



# SAWSTON PARISH COUNCIL

## MINUTES of the PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE MEETING HELD 28 MAY 2019

At Link Road Parish Council Offices - Meeting commenced at 7.30pm

### PRESENT:

**Parish Clerk** Jo Keeler

### Councillors

Kevin Cuffley

Jayne Merrick

Janet Martin (Chairman)

David Bard

Neil Reid

Anand Pillai

Brian Milnes

Plus one member of public

### 1 TO ELECT A CHAIRMAN OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE FOR THE ENSUING YEAR

It was **proposed** by Councillor Kevin Cuffley and **seconded** by Councillor David Bard to **nominate** Councillor Janet Martin as Chairman of the Planning and Environment Committee for the ensuing year.

**VOTE: 6 FOR : UNANIMOUS**

### 2 TO ELECT A VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE FOR THE ENSUING YEAR

It was **proposed** by Councillor Neil Reid and **seconded** by Councillor Kevin Cuffley to **nominate** Councillor David Bard as Vice Chairman of the Planning and Environment Committee for the ensuing year.

**VOTE: 6 FOR : UNANIMOUS**

Councillor Rajni Padia arrived 7.34pm

It was **proposed** by Councillor Brian Milnes and **seconded** by Councillor David Bard to bring item 13 forward to after item 6 as a resident and allotment holder was present.

**VOTE: 7 FOR : UNANIMOUS**

### 3 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Tony Fell  
Anand Pillai

### 4 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS FOR THIS MEETING

None

### 5 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 23 APRIL 2019

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 April 2019 were read, confirmed and signed.

It was **proposed** by Councillor Neil Reid and **seconded** by Councillor Kevin Cuffley to **accept** the minutes.

**VOTE: 7 FOR : UNANIMOUS**

## 6 MATTERS ARISING – NEW INFORMATION ONLY

None

## 13 TO DISCUSS THE APPLE TREES ON THE ALLOTMENT, LONDON ROAD

The Clerk explained that an allotment holder has 2 rows of 15 apple trees on their allotment which have restricted the light to other allotments and also encroach on the footpath between some allotments.

Pictures were shown and this was discussed at length.

It was **proposed** by Councillor Kevin Cuffley and **seconded** by Councillor Brian Milnes to write to the allotment holder and ask them to keep the trees trimmed and tidy and to a maximum height of 6ft so as not to shadow the other allotments. Also, to keep the fruit cultivated and express our concern about the proximity of the trees and ask if they would consider thinning trees out which would also benefit the crop. The Assistant Clerk will keep an eye on the trees to ensure this happens.

**VOTE: 7 FOR : UNANIMOUS**

## 7 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

<a href="#">S/1483/19/LB</a>	<p>Total demolition of the building known as the 'Great Eastern Drying Shed' at 163, High Street.</p> <p>It was <b>proposed</b> by Councillor Kevin Cuffley and <b>seconded</b> by Councillor Neil Reid to <b>support</b> this application.</p>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <p><b>Vote: 5 For</b> <b>1 No Vote</b> <b>1 Against</b></p> <p><b>PC Comment:</b> <b>It was felt this has been considered for such a long time and is now at a stage beyond repair. Many attempts have been made to save the building and proven difficult.</b></p>
<a href="#">S/1556/19/FL</a>	<p>Front porch with a synthetic tiled roof at 7, Sunderlands Avenue.</p> <p>It was <b>proposed</b> by Councillor Kevin Cuffley and <b>seconded</b> by Councillor Jayne Merrick to <b>support</b> this application.</p>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <p><b>Vote: 5 For</b> <b>1 No Vote</b> <b>1 Against</b></p>
<a href="#">S/0070/19/CC</a>	<p>Erection of extension to form new school entrance, reception area and administration area following demolition of existing entrance and administration area and alterations to car park layout at The Icknield Primary School, Lynton Way.</p>	<p><b>Asked for an extension of time because we have not had questions answered. Impact on car park? What will they gain out of this?</b></p>

<a href="#">S/3729/18/FL</a>	<p>Full planning application for the erection of 158 residential units and associated access points, landscaping and infrastructure at Site H/1:b – Land North of Babraham Road.</p> <p>It was <b>proposed</b> by Councillor David Bard and <b>seconded</b> by Councillor Kevin Cuffley to <b>send comments to SCDC</b>.</p>	<p><b>Noted – Still issues with this.</b></p> <p><b>Vote: 6 For 1 No Vote</b></p> <p><b>PC Comment: Attached to minutes</b></p>
<a href="#">S/4099/17/OL</a>	<p>Outline planning application for development of an AgriTech technology park at Land to the east of the A1301, south of the A505 near Hinxton and west of the A1301, north of the A505 near Whittlesford.</p>	<p><b>Clerk to arrange a meeting with County, Highways and District representative and nearby villages to discuss before responding.</b></p>
<a href="#">S/1625/18/OL</a>	<p>Outline planning permission for residential development of up to 30 dwellings with matters reserved apart from access, appearance, layout and scale at Land at, Mill Lane, Sawston.</p> <p>It was <b>proposed</b> by Councillor Neil Reid and <b>seconded</b> by Councillor David Bard to <b>support refusal</b> of this application.</p>	<p><b>Support the District Councils original response of refusal.</b></p> <p><b>Vote: 7 For Unanimous</b></p>

