

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

which was held on-line via zoom at:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84185100086?pwd=VG5ZVkgxVWVlYzBMdmpQa09DVkZQU09>

Meeting ID: 841 8510 0086

Passcode: 694736

on **TUESDAY 28<sup>TH</sup> JULY at 7:30pm**

PRESENT: Cllr P Burge (Chairman), Cllr D Roberts, Cllr L Wragg, Cllr C Howe, Cllr R Lennon, Cllr S Mulholland, Cllr P Collinson and Cllr J Hobro  
IN ATTENDANCE Ms K Byrne (Clerk) and 3 members of the public

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.

Cllr Burge also explained that the role and purpose of the Fowlmere Parish Council Planning Committee is as a consultee, and that the decision-making body for planning applications is South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC). Any individuals wishing to make their own comments on applications can do so through the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning portal using the reference numbers on the Agenda, at:

<https://www.applications.greatercambridgeplanning.org/online-applications/>

### 1. Apologies for Absence

There were apologies for absence from Cllr M Vinton (who was unable to join via Zoom).

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

Cllr Lennon declared an interest in items 5 & 6, as a resident of Appleacre Park.

Cllr Roberts declared that she had previously looked at applications related to items 5 & 6, but she comes to these 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.

### 3. Minutes from Previous Meeting 14th July 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. There were no matters arising.

### 4. Review of the Planning Committee's Terms of Reference

The Committee reviewed the planning Terms of Reference document. Changes were discussed and agreed to in the sections on Frequency of Meetings and Public Participation. Cllr Burge will draft updates to the ToR document, and present to the PC in the September meeting.

**ACTION – Cllr Burge to draft updates to the planning ToR and present to the PC in the Sept meeting**

### 5. 20/02635/CLUED – Apple Acre Park London Road, Fowlmere

**Certificate of lawfulness for the continued use of land for the siting of up to twenty touring caravans and up to thirty seven static caravans for the purposes of human habitation.**

Cllr Lennon removed herself from the meeting at 19.44.

[Cllr Burge shared the screen on Zoom to show the relevant documents for this and the following items.]

Cllr Burge summarised the details of the application, which is for a Certificate of Lawfulness bringing together in one application 7 areas of the park which already have permissions. It was unclear why this is required. Cllr Burge invited the members of the public to speak; none did so. Cllr Roberts proposed that the PC objects to this application and Cllr Wragg seconded, all concurred.

Fowlmere PC objects to this application. The requested certificate is not necessary to establish the extant permissions as these are all already a matter of the record. However, we have a concern that granting the certificate as requested will lead to the site being treated as a single planning unit. This would be a material change to the conditions in place on the current permissions and should not be permitted. It is clear that historically these are all separate planning units and have been considered as such. In the 2018 planning appeals (ref APP/W0530/X/17/3183811 and APP/W0530/W/17/3183813) it was clear that the Planning Inspector treated these as a series of independent planning units and reached different conclusions for these

and as recently as the last application the Planning Authority considered areas A and D of the site independently. As such, the treatment as separate planning units is well established - and is not as claimed established common ground. It would be undesirable to treat this as a single planning unit due to the established materially different considerations for different areas of the site. We are also concerned that the wording used in the application deviates from that in the conditions that are in place in the current permissions. As such we see no obvious benefit from restating these permissions within a fresh certificate, and see potential for inadvertent changes being introduced in the permissions granted and how these operate.

#### **6. 20/01209/FUL – Land at Chrishall Road, Fowlmere**

##### **Development of 16 No. dwellings – Amendments**

Cllr Burge said that this application had been seen by the PC once before when the PC recommended approval of the application with some caveats. The amendments in this application include moving houses 1 – 4 to the southwest increasing the distance to the boundary, and reducing some of the driveway parking areas to optimise the green space, and updating the cladding to rendering on the houses.

Cllr Roberts had concerns as to the purpose of the additional area at the bottom of the plan, which has an access road to it (this is a drainage field for discharge from the package treatment plant under the public green space). Cllr Mulholland said that the highways' concerns over visibility haven't been addressed. Cllr Burge invited the members of the public to speak; none did so.

Fowlmere PC has no objections ('neutral' stance) to the amendments to the plans in terms of change of position of houses and parking areas, and changes to cladding, but the PC does have concerns on 2 points – we would like to see the landscaping changed to remove the potential for the road at the end of the close being extended in the future for access to the additional land to the south (designated as the drainage field), and we note that the visibility splays do not appear to have been amended in this resubmission and share highways concerns that these should be improved.

#### **7. 20/02056/FUL – Springfields Fowlmere Road, Fowlmere**

##### **Steel framed agricultural barn – Amendment (Topographic Survey)**

Cllr Lennon returned to the meeting at 20.09.

Cllr Burge said that the PC had seen this before (when it had no concerns); the application has been amended to now include a topographic survey.

Fowlmere PC has no concerns regarding the amendment ('neutral' stance).

#### **8. 20/02918/FUL – Land adjacent to 25 Ryecroft Lane, Fowlmere**

##### **Change of use from open space to garden land**

Cllr Burge said that the area of land concerned in this application, although owned by the owners of 25 Ryecroft Lane, has a section 52 covering it meaning that it is a designated open space for public use. The PC discussed the application, and then Cllr Burge invited the members of the public to speak; none did so.

Fowlmere PC objects to the proposed change of use from public space to private garden. We are of the view that the area should remain as a public open space as designated in the Section 52 agreement as the limited areas of public open space available have intrinsic value to the community (accepting that in recent years the value has been as a wildlife habitat rather than play space). The Parish Council would be open to the owners removing the fence and hedgerow between their garden and this area to improve access for maintenance as long as they demarcated the boundary in some other appropriate way. However, we would object to the installation of any fencing or other boundary treatments that would act to enclose the area defined by the Section 52 agreement and prevent the public having unencumbered access to the land, or any steps to adopt it as a private garden or install privately owned items upon it. We would however have no objection to the owners tidying up the land within their ownership, in a manner that was in keeping with its designation as public open space, so as to improve its visual amenity and accessibility for both themselves and other members of the public.

**ACTION – Clerk to make the maintenance of this area a future PC Agenda item. Also ask Phillip Ricketts what his view is on maintenance and use of this land.**

#### **9. 20/1623/TTCA – Pavilion End Rectory Lane, Fowlmere**

##### **T.1 Silver Birch – Fell to ground level**

The application was noted, however, the decision had already been made by the tree officer. Although the application came in on 20 July the decision was made by 22 July.

**ACTION – Clerk to write to the tree officer to request that if an application is sent for consultation then it should not be decided before the consultee has the chance to discuss it**

**10.20/02688/HFUL – 6 Savile Way, Fowlmere**

**Rear second floor extension to existing dwelling house**

Cllr Burge said that the extension does not appear to effect any neighbouring properties. Cllr Burge invited the members of the public to speak; none did so.

Fowlmere PC has no objections ('neutral' stance), all concurred.

The meeting closed at 20.35.