**BOTTISHAM PARISH COUNCIL**

*Chairman: Mr Jon Ogborn*

Clerk: Jonathan Giles, 86 High Street, Bottisham, Cambridge, CB25 9BA

Tel: 07789 012761 E-mail: clerk@bottishampc.co.uk

Website: www.bottishampc.co.uk

**A meeting will be held online on 4 January 2021 at 7.45pm for the purpose of transacting the following business.**

**All residents are welcome to attend via Zoom. The link is:**

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81469940199?pwd=cjB6b0wxcHk5dHNJcXdRRlpFSjNWUT09>

Meeting ID: 814 6994 0199

Passcode: 593728

**The first part of the meeting will be closed to the public. There will be an open forum at approximately 8 pm, after item 2 of the meeting, for any resident to address the Parish Council or raise questions. A maximum of 15 minutes is allocated to this session with each speaker allowed a maximum of 3 minutes. It would be helpful if you could email the Clerk in advance of the meeting if you wish to speak.**

**MEETING OF BOTTISHAM PARISH COUNCIL – AGENDA**

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2. RESERVED BUSINESS: Vacancy- Co-option of Parish Councillor (The Public are excluded from the meeting for this item)

If there are members of the public wishing to address the meeting, the Chairman will suspend the formal business at this point for up to 15 minutes

3. MEMBERS’ DECLARATION OF INTEREST for items on the agenda

4. PLANNING

a) Applications received

20/00296/OUM

Land rear of 163 to 187 High Street

Development of retirement care village: Amendment and additional information to address ECDC’s recommended reasons for refusal of permission.

Extension for comments to 7 January 2021 – see attachment 1

20/01309/FUL & 20/01209/FUL

1 Bottisham Place

Proposed change of use (only) of existing redundant Grade 2 listed agricultural barn to B1 (light industrial) for manufacture of timber pods (no alteration to barn)

Amended plans for Highways in respect new access previously approved under ref 17/01876/FUL – For information: no comments required

20/01638/LBC

Bottisham Milestone S of telephone exchange, adjacent to Chalk Farm Cottages, Newmarket Rd, Bottisham

Consolidation and reinstatement of milestone

Comments by 6 January

20/01667/FUL

Replace existing 3 ft fence on boundary with 6 ft boarded fence

Little Tunbridge, 28 Lode Road, Bottisham

Comments by 14 January

b) Planning Applications Approved

20/00760/FUL

1B Jenyns Close

Proposed single storey rear extension

Application approved 16 December

c) Application for Tree Works

No new applications received

d) Tree Works approved

20/01488/TRE

Parsonage Farm, 112 High Street

T1 Beech – Crown: reduce to and over building to clear roof by 2-2.5 m

T2 Willow – Remove tree and replace with smaller species

5. TO SIGN AND APPROVE MINUTES OF MEETING of 7 December 2020

6. MATTERS ARISING

 a) Greater Cambridge Partnership: Cambridge Eastern Access consultation

b) Preventing vehicular incursion on Ancient Meadows green – update from Cllr Winkcup

 c) Preventing parking on the Triangle – update from Cllrs Sunner & Martin

 d) Quotations for repairs to bus shelter – Clerk

 e) Parish Council Streetlights – Quotation still awaited from Balfour Beatty

7. REPORTS FROM COUNTY AND DISTRICT COUNCILLORS

8. CHAIRMAN’S REPORT

9. ENVIRONMENT:

 a) Update from Cllr Sunner and areas of responsibility

 b) Parish Council streetlights: update from Clerk

10. FINANCE

 a) To approve Precept request of £16,500 for 2021-22

 b) To approve payment of outstanding accounts

January £

Items for approval

Jonathan Giles – Salary, PAYE and NI 728.52

I Swift – Litter picking (4 weeks) 52.50

K Levitt – Litter picking (4 weeks) 52.50

Bordaline Web Design 671.00

Wave (Anglian Water) 11.85

East Cambs Trading Company – Grasscutting etc 332.80

11. NEW CEMETERY WORKING PARTY

12. PLAY AREA WORKING PARTY

Land at 34 Tunbridge Lane – response from landowners to letter from the Parish Council

13. CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED

a) Vision Zero Road Safety Strategy – Police & Crime Commissioner

b)

 CORRESPONDENCE WITH RESIDENTS AND ASSOCIATED MATTERS

1. State of the Foot path from Beechwood Ave to Ancient Meadows and other highways faults – resident
2. Further complaint about Beechwood Avenue to Ancient Meadows footpath

c) Response to resident and report to ECDC/Anglian Water

d) Blocked path to rear of Bottisham Village College

14. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will be Monday 1 February 2021, 7.45pm (online meeting).

