

**BOURN PARISH COUNCIL****The minutes of the Meeting of Bourn Parish Council held on  
Thursday 30 August 2012 at 7.30 pm in the Village Hall**

**Present:** Cllrs: Mr N Ball (Chairman) Dr G Pountain  
Mr R Ansell Mrs X Rees-Howell  
Mrs V Bruce

**In attendance:** District Councillor Alison Elcox and 8 members of the public

**1. Apologies for absence and declarations of interest and to note resignation**  
None.

**Comments and observations from members of the public and from the County and District Councillors**

None.

**2. SCDC LDF Issues and Options consultation**

The Parish Council agreed the following responses to the consultation.

Local Plan Issues and Options report – Site Option 5: New Village – Bourn Airfield - OBJECT

The Parish Council made the following comments:

This is not a sustainable site with respect to local employment and would also lead to coalescence between Highfields Caldecote and Cambourne. The lack of local employment would increase the volume of traffic into Cambridge and nearby towns with rail connections. Any development would overstretch existing facilities at Cambourne (especially education and potentially drainage).

Local Plan Issues and Options report – Site Option 17: Land west of Lower Cambourne and the Cambourne Business Park, bounded to the north by the A428 and to the west by the A1198 (Swansley Wood) - OBJECT

The Parish Council made the following comments:

An extension of Cambourne would overstretch existing services. Given the lack of local employment, any development will lead to increased commuter traffic into Cambridge and/or neighbouring towns with railway stations.

Local Plan Issues and Options report – Development Strategy to 2031, Question 9, Q9iv. Combination of the above – SUPPORT

But the strategy should provide more detail into the prioritization of sites with respect to employment and service criteria.

Question 3i – Lower jobs growth – SUPPORT

This is the most realistic estimate given the expected trends in the world economy - especially the Eurozone.

Question 4Ai – Lower housing growth – SUPPORT

This is consistent with the council's view on the lower estimate for jobs growth.

Question 7 – Localism and relationship with neighbourhood development plans - SUPPORT

But only in the context of the Bourn PC's response to the following issues - 14,15,16,37,38,49,68. In general terms, the PC has supported issues that continue to give the village some measure of control over planning eg by retaining existing village frameworks. If after consultation, SCDC decide to weaken or remove such local

constraints then they must provide effective help to enable parish councils to rapidly develop neighbourhood plans.

Question 8 – Sustainable development – SUPPORT

But the sustainability criteria must be both clearly defined and followed consistently by planning officers.

Question 14i – Scale of housing development at villages – retain existing numerical limits for individual schemes - SUPPORT

This has worked well in the past

Question 15, Question 15Ai – Village Frameworks – retain village frameworks and the current approach to restricting development outside framework boundaries - SUPPORT

This is one of the few policies that currently give an element of control at the parish level

Question 18a, Question 18Aii – Renewable Energy – include a criteria based policy but specifically requiring a separation distance - SUPPORT

The current policy is working OK.

Question 18b – Renewable Energy – SUPPORT

Question 18c – Renewable Energy – COMMENT

These should be considered on an individual site-specific basis.

Question 27A – Sustainable drainage, water management and flood risk – SUPPORT

This policy must consider tributary systems as a whole to avoid developments leading to downstream problems

Question 31 – Protection of Agricultural Land – SUPPORT

Question 37A – Protected village amenity areas – SUPPORT

Question 38 – Local Green Space – SUPPORT

The policy should seek to include important flood plains as identified by village communities; it should also attempt to preserve "greenways" between villages. Presumably land owned by SCDC can also be proposed as Local Green Space.

Question 46, Question 46ii – Housing Mix – include a policy on housing mix but only for market housing – SUPPORT

Question 46iii – Housing Mix – Any policy on housing mix should only apply to sites of 10 or more homes – SUPPORT

Question 46iv – Housing Mix – Any policy on housing mix should seek to balance demographic trends for smaller homes with market preferences for larger homes – OBJECT

Local circumstances as identified by parish councils should always be sought as part of the policy

Question 48ii – Target is reduced to 30% in specific circumstances – SUPPORT

But the criteria that can trigger this change of threshold must be clearly defined

