

**MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING OF FOXTON PARISH  
COUNCIL**

**HELD ON MONDAY, 9<sup>th</sup> MAY 2005, AT 7.30 p.m.**

**PRESENT**

Mr Pusey, Mr Broadley, Mr Brooksbank, Mr Chilton,  
Dr Grindley, Mr Hockley, Mr Kennedy

County Councillor David McCraith

District Councillor Mrs Deborah Roberts

**IN ATTENDANCE**

29 members of the public

**APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Mr Barnes and Mrs  
Thake

**ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN**

The Clerk called for nominations for the position of Chairman of the Council. Mr Kennedy proposed that Mr Pusey should remain as Chairman. Mr Chilton seconded the proposal, and all were agreed.

**ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN**

Mr Pusey called for nominations for the position of Vice-Chairman. As there were no new nominations, Mr Pusey proposed that Mr Broadley continue as Vice-Chairman. The motion was seconded by Mr Kennedy, and all were agreed.

**ELECTION OF THE COMMITTEES**

Mr Chilton proposed that the members of the three committees (Recreation and Amenities, Finance and Planning) be re-elected en bloc. Mr Hockley seconded the proposal and all were agreed.

Mr Brooksbank (recently co-opted onto the council) agreed to serve on both the Finance and Planning committees.

**OTHER POSITIONS**

**Transport**

Mr Hockley agreed to continue as the council's representative for transport.

**Village Hall Management Committee**

Mr Broadley and Mr Pusey agreed to represent the council on the committee.

**Cimex (formerly Rugby Cement) representative**

Mr Broadley agreed to continue to represent the council.

**Police Liaison**

It was hoped that Mrs Thake would continue in this role.

#### **Dovecote/Meadow Project**

Mr Kennedy and Mr Pusey agreed to continue as lead members on this project.

#### **Footpath Development**

Mr Brooksbank agreed to be the lead member on this matter.

#### **Skateboard/Mountain Bike Project**

Mr Broadley agreed to continue as a lead member on this project with, subject to her agreement, Mrs Thake.

Mr Pusey welcomed all to the meeting and, particularly, the new County Councillor for Melbourn Ward, David McCraith.

### **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

All were agreed that the Minutes of the previous meeting, held on 4<sup>th</sup> April 2005 should be signed as a true record.

### **MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

#### *Parish Plan*

Mr Pusey said that there might be an item about this in the next issue of “The Laurentian”.

#### *The Old School Site*

Mr Pusey gave Mr McCraith a brief summary of how matters stood with relation to this site, on which eventually the council would like to see affordable housing.

#### *Police Liaison*

It was confirmed that although it had been thought that PC Sutton would be leaving, in fact he would be remaining in his post.

### **REPORTS FROM THE COMMITTEES**

#### **RECREATION AND AMENITIES**

Mr Chilton said that both the new seat and the goal-post sockets had arrived.

Mr Hockley asked how often the new contractors were cutting the grass. Mr Chilton said that Cleanaway had cut the grass several times in the past month and that the work had been very satisfactory so far.

#### Tree Report

The clerk reported that she had met Mr Hellingsworth on site on 29th April to look at the trees that need attention.

- 1) The large ash tree at the bottom of the path from Illingworth way onto the RG

Mr Hellingsworth thought there was extensive rot in the left-hand fork (nearest to the path) and that the most logical thing would be to fell the tree and replace with another ash tree. Removing just the left hand fork would leave too great a wound and would unbalance the tree. There was also the safety aspect to consider with the rotten fork so near to the path. He advised getting a tree firm to investigate the extent of the damage before making a decision.

2) Trees in the gravel car park

Mr Hellingsworth said that the iron frame round the oak tree should be removed. The other trees should be cut back so as not to overhang the boundaries of the nearby houses.

The matter was referred to the Recreation and Amenities Committee

**FINANCE**

Mr Hockley reported on the accounts for the year ending 31<sup>st</sup> March 2005. The balance brought forward at the beginning of the year was £14,330. The precept received was £11,900 and the total other receipts for the year were £7,673. Staff costs for the year were £4015 and other expenditure totalled £8248. At 31<sup>st</sup> March 2005 the balance brought forward was £21,640 and the valuation of fixed assets was £45,202.

Mr Hockley proposed that the accounts be accepted and that the statement of accounts and the statement of assurance be approved by the council. Mr Kennedy seconded the proposal and all were agreed. The Statement of assurance was then signed, and the signing of the Statement of accounts deferred until the Minute reference was available.

