

## MINUTES OF A MEETING OF FOWLMERE PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE

which was held on-line via zoom

on **TUESDAY 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2021 at 7:30pm**

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

IN ATTENDANCE Ms K Byrne (Clerk)

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 D Roberts was absent.

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

Cllr Collinson declared that the locations of the applications in item 5 & 6 are quite near his home, but the PC felt that they were not near enough to pose a conflict of interest. Cllr Mulholland declared that the location of the application in item 4 is quite near to his home, but the PC felt it was not near enough to pose a conflict of interest. There were no other declarations of interest.

### 3. Minutes from Previous Meeting 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2021 – Matters Arising

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

Cllr Hobro said regarding item 6 (Foxton Travel Hub), he had received a reply from Foxton PC who wish to work together with Fowlmere to oppose the current plans. The PC agreed that Cllr Hobro should reply positively.

#### **ACTION – Cllr Hobro to reply positively to Foxton PC**

Also Cllr Burge said that regarding items from previous minutes, additional information had been received regarding Mill Farm (20/03105/FUL) and Lower Farm (20/04374/HFUL & 20/04375/LBC) but the additional information did not have a material bearing on the comments the PC had already made in either case.

Therefore, Cllr Burge proposed that he replies to the Planning Officers that the PC's previous stance and comments hold. Cllr Burge also said that the Mill Farm application will go to the SCDC Planning Committee possibly in April.

### 4. 20/05182/HFUL – 48 Chapel Lane, Fowlmere

#### **Roof extension incorporating raising of roof height, change from pitched to mansard style, rear dormer with Juliet balcony and obscure window to side elevation**

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

Cllr Burge summarised the application. The application included a change to the roof of the property, which would increase the height by 1.2m. Councillors had issues with the mansard roof, which would be out of keeping with the surrounding area, and because the site is so close to the neighbouring properties on either side. The proposed roof would be contrary to the Design Principles in Policy HQ1 of the Local Plan, particularly sub clause d), which states that:

*All new development must be of high quality design, with a clear vision as to the positive contribution the development will make to its local and wider context. As appropriate to the scale and nature of the development, proposals must:*

*d) Be compatible with its location and appropriate in terms of scale, density, mass, form, siting, design, proportion, materials, texture and colour in relation to the surrounding area;*

Cllr Burge proposed that the PC recommends refusal; all concurred.

Fowlmere PC recommends refusal due to the height of the proposed roof extension and the style being out of keeping with the surrounding area and local environment. It would be visibly prominent from several different directions due to the low height of other properties on the approach around the road, and the design and massing are not compatible with the directly neighbouring properties.

It does not preserve or enhance the character of the local area or respond to its context in the wider landscape, nor is it compatible with its location and appropriate in terms of scale, density, mass, form, siting, design, or proportion in relation to the surrounding area. As such it is in conflict with Policy HQ/1 and should be rejected.

If planning officers are minded to approve the application then Fowlmere PC would like the application to go to the Planning Committee. If ultimately approved Fowlmere PC would ask that a condition is added that, to avoid conflicts from construction traffic and adverse impact on neighbours, the work should not begin until the other two nearby building projects which have recently been given approval – 56 Chapel Lane S/3466/19/FL and 50 Chapel Lane S/2224/19/FL – are completed. However, the PC remains of the view that the proposed development is non-compliant with policy and should be refused on sound and material planning grounds.

#### **5. 21/00247/HFUL – 26 Ryecroft Lane, Fowlmere**

##### **Erection of detached carport**

Cllr Burge summarised the proposed application. Cllr Mulholland said that the proposed site is a set-back property with only one neighbour, and cannot be seen from the street.

Fowlmere PC has no objections to this application.

#### **6. 20/02918/CONDA – Land Adjacent To 25 Ryecroft Lane, Fowlmere**

##### **Submission of details required by condition 4 (Soft Landscaping) of planning permission 20/02918/FUL – For information only**

Fowlmere PC noted the submission of details for condition 4 and had no objections. However, the PC would ask that officers ensure that the replacement 1.9m fence on the east boundary is limited to replacement of the current length of high fence and it is not permitted to extend further along the proposed hedgerow along the boundary.

#### **7. Greater Cambridge Local Plan – site information**

Fowlmere PC had been invited to provide The Greater Cambridge Local Plan team with comments / knowledge about any of the submitted sites, via SurveyMonkey. Cllr Burge had circulated a spreadsheet listing the submitted sites in Fowlmere along with the questions from the survey, and had collated comments received.

The PC discussed the need or not for more housing in Fowlmere. General issues discussed included: the lack of a shop and other facilities in the village, expanding too much or too little, the effect of both these scenarios on the primary school, the type of housing that local people may want and where, integrating affordable housing into the village, the effect of additional traffic through the village, the possibility of building a nursing / retirement home in the village, the effect of the economy on the need for housing, changes in working patterns affecting the dynamics of life in the village, council tax on 'affordable housing', growth in size of the village over time.

The PC agreed that the opinions of residents should be surveyed on the future of Fowlmere, to give advice to the PC. However, there would not be time to do this before the current deadline for comments (Monday 1 March). The PC agreed that this should be done before the second round of comments are sought. Questions that may be asked include: What do you like and dislike about Fowlmere? What should the rate of growth of the village be (in light of the historic rates of growth)? Cllrs Burge, Lennon, Mulholland and Howe agreed to form a working group to further consider how to carry out the survey.

##### **ACTION – Working group to consider surveying the village on housing requirements / future of Fowlmere, and report back to the PC in a few months**

The PC then discussed the submitted sites in Fowlmere and reviewed the comments received so far. Some further comments were made. It was agreed that the emphasis should be on the sites that the PC are categorically opposed to, and to be neutral at this stage on the sites that are more acceptable. Cllr Burge proposed that he would summarise the comments for each site and submit them on behalf of the PC; all concurred.

##### **ACTION – Cllr Burge to summarise the comments and submit on behalf of the PC**

The Public section of the meeting closed at 21.15.

#### **8. Motion to move to a closed session**

Cllr Wragg proposed to move to a closed session, Cllr Lennon seconded; all concurred. No minutes were recorded for this item.

The meeting closed at 21.30.