

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF FOWLMERE PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE

which was held on-line via zoom

on **TUESDAY 3RD November 2020 at 7:30pm**

PRESENT: Cllr P Burge (Chairman), Cllr L Wragg, Cllr R Lennon, Cllr S Mulholland, Cllr J Hobro and Cllr P Collinson

IN ATTENDANCE Ms K Byrne (Clerk), 2 members of the public who left at 19.55

Before the meeting began Cllr Burge advised the attendees that the Zoom session was going to be recorded but would not be widely distributed. There were no objections.

1. Apologies for Absence

There were apologies for absence from Cllr M Vinton (who was unable to join via Zoom), Cllr Roberts (who was out of parish) and Cllr C Howe (who had a work commitment).

2. Declarations of interest (*if any*)

Cllr Burge declared a pecuniary interest in item 6 as a neighbour.

3. Minutes from Previous Meeting 18th August 2020 – Matters Arising

The minutes were agreed as a true record, and were signed by Cllr Burge; he will deliver the signed copy to the Clerk.

Matters arising regarding item 8 from 18 August the minutes, Cllr Burge, Wragg and Roberts had prepared and submitted a response to the Planning White Paper on behalf of the PC on 28 October 2020.

With regards to item 5 from the 14 January 2020 minutes, the Cherry Tree Field, Shepreth Rd application (S/4252/19/FL) for conversion of cowsheds to a 3 bedroom house, the application has been referred to SCDC Planning Committee for the 11 November meeting. Cllr Burge suggested that depending on the officer's report, someone from the PC should attend. Cllr Burge or Wragg will attend on behalf of the PC, depending on their availability. The committee agreed to this, there were no objections.

ACTIONS – Cllr Burge or Wragg (depending on availability) to attend the SCDC planning meeting on 11 Nov

Regarding item 8 from the 28 July minutes, the Land adjacent to 25 Ryecroft Lane application (20/02918/FUL) for change of use from open space to garden land, the SCDC planning officer was recommending approval. Following discussion, the PC was satisfied that the application could be made through delegated powers and did not need to be referred to the Planning Committee provided that the stated conditions are applied. Cllr Lennon proposed that the application could be decided under delegated powers, Cllr Collinson seconded; all concurred.

4. 20/03916/HFUL – Robins Nest, Long Lane, Fowlmere

Conversion and extension of existing garage to provide home office and games room

[The screen was shared on Zoom to show the relevant documents for this and the following 2 items.]

Cllr Burge summarised the application. The appearance from the front of the property would be largely unchanged with the conversion. Fowlmere PC has no objections to this application ('neutral' stance).

5. 20/03290/HFUL – Brooklyn, Long Lane, Fowlmere

Replacement porch

Cllr Burge summarised the application. Cllr Hobro said that the proposed changes improved the appearance of the front. Fowlmere PC has no objections to this application ('neutral' stance).

Cllr Burge left the meeting at 19.57 and handed the Chairmanship to Cllr Wragg.

6. 20/04274/REM – Land to the rear of 1 Westfield Road, Fowlmere

Approval of matters reserved for access, appearance and layout following outline planning permission S/4112/17/OL for development of 1 No. detached house as part of the SCDC Right to Build Vanguard

It was felt that there was overuse of windows on the west elevation which may produce glare, and that these may overlook and be overbearing to the neighbouring properties. Overall it was felt that there were too many windows and an inadequate traffic plan. Cllr Wragg said that if the applicant improved the fenestration and the traffic management plan then the PC may not object to the application.

Cllr Mulholland proposed, and Cllr Lennon seconded, all concurred with the following comments:

Fowlmere PC objects to this application.

1) Fowlmere Parish Council considers that the excessive use of glass on the south-west facing rear of the property may cause an unacceptable glare to neighbouring properties, as well as providing an excessive amount of overlooking. A significant reduction in the area of glass could be acceptable to us.

2) The traffic management plan seems quite formulaic and does not take into account the constraints of the locality with just 2 contractor parking spaces allocated on site. The primary school is very near by and it has a dedicated car-park for staff, which is owned by the County Council. Whilst this parking area is in principle open to the public, the planning permission for this car-park (S/0653/93/F) makes it clear that this area was intended mainly for school staff use. If the car-park were to be overrun with contractors it would cause considerable difficulty to the school, so the PC requests that a condition be placed that contractors do not park in this area. In addition to this, there must be timing constraints placed on all vehicle and delivery movements for the safety of the school children similar to the precedent set with S/0084/17/DC, and a requirement that a banksman be in place to oversee all vehicle manoeuvres.

The meeting closed at 20.10