Mr Hockley then gave details of the bank accounts as follows:

Current Account (This included a an outstanding VAT refund of £12.51)	£62.73
Deposit Account (This included the first instalment of the 2004/05 precept of £5950 and the CCC contribution to the 2004 grass-cutting season of £1059)	£18,716.01
Cambridge Building Society (This included a tax rebate for 2004/05 of £41.24. A further £25 had been received from the WI, being Walter Herriot's speaker's fee that he kindly donated to the Dovecote project, which would be paid into the account.)	£816.98

Mr Hockley proposed that the following cheques be approved:

Hart Country Gardens (6 bags of shredded bark for mulch)	£26.94
Glasdon U.K Ltd (Phoenix seat)	£417.64
Wicksteed Leisure (4 No. 5-a-side goal ground sockets)	£142.79
Playground Management Ltd (annual playground inspection)	£69.33
Foxton Village Hall Trust (hire of Meeting Room 4/3, 4/4, and 25/4 and the lounge11/4)	£46.00
Allianz Cornhill plc (annual insurance premium)	£1,045.54
Lawrence Printers (6600 A5 leaflets)	£32.00
Cleanaway Ltd (4 grass-cuttings, April)	£645.16
J E Burns (salary April/May)	£493.93
J E Burns (expenses March/April)	£38.36
V W Mead (refuse collection and ground maintenance, April)	£46.22

Mr Kennedy seconded the proposal and all were agreed that these payments, totalling £3003.91, be made and that £2992 be transferred from the Deposit Account to the Current Account (although the clerk was asked to withhold payment to Cleanaway until there was clarification about the invoice).

### **PLANNING**

In Mr Barnes' absence, Mr Pusey reported as follows:

#### **Planning Applications considered at the meeting:**

P Ridgeon	Application No. S/0813/05/F for conversion of existing Press into 8 dwellings, demolition of part of Press building and erection of 6 houses; and erection of 20 affordable houses at Burlington Press Building on land to North of Station Road
-----------	--

This planning application was for development on two sites – at the Press and on parkland behind the former Press houses. This application had been given wide publicity within the village and the plans had been displayed in the foyer of the Village Hall on Election Day, Thursday, 5<sup>th</sup> May. Mr Pusey said that he had received many written responses from which he had drawn up a summary of the many issues raised. He thanked parishioners for their comments on Election Day and for the written responses.

One response, from Dr John McCombie, had impressed him so much that he thought it might be used as the basis for the council's response, once all the views of the other councillors and residents had been heard, as it covered many of the issues raised before the present meeting. To this end, he had circulated Dr McCombie's letter by e-mail to fellow councillors so that they could form an opinion on this course. He then asked for the council's agreement in using Dr McCombie's letter, revised as necessary after other views had been expressed, as the basis for the council's response.

Dr Grindley did not agree and said that he didn't think this was correct procedure from the information he had received at the CPRE workshop on the Local Development Framework he had attended recently.

Mr Hockley said that his views coincided in large measure with those expressed in Dr McCombie's letter. Mr Kennedy agreed and asked what was Dr McCombie's background. Dr McCombie (in the visitors' seats) said he was an urban land economist.

At this point, Mrs Roberts said she would issue a warning that correct planning procedure should be followed and questioned whether the council should be using Dr McCombie's views as the basis for its response. She said the Standards Board for England was very strict and her advice would be to listen to fellow councillors' views and the members of the public and to do the job itself.

Mr Brooksbank said the points made would fit into the recommended format.

Mrs Roberts said the SCDC Planning Committee would make its decision on planning merits alone.

Mr Pusey proposed that the council prepare its response to this application with the help of Dr McCombie and taking all the views expressed into account. Mr Kennedy seconded the proposal and the motion was carried with one vote against.

Mr Pusey then summarised the points made in the written representations the council had received so far. These included:

- Objections about the impact on the environment in Station Road and the High Street
- Increased problems with parking and traffic movement
- Village facilities overstretched – only 4 out of seven classes at the school have spare places
- Increased burden on the infrastructure including water and sewage
- Local medical practices are full already
- Safety issues such as the proposed new footpath to the school would emerge close to development exits on the High Street
- Loss of greenbelt land

Mr Pusey said the overall response from the village appeared to advise the council to resist this application.

Mrs Roberts said that the application must be looked at in planning terms. She said there were two sites included in the application, one a brownfield site within the village framework for which a maximum of 15 houses could be allowed. Under present planning policy all applications had to include a 50% affordable element so if this site were presented as a separate application, seven of the houses would have to be affordable. However, because these would not be Housing Association houses, prices would still be at market level albeit at the low end.