FURTHER MEETING DATES

Monday 1 March 2021

Tuesday 6 April 2021

Jonathan Giles

Jonathan Giles

Parish Clerk

Attachment 1

Bottisham Parish Council

Draft response to Planning Application 20/00296/OUM for consideration by Bottisham Parish Council on 4 January 2021

Bottisham Parish Council does not support this planning application for the reasons outlined within this report.

**GREEN BELT**

This application is for a development on land currently designated as Green Belt, which provides for general exclusion of development apart from exceptional circumstances.

NPPF policy numbers 145 and 146 indicate the exceptions that may be made for development on Green Belt. In the 2009 Master Plan, developed in conjunction with ECDC, the Parish Council supported planned limited development on Green Belt off Bell Rd to provide affordable homes for the village. This is an area with limited landscape value and well away from the more historic part of the village and Conservation Area. Recently planning consent has been given for a further 50 homes (identified as BOTT 1 in the ECDC 2015 Local Plan) with provision for type 3 & 4 affordable housing. The Council sees no requirement for further affordable housing elsewhere in the village.

The proposed development adjoins the conservation area, is outside the building envelope and is on an area long recognised as of significant landscape value (see “Landscape” comment below). Parish Council has long sought to protect this area due to its unique character. During the review of the East Cambs Local Plan, we were explicitly assured by ECDC planning officers that it was not necessary to apply for Local Green Space designation, which would give a high level of protection for special green areas. We were informed that it already had a high level of protection, due to the Green Belt, Conservation Area and the village envelope, plus the Structure Plan 1995 statements. We would ask ECDC to respect this commitment given to the Council.

The Inspector supported the need to protect our Green Belt during the recent refused appeal for planning permission on a very small area of adjacent Green Belt belonging to First Copy. Reference was also made to the need to limit development outside the village envelope.

Any development in this area would be deemed as an encroachment and undermining of the rural character of the landscape and have an adverse effect on the neighbours and residents in other areas within the village and surrounding areas. It would also very significantly increase the number of houses, relative to the current size of the village, and we believe the infrastructure would not be able to cope.

If East Cambs wishes to support development of a retirement village we would argue that it should be located on areas without Green Belt status. It does not merit an “exemption” on Green Belt.

**LOCAL SERVICES**

**The Bottisham Surgery provides health care fo**r two care homes in the village, plus a high dependency unit, placing significant demand on local GP resources. It was keenly noted at the parish council’s consultation that residents were concerned by the creation of a top heavy resident demographic. This would place a significant extra strain on medical and other resources in the village.

It should be noted that Planning Permission has already been granted for a further 50 homes in Bell Road, already adding to the strain on local services.

At this stage there is no information on how the retirement village will be managed and this could seriously impinge on the care and health of the residents who come to live there. This should be clarified at an early stage, as the residents are not going to be the usual mix of ages. They will be in one particular group which would bring added requirements of support.

The Surgery will require reassurances and information on how the care for emergencies and other care issues are managed.

**TRAVEL IMPLICATIONS**

These will apply not only for residents but staff, visitors and delivery vehicles. The public transport to other towns is considered inadequate and there is no bus service on Sundays or evenings. This will undoubtedly encourage car use by residents and be inadequate for staff who will be involved in shift work. This will bring extra traffic into the village

Staffing for the retirement village will not come from Bottisham, as the Care Homes within the village already have a high percentage of staff (including cooks, gardeners as well as carers and nursing staff) drawn from outside of the village. This will again cause an increase in traffic due to the poor local public transport. This, at a time when East Cambs District Council is encouraging a reduction in the carbon footprint.

The subsequent addition of 50+ affordable homes will exacerbate the situation further.

