

Minutes of the Planning Meeting held on Monday 21 September 1998 at 7pm in the Bowls Pavilion.

Present: RJ Farrington (Chair) R Day HM Smith RT Summerfield
LC Twinn and the clerk SJ Daniels.

1. Apologies for Absence: JE Coston J Shaw RLE Waters.

433/98
(94/98)

2. Appeal

New Dwelling on Land at former Library Site at Coles Road

Noted that the County Council's Appeal against SCDC's decision to refuse planning permission was dismissed. The scheme would be an intrusive addition to the street scene which would fail to preserve or enhance the appearance and character of the area contrary to the Local Plan Policy C31. The scheme would not be well related to its surroundings as sought by Structure Plan Policy SP12/10. The proximity to the buildings of no 14 Fen Road and 1A Coles Road would act to the detriment of the living conditions of the adjoining occupants contrary to the aims of good neighbourliness promoted in Planning Policy Guidance 1. The Inspector was concerned about the cramped nature of the scheme and the over development of its plot.

3. Decisions Received

434/98
(410/98)

P Runham 49 Fen Road - extension refused.

Over development of the site and a significant loss of light and sunlight to no 47. The extension would also appear overbearing when viewed from that property.

435/98
(418/98)

Mr TT Tyrrell 162 The Rowans - front extension approved.

4. New Applications

436/98
(380/98)

S/0917/93 Rowing Trust - amended plans revised general layout.

The following comments were sent to SCDC.

"1. Construction traffic must not use Fen Road Milton.

2. Consideration should be given to a link for cyclists from Milton Country Park along the southern end of the lake to be used as a local cycle route to the river.

3. We are concerned that as the whole scheme is being reduced in size the amount of spoil extracted will be concentrated on smaller areas of land thus increasing the height of the bunds.

4. We are concerned at the loss of the Country Park element.

5. We are concerned at the reduction in landscaping on the north/west side.

6. We are concerned in general about the drainage.
7. We do not like the design for the new aqueduct. Its capacity does not seem as large as the previous design. It would appear to be a sediment tank that cannot be cleaned out.
8. We are concerned about the maintenance of Public Drains. Are the Environment Agency aware of the problems of drainage?
9. If the lake is higher than the River Cam then water will flow into the Cam against the natural flow of the river at the outfall into the river.
10. Does the Fen Road bridge allow for access for agricultural vehicles including combine harvesters? Will the bridge comply with the County Council standard for cycle bridges?
11. We would like the assurance that the trees along the drift road will not be lost.
12. We understand that the conditions as set out in the *Draft Conditions (revision 6)* dated 15/12/95 cease to have any effect without renewal of permission by December 1998. Is this correct?"

- 437/98
(350/98) S/0840/98 P Runham 49 Fen Road - amendments to lean-to. Roofing panels omitted, velux roof lights added. For information only.
- 438/98
(351/98) S/0849/98 Mr & Mrs Heath 8 Goding Way - amendments. Slight enlargement to front porch, two storey rear extension omitted, existing single storey utility room extended. For information only. Permission already approved - no objections by Planning Officer to amendments.
- 439/98
(137/98) S/1442/98 Upware Marina 2 bungalows at r/o 8-10 Cambridge Road. Preservation of the old farm hedge on the southern boundary requested.
- 440/98 S/1535/98 Nickerson Biocem Ltd Science Park - 2nd flue stack. Information requested as to what was being extracted.
- 441/98 S/1536/98 Trinity (CSP) Ltd - erection of new security fencing to the southern boundary of the Science Park. No comments.
- 442/98 S/1537/98 Trinity (CSP) Ltd - land between buildings 290 and 320 Science Park - Day Nursery for Children. No comments.

443/98
(377/98)

5. Draft Regional Planning Guidance

It was agreed to support SCDC's sequential approach to development:-

"1st preference - development within Cambridge making best use of previously developed 'brownfield' land whilst maintaining the Green Belt intact.

If development needs cannot be met from the 1st preference then:

2nd preference - development in and around the ring of market towns which mark the present outer limits of the Cambridge Area, again making best use of previously developed 'brownfield' land.

If development needs cannot be met from the first two preferences then:

3rd preference - growth on rural 'brownfield' land which is in sustainable locations - primarily land which is presently well served by public transport or where good public transport services can be guaranteed.

And if development needs cannot be met from the first three preferences, only then:

4th preference - limited release(s) on the inner edge of the Green Belt around Cambridge provided that the integrity of the Green Belt remains intact eg separation is maintained between Cambridge and the "necklace" villages."

The meeting ended at 8.25pm.

Signed..........Chairman.....19/10/98.....Date