Turning to the second site, she said this was for 20 Housing Association houses behind the former Press cottages. These would be outside the village envelope, which would never be allowed under normal planning criteria. The land would not be eligible for anything other than affordable housing, primarily to meet the housing needs of village people.

Mrs Roberts, quoting from the latest housing needs survey carried out as a Rural Housing Enabler Project in July 2003, said that 38 households in Foxton were in need of affordable housing. Although she was not allowed to voice a personal opinion, she said there were difficulties with access, questionable numbers and the noise aspect. She said the involvement of the Housing Association had been premature and the whole application had not been well thought through. In addition, she said, there had not been enough preliminary consultation with the council and residents.

Mr Pusey said the SCDC housing officer he had seen had said that the number of affordable homes required was 16. Mrs Roberts said that Mike Sugden (SCDC) had suggested that another housing needs survey could be done.

Mr Pusey then invited councillors to express their views about the application.

Dr Grindley said that his concern was that the number of houses proposed for the exception site was too great and in one block whereas in Foxton at present the housing types were nicely mixed. Regarding the Press site he said the village would lose commercial accommodation, which would be replaced with executive houses.

He also criticised the layout as not being particularly attractive and presenting access problems. He thought the indicated access from the High Street was not acceptable and that an improved development was needed. He said there were other negative aspects including the congestion at the Station Road/High Street junction.

Mr Pusey and Mr Brooksbank both agreed with what Dr Grindley had said. Mr Brooksbank said he would be very wary of development outside the village envelope – he thought this would set a dangerous precedent, especially in view of the threat posed by the East of England Plan. He also thought the former Press houses formed an environment that the village would like to protect. He thought the increased traffic that would result (if the application were granted planning consent) at the junctions of Station Road with the High Street and the A10 could not be easily tolerated. He thought there were too many houses in the application near the War Memorial because of traffic problems. Finally, Mr Brooksbank pointed out that, although the application allowed for the retention of the main part of the High Street facade, the height would be increased and this might lead to a loss of light to the houses opposite.

Mr Kennedy said that his concern again was the number of houses proposed outside the village envelope when there was already an application under consideration for 7 affordable houses at the Moore's Farm site and a further 7 that could be built on the old school site – together these would go a long way towards satisfying the village's need for affordable houses.

Mr Hockley thought that the way the application had been made by splitting it between two sites might have been intended to encourage acceptance of the development of the houses on the Press site by providing 20 affordable houses on the other site. He also thought that too many houses had been proposed for the Press site and that there would be a noise problem on this site and problems with access and that the application needed more thinking through.

Mr Broadley said that he agreed with Mrs Roberts that there was a need to look at the provision of affordable housing in the village.

Mr Chilton said that his main concern was the consequent traffic issues should the application gain planning consent. Traffic conditions in the village were already dangerous and services were at capacity levels.

Mr Pusey then invited the members of the public to express their views.

Mr Challis said he was interested in the access to affordable houses and said that one of the Press houses had not been sold off. He suggested that the District Council might have a financial incentive in the scheme, as it would allow it to sell the land it owns on the site.

Mrs Roberts said that this was not the case: she said that sometimes the council was giving away land for affordable housing.

Another member of the public said that the elderly occupant of one house that would be affected by the new access had tended land in the District Council's ownership as part of his garden. He had taken a great pride in it and would be heartbroken to lose it.

Mrs Roberts said that the application had been handled the wrong way round and that South Cambs was not a "bully-boy". Although a similar application had been turned

down in the past, she said that the thing that had changed was that not all the factory site was now needed, and that until recently a development would only have needed to include 30% affordable housing whereas this had now risen to 50%. Mrs Roberts said that the District Council would have to consider whether this was an acceptable application.

Mr Pusey said that SCDC would need to identify the market value of the access as it would be a ransom strip: this was public land for which the council would have to get best value.

Mr Mitchell said that access problems were his main concern.

Mrs Roberts said that the Highways Authority might require a path either side of the access road and that this might be physically impossible.

Dr Duncan-Barclay said that the last application proposed an access road in the middle of Station Road and had been vetoed because of inadequate sight lines.

Mr Ling was concerned about services. He said that the sewage system was not coping with present needs and that there were problems with surface water in the High Street.

Mr Tudor said he would support all the objections raised so far especially the last one.