Question 48B – Affordable Housing – SUPPORT

Question 49, 49Ai – Exception sites, Affordable Housing - Allow minimum amount of market housing – OBJECT

The parish council does not support a top-down approach as dictated by SCDC but would support this policy at the local level as part of a neighbourhood plan

Question 49, 49Aii – Exception sites, Affordable Housing – Provide more market housing to support local communities – OBJECT

This should be determined at the local level via a neighbourhood plan

Question 49B – Exception sites Affordable Housing – OBJECT

This will not be workable in practice

Question 51, 51ii – Extensions to dwellings in the countryside – Include a simplified version of the policy requiring the extension to be in scale and character with the existing dwelling – SUPPORT

This will align the policy with the current practice adopted by planning officers

Question 52i – Replacement dwellings in the countryside – Keep the existing policy and continue to limit replacement dwellings in the countryside to being no more than 15% larger than the dwelling they replace – SUPPORT

It is important to maintain housing mix

Question 54, Question 54ii – Re-use of buildings in the countryside – Include a policy on the re-use of buildings in the countryside for residential use setting out what factors would be taken into account – SUPPORT

Question 67, Question 67i – New employment development in villages – Continue to restrict to small scale development and the size limitations – SUPPORT

But the current size limitations should be reviewed against planning history to identify possible amendments

Question 68, 68Ai – New employment buildings on the edge of settlements – Flexibility to utilise PDL adjoining or very close to the village frameworks of any villages – SUPPORT

Question 68B – New employment buildings on the edge of settlements – SUPPORT

The policy must make the criteria very specific and involve parish councils for local context

Question 69, 69i – Extensions to existing buildings in the countryside – Continue to apply a generally restrictive approach, where proposals would have to demonstrate exceptional circumstances – SUPPORT

Question 72, 72Aii – Retention of employment sites – include areas outside frameworks on the edges of villages – SUPPORT

because all areas are important to local employment

Question 72B – Retention of employment sites – SUPPORT

This policy should also include consultation with parish councils to establish local context

Question 76iii – Assessing the impact of retail development – 250sq m typical village shop – SUPPORT

Question 78 – Village shops and related local services – SUPPORT  
But it is unclear what form this support will take ie will this be related to community right to buy?

Question 81A – Protection of existing village services and facilities – SUPPORT  
It is important that SCDC expedite the creation of community asset registers as part of this policy

Question 81C – Protection of existing village services and facilities – SUPPORT  
But parish councils must be consulted for local context

Question 87A – Meeting needs for open space – SUPPORT

Question 87B – Meeting needs for open space – SUPPORT

Question 88A – Allotments – SUPPORT

Question 88B – Allotments – SUPPORT

Question 89A – Scale of development where open space should be provided on site – SUPPORT

Question 91A – Protecting existing playing fields and recreation facilities – SUPPORT

Question 93A – Light Noise and Odour issues – SUPPORT

Question 97 – Planning for sustainable travel – SUPPORT  
But this policy will need to be very clearly defined - especially in the case of point (1) where words such as "significant" and "appropriate" will be need to be formalized

Question 98A – Transport Assessments and Travel Plans – SUPPORT

Question 99A, Question 99Ai – Car parking standards – Maximum parking standards – 1.5 spaces per dwelling for developments on the edge of Cambridge, 2 spaces across the remainder of the district, with 2.5 spaces in poorly accessible areas – SUPPORT

Question 100A, Question 100 Ai – Allocation of car parking within residential developments – Should only allocate a proportion of the car parking spaces to individual properties – SUPPORT

Question 101, Question 101i – Residential garages – specify minimum size dimensions for garages to count towards parking standards, to ensure they are large enough to easily accommodate modern cars, cycles and other storage needs – SUPPORT

Question 102 – Car parking standards for other types of developments – SUPPORT

Question 103Aii – Cycle parking standards – continue to set minimum cycle parking standards for different types of development, but develop new higher levels of provision – SUPPORT

Question 104A – Rail freight interchanges and rail freight – SUPPORT

Cllr Ball will submit the response to SCDC on behalf of the Parish Council.

**9. Closure of meeting**

There was no further business and the Chairman declared the meeting closed at 10.15pm.

Signed \_\_\_\_\_ (Chairman) \_\_\_\_\_(Date)

DRAFT