

## **Briefing note 1**

Agenda item 22-23/P11 Greater Cambridge Local Plan – Call for Sites and request from Greater Cambridge Planning (GCP) for supplementary input from Parish Councils.

We have received a request from the GCP Local Plan team for further information. It is simplest to set out their email. I have underlined the parts which explain what they are seeking from us:

*Dear Parish Councils*

*Last year we asked you to provide information on the 650 sites we received through the 'Call for Sites' for consideration as part of developing the new Greater Cambridge Local Plan. Many Parish Councils and Residents Associations helped us by taking part in a survey to 'fact check' these sites.*

*We are now seeking your help again. As part of the Greater Cambridge Local Plan First Proposals consultation in late 2021, we received 42 new site proposals and additional information and/or amendments on a further 172 sites that had previously been submitted.*

### **The Call for Sites process**

*The call for site process is a normal part of plan making, you can read more about it on our website.*

*[Call for Sites \(greatercambridgeplanning.org\)](https://www.greatercambridgeplanning.org).*

*You can find a list of information received on new or amended sites on [this web page](#), and you can also use our [interactive map](#), which allows you to show all sites received or only the new or amended sites (dated June 2022). Here you will be able to view information in relation to individual sites, including their supporting evidence submitted by the land promoters.*

*New sites and information received are assessed by a wide range of officers against a rigorous methodology, as part of the [Housing and Employment Land Availability](#). This includes assessments by landscape, conservation, ecology, environmental health and highways officers as well as using data relating to issues including surface water and fluvial flooding and accessibility to local services and facilities. accessibility to local services and facilities.*

### **Survey on new or amended sites**

*We would like to give you the opportunity to supplement our information gathering on new or amended sites with any knowledge you may hold about any of the submitted sites in your Parish or area covered by your Association. We are particularly interested in local factual information that we may not be aware of or where you think any of the information submitted by the site promotor is incorrect. There is no need to re-submit comments made*

*previously on these sites to us, we have this information on file and will continue to take it into account as we assess the sites.*

*It is not compulsory in any way to provide this additional information at this point in time and you may wish to wait to read and comment on our assessments at the next stage of plan-making in 2023, when alongside the draft local plan for consultation the Councils will publish responses to the new information through an update to the HELAA.*

### **How do you take part**

*On Friday 29 July, you will receive an email from us which will contain the link to the online survey. The link will set out instructions on how to find the site information and how to complete the form. Please can you check your spam or junk mail settings if you do not receive it by the end of Friday 29 July. We can resend it to you if required.*

*The survey is only open to Parish Councils and Residents Associations, and you will need to be a recipient of this email to access the link. If you forward the link to a third party the survey response is unlikely to be considered by the relevant site assessors. If you would like a third party to complete the form on your behalf, please inform us of their name and email address. Please note that your response will be recorded as the response of your Parish Council or Association, not of the individual who completes the form. For some groups, we have more than one contact email address on file. Please ensure that you coordinate so that only one response is submitted, per site, per Parish Council or Residents Association.*

*Please complete the survey by 5pm on Monday 12 September 2022. If you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact us at this email address.*

I have looked at the Call for Sites webpage to which the email from LocalPlan links. It is not very clear what information is there but it looks to me as follows. There are four Fowlmere sites in the amended and new sites spreadsheet on the SCDC website (<https://www.greatercambridgeplanning.org/media/2565/greater-cambridge-local-plan-call-for-sites-submissions-140622.xlsx>), refs 40012, 40116, 40130 and 40252. In the original list (<https://www.greatercambridgeplanning.org/media/2265/greater-cambridge-local-plan-call-for-sites-submissions-140521.xlsx>) we also have refs 40115, 40160, 40308, 40309, 40327, 40353, 40456, 40465, 40467, 51059 – ten sites. That makes 14 in all.

There do not appear to be any sites in Fowlmere on the call for green sites spreadsheet [greater-cambridge-local-plan-call-for-green-sites-submissions-14062022-1](https://www.greatercambridgeplanning.org/media/2565/greater-cambridge-local-plan-call-for-green-sites-submissions-14062022-1.xlsx).

From the email it appears we are only being asked to comment on the new and amended sites, so just the four above.

I have the spreadsheets from former councillor Peter Burge giving the FPC response on the result of the call for sites and also a wider set of comments held back so as not to detract from the comments on sites likely to have most detrimental impact on the village. I will send those with the agenda. Peter explains: “We RAG rated the sites and submitted the feedback

*on those that we categorised red (these are in the "responses" file). They are the sites that we determined would have most detrimental impact on the village. The one rated green is the Shaws Way site that we had previously supported.*

*The ones rated amber had more potential, although still a number of issues. We compiled thoughts on these (see "compiled" file) but did not submit comments as we decided we would have more impact by focusing on those that really needed rejecting rather than being seen to say "no" to everything - noting that we knew that with the direction of travel it was very unlikely that the emerging plan would include them. There are aspects on these ones that might be played to the advantage of the village if pursued, although none of that has been submitted at this stage."*

Responding to the SCDC request could be quite a demanding task. It is also important that we submit a representative view. Rather than call upon all parish councillors I suggest that we establish a working party of up to four councillors comprising the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Planning Committee and up to two others appointed by the committee on 2 August, calling on information and resources of other members of the committee as they see fit, to draft and submit the responses to the GCP request. Although the GCP team are giving until 12 September for responses, I will be away from 27 August. Whilst I can submit the responses from anywhere in the world with an internet connection, in case meetings are required to discuss or approve the responses I suggest we aim to respond on or preferably before 26 August and so pencil in a committee meeting on say Tuesday 23 which would mean circulating the final draft responses before that meeting, on 18 August.