#### **Information Only – Noted**

[S/1074/19/DC](#) Discharge of conditions 20 Part B (contamination) pursuant to planning permission S/1515/15/OL for residential development and associated works including access at 43, Mill Lane.

[S/1411/19/DC](#) Discharge of conditions 11 (ecological enhancement) of planning permission S/0492/19/VC for variation of condition 2 (plans) of planning permission S/2372/16/FL at Deal Farm, Cambridge Road

[S/1708/19/NM](#) Non-material amendment to planning permission S/2284/17/OL at Sawston Trade Park and adjacent vacant land, A1301/London Road, Pampisford

## **8 PLANNING DECISIONS**

Noted

## **9 TO AGREE TYPE OF BUS SHELTER AT LONDON ROAD**

SCDC recently made a resolution to grant planning consent for Unity Campus, Sawston and one of the requirements regarding S106 is to install two bus shelters on London Road.

The Parish Council has been asked which design they prefer.

The Clerk explained that a few years ago she met with the Highways Officer and went around the village bus stops to see if any were suitable to have a shelter and was told that due to either the area or the curtilage there were not suitable areas. The Clerk was asked to contact SCDC and question this before we make a decision on the proposed bus shelters.

**10 TO REVIEW THE DRAWINGS/PROPOSAL FOR THE LHI (LOCAL HIGHWAYS INITIATIVE) APPLICATION IN CHURCH LANE**

The committee has been asked to review the position of the proposed double yellow lines in Church Lane and give feedback.

It was **proposed** by Councillor Neil Reid and **seconded** by Councillor Jayne Merrick to accept the proposed layout.

**VOTE: 7 FOR : UNANIMOUS**

**11 TO DISCUSS TREE WARDEN TRAINING**

SCDC are asking for few parishes to find out how receptive they would be to paying for some tree warden training if SCDC organised it and facilitated it.

It would be a basic Tree Survey and Inspection one day course, suitable for tree wardens or clerks who perhaps help to monitor and assess parish tree stock on open spaces etc for health and safety. The cost to the parish council would be £100. At the end the candidate receives a certificate of attendance.

This was discussed and the committee decided against it as they would not want to take on such a responsibility, we budget to have tree survey regularly and are happy with this arrangement.

It was **proposed** by Councillor Kevin Cuffley and **seconded** by Councillor David Bard to decline the offer.

**VOTE: 6 FOR : 1: AGAINST**

**12 TO DISCUSS THE HEDGE AT BUTLERS GREEN**

The Clerk explained as previously requested she has written to the owners of the hedge at Butlers Green to ask them to tidy it up and cut back from the public footpath which is almost covered. No response has been received and the work has not been done.

It was **proposed** by Councillor Kevin Cuffley and **seconded** by Councillor David Bard that the Clerk writes to them again asking if they intend to do the work. We understand it cannot be done until after July because of the birds nesting but will it be scheduled to be done. This is an amenity area which should be kept clean and tidy and the hedge is now encroaching on the public footpath. If the Clerk doesn't receive a response within 4 weeks of the letter she is to write a 3<sup>rd</sup> time. If after that time there is no response it will be an agenda item for the full parish to discuss.

**VOTE: 7 FOR :**

**13 TO DISCUSS THE APPLE TREES ON THE ALLOTMENTS**

Already discussed.

**14 TO DISCUSS THE POSSIBILITY OF MOVING THE SAWSTON SIGN ON CAMBRIDGE ROAD/HUCKERIDGE HILL**

The County Council has had a request for the "Sawston – Twinned with Selsingen" sign to be relocated slightly further back towards the hedgerow. This would be to improve the visibility/sight lines along Cambridge Road whilst exiting Deal Farm.

The County Council have capacity within the Stapleford to Sawston project to respond to this request – however they wanted to run it past the Parish Council first. They would effectively be looking to keep the far left post in place – installing a new post to the left of that and moving the sign across. The post currently on the right hand side would then be removed.

This was discussed at length and Councillor Kevin Cuffley is concerned that if the sign is moved closer to the hedge and then gets covered by the hedge as many do it will not be

visible and he felt that this sign does slow vehicles down entering the village so would not want to see the sign moved.

It was ***proposed*** by Councillor Brian Milnes and ***seconded*** by Councillor Neil Reid that the sign is moved.

