

**CAXTON PARISH COUNCIL**

**Minutes of the Extra-ordinary Meeting of the Parish Council held in the Village Hall  
on Thursday 16 October 2014 at 7.45 pm**

Present: Councillors: K Howard (Chairman), K Human, E Blair, L Post and J Molloy.

In attendance: 7 members of the public, District Cllr A Elcox and Mrs A Griffiths (Minutes Secretary, LGS Services)

**1. Apologies for absence and declarations of interest**

None.

**1.1 To receive declarations of interests from councillors on items on the agenda**

Cllrs Howard, Blair and Human declared an interest in Item 2.1 as residents of Ermine Street, and also the existence of their dispensations. Cllr Molloy declared an interest in Item 2.1 as a resident of Ermine Street.

**1.2 To receive written requests for dispensations for disclosable pecuniary interests**

Cllr Molloy submitted an application for a dispensation as a resident of Ermine Street.

**1.3 To grant any requests for dispensation as appropriate**

The dispensation request from Cllr Molloy enabling her to speak and vote on matters relating to Ermine Street was approved (Prop KHo, 2nd EB, carried with 4 in favour and 1 abstention).

**Comments & observations from members of the public and reports from District & County Councillors**

Residents spoke to their letters of objection to the proposed development at 94 Ermine Street, and urged the Parish Council not to support the application. The points made included:

The need to preserve the rural aspect of the area and the objection to the felling of two mature trees, leading to urbanisation of the area and the creation of a cul-de-sac, on the grounds of which previous applications had already been refused. The building would be close to the adjacent residents' fence and driveway.

The potential increase in traffic movements and the consequent deterioration of the track. The need for three cars was questioned.

Concerns were expressed that if approved, further applications for the adjacent area of land, which was outside the village framework, would follow.

The design of the house was not felt to be in keeping with the surrounding area or properties and was sited close to the village framework boundary on two sides.

Removal of the trees would be detrimental to the rural character of the area.

The track used by both vehicles and pedestrians was considered hazardous and the splay dangerous, with limited visibility. It was already difficult to turn right on to Ermine Street and existing problems would be exacerbated. An increase in the number of vehicles using the track could restrict residents' ability to access/exit their drives. In times of heavy rain water was funnelled down the track taking sand and gravel with it, which washed into drains and made the track surface hazardous. There appeared to be no turning space for vehicles and it was difficult to see how vehicles could park or manoeuvre, or how construction vehicles could access the site, without causing disruption to residents and blocking them in.

It was observed that the rear of the building was on the boundary line of the village framework.

It was observed that the Planning Inspector had commented that the last plan for the site was not in keeping with the local area and would have an adverse impact on the countryside. Of the seven points raised by the Inspector, only the one relating to the Framework had been addressed by the developer.

The Chairman confirmed that the Parish Council had sought clarification and checked the plans with South Cambridgeshire District Council, and had established that the dwelling itself was contained within the village framework. It had been confirmed that the plans received by the Council were in accordance with the application under consideration. SCDC had stated that

any additional garden space situated within the blue area would be subject to planning and change of use applications.

A query was raised as to whether there was adequate access for emergency vehicles, and whether requirements were met.

Cllr Blair stated that, whilst he had indicated he was predisposed to refuse the application, he had not yet made or pre-determined his decision.

## **2. Planning Applications**

### **2.1 S/2135/14/FL – 94 Ermine Street – New dwelling**

RESOLVED unanimously to recommend refusal. <sup>(Prop JM, 2nd LP)</sup> An accompanying letter is to be sent outlining the objections on the following grounds:

- Vehicle access and volume - The very narrow width of the access track does not allow any passing of vehicles. The track is dual purpose, for pedestrians and vehicles, is used by parents with pushchairs, and is not suitable for heavy vehicles. The Council has concerns that emergency vehicles would have difficulty in attending/accessing the properties. The splay is dangerous, and it is already very hazardous and difficult to turn right onto Ermine Street; another building bringing additional traffic movements would exacerbate existing problems. The surface of the track is lime and gravel and in times of heavy rain the surface washes away as water is funnelled down the track and washes loose gravel away down the track, making the surface hazardous.
- The proposed development is in a conservation area, and it is not in keeping with the rural environment or the surrounding properties. The Parish Council is concerned about the removal of trees, including a healthy ash tree, which would detract from the rural scene and nature of the surroundings. The comments of the Planning Inspector on this aspect, made at the time of the last application on this site, are to be quoted as they are pertinent to the current application.
- The proposal indicates there will be provision for space for 3 cars, but no garaging or parking area is shown on the plan. No turning area is possible within the site, and it is unclear how construction vehicles would access the site. The plans are ambiguous as to where cars can manoeuvre, and the building of an additional dwelling resulting in three extra parked vehicles is likely to restrict existing residents' access to their properties.
- Of the seven points raised by the Inspector at the last appeal for a property built adjacent to the site, only one has been addressed, namely the issue relating to the Framework. The walls of the building appear to be at the very edge of the village envelope.
- If the Planning Officer is minded to approve the application, the Parish Council asks that the application be called in for the Planning Committee to consider. In that event, Cllr Elcox indicated her willingness to speak on this, in addition to the Parish Council.

Six residents left the meeting.

## **3. To consider any correspondence received**

### **3.1 SCDC Neighbourhood Planning**

RESOLVED to respond to SCDC that the proposed model appeared to be a perfect template for a Service Level Agreement between the interested parties.

RESOLVED that Cllrs Howard and Molloy should attend the one day training session on Neighbourhood Planning.

Brief consideration was given to the process of preparing a Neighbourhood Plan, which would involve assessing the benefits, setting up a working group of Councillors and

others, considering becoming a Quality Council, and the possibility of co-operation with other Parish Councils.

**4. To consider a report from the Chairman on a meeting with representatives from Cambourne Parish Council about the Caxton/Cambourne boundary**

The Chairman reported on the informal meeting held with Cambourne Parish Council. RESOLVED that while the Parish Council was opposed to the inclusion of Cambourne West to find out what stage the S106 agreement had reached, noting that it would be necessary to define what Caxton would want from the agreement and how any money should be spent.

RESOLVED to invite the SCDC S106 officer James Fisher to the next meeting to provide information and discuss S106 agreements.

Consideration of any suggestions and the way forward will be an agenda item for the next meeting. Support and input from the village would be necessary in due course.

**5. Closure of meeting**

CIlr Elcox reported on the renewable energy fund for installing solar panels on public buildings, and offered to forward information about this.

There was no further business and the meeting closed at 9.30 pm.

Signed .....Chairman .....date.