David Brock  
Chair FPC Planning Committee  
27 July 2022

## Briefing note 2

Agenda item 22-23/P14 section 106 policy and allocations

1 SCDC asked FPC for advice in relation to the application for 125 houses off Long Lane (22/02356/OUT) on what projects exist in the village towards which developer contributions may be directed. SCDC estimated the figures to be available from that application as:

Outdoor sports – £140k

Children's play (older children) – £50k

Allotment and community orchard – £12k

Indoor meeting space – £65k

Burial – £25k

Green infrastructure (i.e. Fowlmere RSPB) – £100k

2 As reported at the 26 July Council meeting the Chairman of the Council replied as follows:

*Outdoor sports – £140k*

*We would like to explore the installation of a 4G (all weather) football pitch with flood lighting at the Village Hall. The Recreation ground there currently accomodates 2 football pitches with a cricket square in between. A 4G facility would allow for all year use and external hire. Additionally (not mentioned previously) the Cricket Nets are in a very poor state of repair and could do with replacement.*

*Children's play (older children) – £50k*

*A small skate/scooter park has recently been installed at the village hall after applying for and receiving grant funding. Focus has turned instead to finding a suitable site for a Zip Wire and some sunken trampets / trampolines (similar to that installed at Shepreth). Additionally we would look to site a larger climbing frame / trim trail (aimed at teens) and also a "Teenage Shelter"*

*Allotment and community orchard – £12k*

*Since Covid we have been receiving almost monthly enquires for allotments. The parish council does not (and never has) had allotments. There was once a allotment area that was run by the Church as a charity and the legacy of this can still be found as "Fowlmere Poor Allotments" does still exist and own the land but it is leased out as farm land providing a small income for the charities objectives. The allotments as they were, were in a poor location, with no water supply and sheds were not allowed. So not really what we would now recognise as an organised allotment site. There is also the possibility of a piece of land owned by the County Council but this would require a formal legal agreement. Funds would be needed set the allotment up properly (including some legal costs) with plots marked out and installing a water supply.*

*Indoor meeting space – £65k*

*The job of the Clerk is becoming more and more involved and an office space would be a huge benefit to the running of the council. Exploring the possibilities of a small meeting and coffee space with an office area attached (a smaller version of the Melbourn Hub) would be something we'd be keen to do.*

*Burial – £25k*

*The PC has a secular cemetery to the north of the village. The cemetery extension has been mentioned in other S106 requests. Two recent areas that have been identified are the installation of a new fence to try at least to keep the Muntjac out as they eat all the flowers in the winter and also to continue the refurbishment of the small chapel of rest - The parquet flooring has seen better days and could benefit from replacement / refurbishment*

*Green infrastructure (i.e. Fowlmere RSPB) – £100k*

*Both the Round Moat in Fowlmere and the RSPB reserve can always benefit from improvements. Practical improvements such as better disabled access would see the money identified in the "self-build" S106 allocation spent very quickly. The additional money could see the improvements of the hides at the reserve, and the installation of a hide at the round moat which could double up as an education and information space with info about the sort of wildlife on view.*

3 It is evident that SCDC are expecting FPC to have a list of projects available, whilst they also explain that their task is "to understand the impact of the proposal and then seek to mitigate this, typically by securing financial contributions towards infrastructure and facilities" which suggests a more bespoke approach for each application. I am interested in knowing practice across the District and how the Parish Council is meant to address the question; is it a matter of addressing current needs, current desires, anticipating likely needs in the light of the local plan, and how to ensure that proposals are to be justified both to SCDC and to the Secretary of State in the event of an appeal. SCDC have offered a meeting with interested members of the Council and at present I hope that this meeting can take place via Zoom on Tuesday 2 August 2022. I will update members of the committee at the meeting that evening. Councillors Collinson (the Vice-Chair of the Planning Committee) Baker-Oxley) Chair of the Finance Committee) and Mulholland (Chairman of the Council) have all expressed an interest in attending that Zoom call).

4 By way of further background there is an extant planning permission for 16 dwellings at Chrishall Road (20/01209/FUL) which secured the following contributions for the Parish Council:

Sports

£13,074.88 towards the provision of new or improvement to existing sports facilities in Fowlmere inc. new goal posts, football pitch imp.