**SEWAGE WORKS**

**We have always questioned the statement from Anglian Water that there is adequate capacity. Residents in the area repeatedly comment on the early morning traffic of tankers removing effluent several times a week. If the retirement village and more afforda**ble houses are built, as well as the 50 already granted permission off of Bell Road, then it could be estimated an extra two tankers a week will be required - as well as increasing the strain on a sewage farm built for much lower volume.

**LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT**

We have previously commented on the Landscape and Visual Impact of this area during several submissions to reviews. These include Green Belt policies and reviews in public, Local Plan and the review of the Structure Plan 1995. This concluded the area between the bridleway (now a public footpath) and The Grange (Hilton Park) is appropriately described as being of high landscape value and forms a clear cut, permanent and easily recognisable boundary for the Green Belt in the neighbourhood.

There is also a vista from the Nine Mile Hill to the Swaffham Road. This was referred to during the Consultation and opposition to the Nine Mile Hill application in 1991.

Any applicants will go to considerable lengths to reduce the impact of the proposal both in terms of layout, landscaping and usage. But, this will not overcome the detrimental impact on the area. Bottisham is a rural village and it is important that we preserve the Green Belt to prevent urbanisation.

**HIGHWAYS PARKING AND SAFETY ISSUES**

This village already has significant traffic issues and we have installed traffic calming speed indicating displays within the area to them. The traffic survey is misleading, as it was done during school holidays and at times when the village was quieter.

The area of the the High Street and Beechwood Avenue close to the planned site entrance already has significant parking problems due to the primary school - especially at school drop-off/pick-up times. Visibility will be impaired for residents and visitors entering and leaving the site and the increased traffic flow from this new development will significantly increase the possibility of accidents.

Approaching the site along the High Street from the village centre, there are concerns that the visibility on entering the site is impaired due to a neighbouring property’s high wall.

The entrance to the play area has yet to be defined and there may be issues with ownership at the end of Rowan Close. However, if access is via Rowan Close, there will be issues with parking there – again likely to be worse during school pick up time. We are unable to see any provision in the draft plans for parking adjacent to the additional amenities promised for the village.

**CONSULTATIONS**

We received the original application shortly before the Covid-19 restrictions, but managed to have a well attended meeting in order for the Village to see the plans. We were not however able to have a subsequent public meeting to discuss the feedback. However, the Parish Council held an online meeting to discuss this and has done its best to represent local views given the circumstances.

The subsequent recent late changes to the application have given us inadequate time properly to consult with the village. We have, however, done our best to inform local people in the circumstances and gather residents’ views.

**CONCLUSION**

We oppose this application for the following reasons:

 The Parish Council has previously supported planned limited development on an area of Green Belt off Bell Rd, to allow provision of affordable housing for the locality in line with NPPF exemptions (with permission for a further 50 homes recently given). This is in an area that is well away from our Conservation Area/historic parts of the village and has limited landscape value. The Parish Council does not believe there is need within Bottisham for provision of further affordable homes. There is no justification for this proposed development on an area of Green Belt long recognised as having significant landscape value and which will negatively impact the Conservation Area. It is also outside the village envelope.

 The local Green Belt is the only area of Green Belt in ECDC and should be protected to prevent urban sprawl from Cambridge. ECDC has adequate supplies of available land for development elsewhere that will supply further affordable homes without requiring development on Green Belt.

3. The need for a retirement village of this scale in Bottisham (or the local area) has not been demonstrated. The expected cost means that only a few residents will be able to afford to live in the retirement village and the majority of residents will be incomers. Bottisham already has significant provision for the elderly, with three residential care facilities and the arrival of a large retirement village will, we believe, negatively impact on the provision of medical care for other residents.

4. While we fully oppose any development in this area of Green Belt, we would point out that the suggested placement of all the affordable homes in a “ghetto” is not in line with guidance that recommends no more than 15 residences in one parcel to ensure a balanced and sustainable community. This guidance has been carefully followed in the planned development in BOTT 1, where the affordable housing is well integrated within the wider development.

5. If this application is referred to Planning Committee, then we will inform the Village and also use our right to attend the meeting to speak.

6. In summary we strongly urge this application be refused. There is no demonstration of a local need for either affordable homes or a large retirement village that justifies development on a Green Belt area long recognised as deserving of protection.