

## Annex A – Planning Minutes approved during 16<sup>th</sup> April PC Meeting

*Cllr Roberts explained that the PC had recently been in correspondence with SCDC regarding the Appleacre site. A Breach of Condition Notice had been issued on 8 March and Cllr Roberts read this out. The person (owners) in breach needs to cease using the area for mobile homes, return the land to its previous condition (i.e. to be used for touring caravans and tents only), and they have 6 months to do so. There was a warning that the Notice takes effect immediately with NO right of appeal other than a judicial review.*

*Cllr Roberts explained that the Breach of Condition Notice was issued by SCDC not the PC; the PC had been concerned about the issues at Appleacre for some time and had repeatedly expressed these concerns to SCDC. The formal review in July 2018 by the Planning Inspectorate had been very strongly against these developments. Thus, the owners have known about the issues for some time.*

*The meeting was then opened up to allow the members of the public to air their views, and six of them did so. The main concerns aired were primarily regarding the four families residing in mobile homes that are in the areas of the park that are in breach of planning permission; two of these families had been served letters to leave and were very concerned about this. [Since the meeting it has been confirmed by John Koch of SCDC that only two mobile homes are in contravention of the 1992 planning permission, not four as he had previously thought.] The other main concern was regarding the safety and peacefulness of the site being disturbed if the areas were returned to use by touring caravans and tents; it was felt that the site would become noisy, and anti-social behaviour would occur.*

*The Parish Council listened to the concerns and expressed sympathy to those who have bought mobile homes in the disputed areas. The PC recommended that the group of residents form an action group, get legal advice regarding their rights and then approach the owners with their concerns asking what they intend to do. The PC suggested that the owners could legally relocate the four [two] affected caravans to the permitted areas as they have permission for 27 caravans and at the moment there are only 22 mobile homes located on the site; the residents' group could press the owners to do this. They also said that if any anti-social behaviour does occur on the site in the future then the residents should let the owners know what is going on and/or call the police.*

### **7. Other Matters and Updates**

*No other matters were brought forward.*

*The meeting closed at 20:11.*

\*\*\*\*\*

### **MINUTES OF A MEETING OF FOWLMERE PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD IN THE PAVILION ROOM, FOWLMERE VILLAGE HALL, FOWLMERE on TUESDAY 2<sup>nd</sup> APRIL 2019 at 7:30pm**

**PRESENT:** Cllr D Roberts (Chairman), Cllr L Wragg, Cllr P Burge, Cllr T Bearpark, Cllr M Vinton and Cllr S Mulholland arrived at 19:32

**APOLOGIES:** Cllr M Sunderland, Cllr C Howe and Cllr P Collinson

**IN ATTENDANCE** Ms K Byrne (Clerk) and 10 members of the public including Mr Foulsham who left the meeting at 19:43

### **1. Declarations of interest (if any)**

*Cllr Roberts declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 3.*

*Cllr Roberts declared that if an application is later placed before South Cambridgeshire District Council she will approach any new information afresh. Also, because Cllr Roberts is a District Cllr at SCDC, the same applies and she will look at any application, which goes to SCDC, afresh.*

## **Annex A – Planning Minutes approved during 16<sup>th</sup> April PC Meeting**

### **2. S/0859/19/FL – 6, Thriplow Road, Fowlmere, SG8 7QT**

**Erection of a 2-storey side extension and single storey porch to principle elevation.**

**Mr Paul Foulsham**

The PC reviewed the application. Regarding the original application, the PC had been concerned about the size of the proposed building, and overdevelopment of the site in a flood plain (Aug 2018). Cllr Roberts said that this application is within the village envelope, the size has been reduced and the flood risk had been considered. Neighbours' comments indicated concerns about overshadowing, loss of privacy, parking (during development) and noise. Cllr Burge said that the revised plan has significantly reduced the size of the extension and what is being proposed is more modest and more in keeping with the area. The applicant said that this is encouraging as he had taken extensive advice and had reduced the planned extension considerably; he also said that there will be no ongoing parking problems, and he will speak to his neighbour about the noise.

Fowlmere Parish Council had no objections, and voted unanimously in favour of recommending approval.

### **3. S/1022/19/TC – Eaden Cottage, High Street, Fowlmere, SG8 7SR**

**Removal of a small tree with a TPO**

**Mr McCreery**

Cllr Roberts left the room at 19:43 as she had declared an interest in this item. Cllr Wragg took over the chair. The application details were read out. As the notification was dated 21 March and the consultation period was 21 days, the PC were given to understand that they had until 11 April to return their comments. However, on the SCDC planning portal today (2 April) it was noted that approval had already been given on 26 March, and a decision notice sent to the applicant. A neighbour was present at the meeting who stated that she had objected to SCDC on several occasions both verbally and in writing, firstly with regards to the tree having been pruned very heavily down to the bare trunk, and then with regards to the applicant wishing to remove the tree completely. SCDC had not replied to any of these comments, and had not included any of them in the application details.

Cllr Wragg said that PC will express their concerns in a letter to SCDC asking the following questions:

1. Whether approval should have been sought before the first heavy pruning of this tree, which is located in a conservation area, and if so why this had not been done?
2. Why SCDC had cut short the consultation period and had thereby not abided by due process?
3. Why the neighbour's comments submitted to SCDC has not been included in the application?

**ACTION – PC to write a letter to SCDC**

Cllr Roberts re-entered the room at 19:50 and resumed the chair.

### **4. Other Matters and Updates**

Cllr Roberts said that Cllr Wragg and herself had attended the hearing for the Grain Store planning appeal that day (2 April).

The hearing had run from 10:00am until 15:00 with full representation from the applicant and 2 solicitors representing the Parish Councils (Foxton and Fowlmere). Cllr Wragg said that everybody had had a good opportunity to be heard. Although agricultural buildings are not inappropriate in the green belt there needs to be very special circumstances for permitting them, which in this case the application did not appear to demonstrate.

The Planning Inspector had made a site visit before Christmas, and again that morning, including the existing site, and was to return again that afternoon to inspect the site with regards to the view that is under threat should the application be approved. The decision from the appeal is awaited.

Cllr Roberts asked the members of the public if there was a particular reason why they had attended the meeting. One member of the public asked whether the 30mph speed limit signs on London Road could be moved to beyond Appleacre Park? Cllr Burge explained that the PC had requested this very thing but had been advised by a CCC Highways officer that 30mph signs can only be positioned where there is housing on both sides of the road, therefore these signs couldn't be moved. However, within the PC's traffic calming

## **Annex A – Planning Minutes approved during 16<sup>th</sup> April PC Meeting**

*plan, a 40mph buffer zone has been proposed to cover this area (and the other two road entrances into the village).*

*The meeting closed at 20:00.*