Children's play

£19,244.40 towards the provision of children's play equipment in Fowlmere including new play equipment at the Butts recreation ground and Village Hall

#### Indoor meeting space

£5,936 towards improvements to Fowlmere Village Hall inc. provision of new bicycle racks, rigging infrastructure for performance equip, improving acoustics and controlling curtains, projector & assoc equip

#### Green infrastructure

£1,600 towards improvements to Fowlmere Round Moat including lowered pavements and wider walkways

SCDC also received, late last year, two planning applications on land to the south of the above site (both of which on the same area of land); one for self-build market housing and one for a mix of market and affordable housing. The latter of these was withdrawn and the owner has submitted an appeal following SCDC's refusal of the former.

In response to the self-build application (21/05641/OUT currently being appealed) SCDC has requested the following:

#### Sports

£23,254.61 to help fund new or improved sports facilities including new goals, football pitch improvements, flood lighting, running track, basketball court, resurfacing of tennis courts, remodelling of tennis courts to convert to multipurpose facility

#### Children's play

£34,277.54 to help fund new play equipment at Butts Recreation Ground and/or Village Hall and/or Savile Way, new skate park at Village Hall

#### Indoor meeting space

£10,557.60 to help fund improvements to Fowlmere Village Hall including bike racks, rigging infrastructure for performance equipment, acoustics, controlling curtains, meeting room refurbishment, car park extension

#### Green infrastructure

£17,370 to fund improvements to both Fowlmere Ring Moat and Fowlmere Nature Reserve

#### Allotments and community orchards

£1,500 to help fund new allotment plots in the village

#### Burial provision

£3,150 to fund the expansion and upgrade of a cemetery extension

#### Indoor sports

£8,825 to improve the indoor sports courts at Melbourn Sports Centre

#### Swimming

£9,832 to improve swimming facilities and Melbourn Sports Centre

5 SCDC now seek the following information from us in relation to the self-build application (21/05641/OUT currently being appealed):

- a) Does the Parish Council wish to amend any of the projects previously identified.
- b) Allotments: SCDC have said *“Fowlmere needs 0.49 ha of allotments and has 0.59 ha, i.e. a surplus of 0.10 ha of allotments<sup>15</sup>. However, the village allotments identified by the recreation study, that were said to be “very poor and do not look as though they are being used”, were never actually public allotments. The allotments that were administered for public benefit within the parish were run by the Churchwardens and were located on church land on Shepreth Road opposite the cemetery. These have however fallen into disrepair as they are too far out, very exposed, and prone to deer. Fowlmere Parish Council requests that contributions are directed towards the establishment of allotments and a contribution of £1,500 representing £100 per dwelling is required towards this project”*. Is the Parish Council able to identify any land that would be suitable for allotments or community orchard?
- c) Burial space: SCDC have said *“In 2007 the Parish Council purchased a plot of land directly to the west of the cemetery to allow for expansion to accommodate the needs of existing and new residents because of housing growth. Fowlmere Parish Council have requested a financial contribution to assist with development of this land and integration into the existing burial site”*. What is the number of burial plots remaining in the village and when is the existing land expected to be at capacity?

6 I expect that our response to the questions in para 5 will be taken as our response to the new application for self-build at item P4(d) of the agenda ([22-02870/OUT](#) - Land to the South of 86 Chrishall Road Fowlmere Cambridgeshire Outline planning application for 15 No. self-build dwellings).

David Brock  
Chair FPC Planning Committee  
27 July 2022

### **Briefing note 3**

22-23/P15 – 125 houses east of Long Lane, application ref 22/02356 – update

To authorise the Chair to write to SCDC expressing our concern that the application has not yet been refused given SCDC's decision not to refer the application to committee for decision and to request that it is referred to the committee unless the officer concludes that it should be refused and so refuses the application.

To authorise the Chair (or in his absence another member of the Planning Committee chosen by the Chairman of the Parish Council) to appear before any meetings of SCDC or its committees to speak on behalf of the Parish Council.

I reported to the Council at its meeting on 26 July that in response to our request that the matter be referred to the SCDC planning committee in the event that the planning officers' recommendation is different from that of FPC (i.e. to refuse) SCDC have decided not to refer the application to their planning committee.

In a telephone call to the relevant officer (Phil McIntosh) on 27 July I explained that the logic of their position is that they should immediately refuse the application. We are also concerned that in the (apparently unlikely but nonetheless possible) event that the officers dealing with the application conclude it should be granted then as things stand it could be granted without being referred to the planning committee. We think that would be the wrong thing to do. I also explained that in the absence of other factors the current policy and factual position including housing land supply leads to refusal and it would be sensible to do so now, in case other matters undermine the SCDC local plan policy. SCDC informed me that the decision is due on or before 17 August and they have no reason to suppose that the planning officer dealing with the application will not do so in a timely manner. They did not respond to the information given to Cllr Roberts by Mr Sexton that the case would almost certainly go to committee given the size of the application. If the matter goes to committee then the Parish Council and all others who have made representations will be informed. I asked that the decision not to refer should be revisited and that following our planning committee meeting on 2 August I may write to the relevant officer.