Dr McCombie said the 1998 application was for eight affordable houses and had been turned down because the site was outside the village envelope, would cause congestion in the High Street and was inappropriate to be next to the Press due to noise. He added that in the present application it was actually the high-value homes that were nearer to the Press and would therefore have the greater problem with noise.

Mr Broom (34 Station Road) said that 10 years ago a planning application he made had had to show provision for three off-road parking spaces.

Some members of the public described the noise problems they suffered as a result of the Press's activities and Mrs Roberts suggested they take up any noise issues with her.

Mrs Cooke (76 Station Road) said the congestion in the road was very bad: she had fought for four years to get yellow lines at the entrance to Station Road from the A10. The traffic was now much worse and there had been a bad accident at the crossing a month ago. She said she was very concerned about safety issues.

Mr Humphries (26 Station Road) said the access road would be directly opposite his house and would make it dangerous for him when driving in and out.

Mr Challis said he was concerned about the War Memorial environment – the plans seemed to show a garage abutting it.

Paul Bonnet of Hereward Housing Association stressed that this was not a Hereward Housing application. The association had been approached by the developer's architect and asked whether it would like to handle the social housing. As an exceptional site, it would need to have a Registered Social Landlord (RSL). Mr Pusey thanked Mr Bonnett for his comments and for attending the meeting.

Mrs Roberts said that Hereward Housing was a businesslike Housing Association.

Mr Pusey said that copies of all written responses received by the Parish Council would be forwarded to the District Council when the Parish Council made its response to the application. He then proposed that the council object to the application in the strongest possible terms. Dr Grindley seconded the proposal and all were agreed.

Mr Pusey then moved on to the rest of the planning matters arising since the last meeting.

**Other Planning Applications considered at the meeting:**

A Botcher	Application No. S/0853/05/F for an extension at 33 Fowlmere Road Approved
M Kohler	Application No. S/0837/F for an outbuilding at “Bartholomews”, Shepreth Road Refused because the outbuilding would be in front of the building line
South Cambridgeshire DC	Application No. S/0642/05/F for additional residents’ parking area at Hillfield Approved
Miss E Salmon	Application No. S/0686/F for a conservatory at 19 Fowlmere Road Approved
Mr and Mrs A Shelford	Application No. S/0732/F for extension and alteration at Beech Tree Farmhouse Approved for stated use (conversion of garage to sitting-room with bay and new chimney)

**Planning application amendment:**

Mr and Mrs L Wilson	Application No. S/1874/04/F for erection of bungalow and garage following demolition of existing dwelling at 22 Caxton Lane For information only
---------------------	---

**Planning Appeal decision:**

Mr and Mrs Payne	Application No. S/0579/04/F for a new dwelling to the rear of 59 Station Road Refused mainly on the grounds of the effect on the character and appearance of the area and on the nearby residents in terms of possible noise and disturbance.
------------------	--

Finally, Mrs Roberts said she would arrange an extension of the consultation period regarding Mr Ridgeon’s application.

**RECREATION GROUND TRUST REPORT**

Mr Pusey reported that he had received a letter from the school about support for CCTV cameras, but that discussion of this would have to be deferred.

### **FOXTON COMMUNITY PROJECT**

No response had been received from Bill Tarling (CCC Clerk of Works) about the faulty taps in the pavilion. Mr McCraith was briefed on the problems encountered with these taps and promised to look into the matter with Mr Browning (CCC).

### **DOVECOTE/MEADOW PROJECT**

Mr Pusey reported that the line of the footpath through the meadow had been agreed but some internal formalities were needed at County Hall.

He said the meadow had been cut again last week.

Dr Grindley asked whether the conveyance for the extension to the Recreation Ground had gone through and Mr Pusey said it had not.

### **CORRESPONDENCE**

The Clerk summarised the correspondence received since the last meeting, which is given in full below:

- 1) Letter dated 9<sup>th</sup> March (omitted from last month's circulating correspondence) from the CCC Environment and Transport Department saying that Foxton's bid for a jointly funded minor improvement scheme for 2005/06 had not been successful.
- 2) Letter dated 24<sup>th</sup> March from NSPCC asking for a donation.
- 3) Letter dated April 2005 from the CCC Chief Executive enclosing two copies of its Corporate Plan "Cambridgeshire – the next four years".
- 4) Letter dated April 2005 from the SCDC Sports Project Officer enclosing posters promoting the Disability Sports Festival 2005 taking place at Sawston Sports Centre on Sunday, 15<sup>th</sup> May.
- 5) Letter to Mr Pusey (received April) from a Prince's Trust worker who would like to publicise the work of the Trust.
- 6) Letter dated 1<sup>st</sup> April from Harstoe Housing Association Ltd re its rural housing seminars (first one at Linton social Centre on 23<sup>rd</sup> May).
- 7) Letter dated 4<sup>th</sup> April from The Land Partnership re affordable housing schemes.
- 8) Letter dated 4<sup>th</sup> April from the SCDC Assistant Licensing Officer re Open days on the Licensing Act (2003).
- 9) Letter dated 11<sup>th</sup> April from Andrew Lansley's office requesting removal (during the election period) of laminated notices advertising how to contact him.
- 10) Letter dated 12<sup>th</sup> April from Andrew Hall (CCC) re the revised boundary for the lease of the dovecote meadow: enclosing plan.

- 11) Reply dated 12<sup>th</sup> April from G Burnes (CCC) to Mr Pusey's letter about the registration of land adjoining Barons Lane.
- 12) Letter dated 4<sup>th</sup> April from the Tucker Gardner Partnership in response to the council's letter about the vision splay at No. 1 Edis Way, saying the firm has passed the council's letter on to Meldire. *(an e-mail had been received from the council's solicitors saying that Foxton PC has no interest in the vision splay, so the matter was in the hands of the developer, Meldire)*
- 13) Letter dated 12<sup>th</sup> April from H C Moss, in response to Mr Kennedy's (re failures with streetlamps in Edis Way) saying that delays in adoption of the road are due to CCC and that residents had not reported faults with the lights to them.
- 14) Letter dated 14<sup>th</sup> April 2005 from CCC South Highways Division in response to the council's letter about the verge in Barons Lane, saying that the "No Through Road" sign would be erected.
- 15) Letter dated 19<sup>th</sup> April from the CCC Environmental Management Officer about the CCC's Climate Change Strategy: enclosing publication entitled "Tackling climate change in Cambridgeshire".
- 16) RoSPA Play Area safety Inspection Report April 2005. *(Passed to DC)*
- 17) Letter dated 3<sup>rd</sup> May (to Mr Boreham) re the Cambridge Projects Database for consultees on proposed traffic management schemes in Cambridge. *(It was agreed that it would be best for all communications on traffic management to go to the clerk)*
- 18) Letter from the SCDC Trees and Landscape Officer re update of Tree Warden records: enclosing a copy of "The Tree Guardian".
- 19) Letter from Ken Charles, Event manager, re "Animal Crackers – a Family Fun Day" to be held on Sunday, 12<sup>th</sup> June between 11am and 4pm.
- 20) Letter (received May) from the Cambridgeshire Drug and Alcohol Action Team enclosing various publicity material including a directory of services.
- 21) Information from CALC including:
  - Update on Cambridgeshire county training Partnership
  - Memo re District Association meetings
  - Memo re Quality Status applications and training bursary (the latter with application form)
  - Leaflets on training days and workshops
  - Invitation to Clerks to a barbeque in Catford
- 22) Letter from a number of sponsors inviting the council to register to take part in "The Trafalgar Weekend" and enclosing a guidance booklet. *(Passed to MK)*
- 23) Local Council Review, May 2005
- 24) "Clerks and Councils Direct" magazine May 2005

- 25) Letter from Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum enclosing poster (displayed).
- 26) Publicity from Hays (accountancy), Wicksteed, Eibe, Miracle, Kompan, Playtop and Playsafe (play equipment and play surfaces) and Glasdon.

### **VISITORS' QUESTIONS**

Dr McCombie enquired whether anyone was organising a Neighbourhood Watch scheme in Foxton.

*It was confirmed that West Hill Road had organised one in the past and that it was up to individual residents to organise Neighbourhood Watch schemes in the vicinity of their homes.*

### **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr McCraith described a scheme being piloted by Christopher Fisher called Junior Neighbourhood Watch. He said this scheme kept young people interested in doing responsible acts in the community with rewards such as trips to the London Eye. It was agreed that Mr McCraith should invite Mr Fisher to speak to the council.

Mr Brooksbank said that the grass had not been trimmed near the fire hydrant signs on the bank near the Press houses. Dr Grindley commented that the Recreation Ground was looking rather good.

### **DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

It was confirmed that this would be held on **Monday, 6<sup>th</sup> June 2005 at 7.45pm, in the Village Hall Meeting Room.**

Mr Pusey and Mr Hockley both gave their apologies in advance for the June meeting  
There being no further business, the meeting closed at 9.50 pm.