting at 7.46pm. Discussion regarding flood risk on Histon Road, which is particularly high on that side of the road. Noted that there is a combined sewer. Cllr Graves commented on the excessive run off rate of 2.1l per second per hectare for that water to be permitted to drain into an IDB drain. The application hasn't approached the IDB and the applicant would need IDB consent to drain into one of their ditches; the run off would also need to be reduced to 1.1l per second per hectare. The IDB are at the limit of what they can pump in that area and Andrew Newton (IDB Engineer) will provide a response to the application on behalf of the IDB. Cllr Bolitho suggested that CPC consider getting expert input on the subject of drainage. As usual the SCDC Drainage Officer has said the application is acceptable subject to conditions. Why this response when the run off rates aren't acceptable? The application puts effort into explaining the sewers but not the surface water drainage. Noted that there is merit in the developer installing a 100m pipe which would alleviate the current sewer issues in the vicinity. Standing Orders suspended at 8.07pm for resident comments.

Residents 1 & 2 stated that the water table was the highest they'd seen in 37 years living at their property. Residents 3 & 4 said that their garden had flooded every year and the proposed site has flooded on several occasions. Residents 5 & 6 agreed with previous flood comments. The access road is directly adjacent to their property. There is a slight bend on the road and they raised safety concerns. It is also precarious for pedestrians to cross (no pavement on that side of the road). Surprised that the traffic survey suggested average speeds were below 30mph. Cllr Morris suggested that in the event that the application is approved the verge should be upgraded to a full 2m wide pavement. Resident 7 was observing only. Residents 8 & 9 were concerned about traffic and drainage. In 30 years of living at their property this was the worst year for flooding. The indicative plan shows 4 properties directly behind their house. Disagree with the application when it states that there are good transport links. Local reports counter what has been stated in the ecology

report and there is an abundance of wildlife on the site. Residents 10 & 11 mentioned the flooding; their garden adjoins the site and it is frequently under water. Concerned that the village facilities couldn't cope with the extra residents. Cllr Morris asked what facilities need improvement to make the development more acceptable. SCDC Cllr Gough encouraged residents to comment on the SCDC website. He has managed to agree an extension for responses until 29th January. Noted that under one Local Plan policy (H/11 1c): any proposed development in the Green Belt must not only prove that demand exists but also pass a sequential test demonstrating that no other sites exist that would have less impact on the greenbelt. He will be making a strong point that the Drainage Officer comments are misleading as written, especially in sensitive areas such as this. The pedestrian issue is a serious concern as currently seen on Oakington Road. Cllr Morris agreed that there was an over-reliance on conditions regarding drainage which can't always be enforced. SCDC Cllr Wilson reminded residents that they need to comment on material considerations. Standing Orders reinstated 8.36pm.

Noted that there is no mention of the Neighbourhood Plan in the design and access statement. Discussion about the need for CPC to employ a drainage expert. Roof pitches appear to be too steep in the indicative plans (one reason why the This Land application was refused) but the proposed housing mix is good. CPC recommends refusal. Proposed Cllr Morris and seconded by Cllr Bolitho. **REFUSED**. Specific issues are: contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan, drainage concerns, road safety/pedestrian safety issues, outside the village framework (contrary to NP policy COH/2-1), in the greenbelt. If Officer minded to approve we would like the application to go to Committee. Residents thanked for attending and left the meeting at 8.47pm. SCDC Cllr Gough said that it would be useful for Cllr Graves to speak to the planning team so that they have a realistic idea about how close we came to a flood disaster. SCDC Cllrs Gough and Wilson left the meeting at 8.49pm.

- **20/05172/P16** - Prior approval to swap 3 no. antennas on to the existing structure retaining the same height and bearings together with associated ancillary works, Communications Station 108, Clarkes Orchard, Beach Road, Cottenham. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Morris and seconded by Cllr Ward. **APPROVED**.
- **20/04822/FUL** - Demolition of existing bungalow, garage and outbuildings and erection of 2 bedroom bungalow, land rear of 160 Histon Road, Cottenham. Noted that a previous application had been looked at on this site last year. In the greenbelt and outside the village framework. This is a new application and not on the same footprint or location. Considered an improvement in building quality. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Morris and seconded by Cllr Jones. **APPROVED**.
- **20/04895/HFUL** - Conversion of existing rear conservatory to single storey rear extension, 1 Lacks Close, Cottenham. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Morris and seconded by Cllr Ward. **APPROVED**.

For information only

- **S/2702/18/CONDA** - Submission of details required by conditions 19 (Details of secure and covered cycle storage) and 20 (Provision and location of fire hydrants) of planning permission S/2702/18/FL, King George V Playing Fields, Lambs Lane Cottenham
- **S/0582/18/CONDC** - Submission of details required by condition 6 (Cycle shed), 12 (SuDS and Sewer report) of planning permission S/0582/18/OL, 13 Ellis Close, Cottenham

SCDC – Approvals

- **20/03806/HFUL** - Erection of a two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension, 5 Ellis Close, Cottenham
- **20/04039/HFUL** - Refurbishment of part of the existing ground floor and conversion of attic space to a bed-deck, 4 Bramley Close, Cottenham

- 21P/006. Tree works applications-** consider response from SCDC regarding issues with tree applications – Cllr Bolitho outlined the issues. He felt that if a Cllr was the applicant then there needs to be evidence that they have been visited by the Trees Officer. Need to know if the tree is of value to the village. Where a tree isn't accessible there needs to be more visibility in terms of information provided. It was noted that in most cases the trees are on private land. Our comments are asking SCDC to change their process; there is no guarantee that their process is in line with the law and this was challenged in the original correspondence. The Neighbourhood Plan quotes trees that may be suitable for protection. Clerk to respond with further queries.
- 21P/007. Planning appeal** – consider response regarding appeal for 8 Mill Field Cottenham (20/02217/FUL) by 22nd January – CPC stand by previous comments.
- 21P/008. Flooding** – Consider preliminary feedback and any necessary follow-up actions from flooding incidents over Christmas – Jetting seems largely to have worked. Counsellor Graves suggested that we are getting more water from Northstowe than we should; need to keep an eye on further extensions. Item is on the agenda for the Flood Risk Forum. Rampton PC have asked to join the meetings and it was agreed that this would be logical; Clerk to contact the Rampton Clerk accordingly. We need walkers to report any issues with the Lode etc. Extinction Rebellion have contacted Cllr Ward for more information on our flooding issues and arrangements; using the NP evidence paper for background. Article for village newsletter approved.
- 21P/009. Enforcement** – consider updates from Enforcement Officers and additional items for enforcement – Case 5/18 – Angling Club, IDB and land owners all require the access code. Case 8/20 - now has three touring caravans.
- 21P/010. Date of next meeting** – 21st January 2021
- 21P/011. Close of meeting** - 9:30 PM