**VOTE: 3 FOR : 3 AGAINST 1 NO VOTE**

The Chairman of the Planning & Environment Committee has the casting vote and went with her original vote of objection to the sign being moved.

**15 UPDATE ON CAMBRIDGE SOUTH EAST TRANSPORT STUDY AND DEVELOPMENTS**

This item will be deferred to July full parish meeting as we have asked representatives to attend.

**16 UPDATE ON THE VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENT**

Councillor Janet Martin explained the consultation is still running and ends 31st May.

**17 CORRESPONDENCE**

None

**18 COUNCILLORS ISSUES AND AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING: CONCERNING P & E ONLY**

**Meeting Closed at 9.08pm**

## Comments regarding S/3729/18/FL

Dear Rebecca (SCDC)

Thank you for attracting our attention to the advert of 10<sup>th</sup> October, 2018 indicating that Application S/3729/18/FL was not in accord with the development plan. By advertising this application as a departure, SCDC has (irrespective of officer opinion) admitted that the application is a departure from Policy H1. Has it been referred to the Secretary of State as such?

The citation of NPPF Para.123 (a) as a justification for departing from H8 is irrelevant. The site is clearly not 'a city or town centre' nor is it 'well served by public transport'. The centre of the site is over 800m from the proposed relocated bus stop near the junction with Churchfield Avenue and the latest guidance suggests that the maximum walking distance to a bus stop with a service of less than 5 per hour (i.e. one every 12 minutes) should be 300m. (Chartered Institute of Highways and Transport (CHIT) guidance ('Buses in urban developments', Jan.2018, Table 4, p.18). This latest standard for less frequent services has been reduced from the 400m guidance cited in the SCDC Design SPD (Para.6.11) and 'Guidelines for providing for journeys on foot' Institute of Highways & Transportation, 2000. The SPD and 'Guidelines for providing for journeys on foot' also suggest a maximum walking distance of 800m from a local centre (Para. 6.17 of the SPD). The distance from the centre of H/1b to the centre of Sawston (junction of Mill Lane & High St.) by the shortest pedestrian route is 1,500m. The 'most sustainable' credentials of this site therefore fail by a large margin against all these criteria. Whilst we are aware that these standards are not mandatory, they are the closest we have to objective criteria for these aspects of 'sustainability' to set against the *ad hoc* unevidenced opinion of a planning officer.

We would also take issue with the reference to a 'design led approach'. This implies that a design guide should have been produced for the site and approved before the full application was submitted. The Officer Report to the Planning Committee (10/04/2019) states that 'Pre-application discussions included three design workshops with consultees and the scheme was considered at by Design Enabling Panel. General support was given subject to amendments to the layout/design'. When were these 'design workshops' held and who were the 'consultees'? SPC has no record of such discussions, no evidence of community or stakeholder involvement beyond presentation with a *fait accompli* following which objections by SPC and the wider community were largely ignored, nor any sight of a final design guide which may or may not have been produced as a result of these deliberations.

It would also be of interest to know what design principles, other than a desire to maximise the number of dwellings on the site, guided this process. The inclusion of four storey buildings which will intrude well above the skyline on this flat and open site is clearly at variance with the guidance in Para. 5.2 of the adopted District Design Guide SPD and also with the Sawston Design Guide consultation draft. It is also misleading to claim as the developers and SCDC officers have done repeatedly, that the density decreases towards the green belt. Since the green belt was altered by the Local Plan, the main boundary between it and this site is on the North East. One of the tenement blocks abuts directly onto this boundary and hence the green belt. At this point the density is 66.7dph. This high building will appear overbearing from the footpath/bridleway running north/south along the western boundary of the site and therefore will have a seriously detrimental effect on publicly accessible views from the green belt which it will be impossible to mitigate effectively with screening. The density calculations also take no account of existing development in claiming a decrease towards the green belt. The closest existing residential estate west of H/1b, N. of the Babraham Rd (Wakelin Avenue, Resbury Close, Broadmeadow, Fairfields, Gosling Way and Teversham Way - 245 dwellings in 8.096 Ha) equates to 30.3 dph net density. This decrease in density as one approaches the centre of Sawston along the Babraham Rd. will be very apparent. The equivalent density figure for Lynton Way/Stanley Webb Close located to the South East of H/1b and the closest residential development is 31.06 dph (110 dwellings on 3.54 Ha). No buildings on these sites exceed two storeys. Thus H/1b will be wholly out of character with neighbouring developments both on density and design grounds.

We are also dismayed at the dismissal of the objections from a neighbouring resident who pointed out, both in written and verbal representations that the dwelling on Plot No.21 of the proposed development was significantly closer to his boundary (5m) than the recommended minimum of 15m in the adopted District Design Guide SPD.