

**MELBOURN PARISH COUNCIL
MINUTES**

Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on Monday 13th November 2017 in the large upstairs meeting room of Melbourn Community Hub at 7.30pm.

Planning Committee – Cllrs Buxton/Clark/Gatward/Hart/Kilmurray/Porter/Regan/Sherwen

Planning Committee Attendance – Chair - Cllr Kilmurray, Cllrs Clark, Gatward, Regan, Sherwen.

In attendance: The Clerk, Mr Richard Dooley from Octopus Healthcare, Mr James Wallace - Architect and District Cllrs Barrett and Hales and 5 members of the public

PL48/17 To receive any apologies for absence
Apologies were received from Cllrs Buxton, Hart, Porter for personal reasons

PL49/17 To receive any Declarations of Interest and Dispensations
a) **To receive declarations of interest from councillors on items on the agenda**
There were no declarations of interests made

PL50/17 To approve the minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting on 9th October 2017

IT WAS PROPOSED BY CLLR SHERWEN THAT THE MINUTES OF 9TH OCTOBER 2017 WERE A TRUE RECORD, THERE WAS NO SECONDER AS NO OTHER CLLRS WERE IN ATTENDANCE WHO WERE PRESENT AT THE 9TH OCTOBER 2017 MEETING, THEREFORE THIS AGENDA ITEM WILL BE DISCUSSED AGAIN AT THE NEXT PLANNING MEETING IN DECEMBER 2017.

PL51/17 To report back on the minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting on 9th October 2017

PL47/17 d) The Clerk noted there had been a response from the Tree Officer from SCDC and this would be read out under notifications.

PL52/17 Public Participation (For up to 15 minutes members of the public may contribute their views and comments and questions to the Parish Council – 3 minutes per item.

The Chair suspended Standing Orders at 7.35pm.

There were no comments from the public

The Chair reinstated Standing Orders at 7.36pm.

PL53/17 To receive any notifications or planning consultation documents.

- a) Notification: The Council hereby grants permission for Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of new single storey extension. New external door in existing window opening and replacement window at 1 The Moor, Melbourn Royston, Cambridgeshire, SG8 6ED. Mr & Mrs Jennings. S/1742/17/FL. Was noted.
- b) Notification – The Council hereby grants permission for External alterations to both chimneys and flue lining renovations to allow for safe use at Tithe Barn, 29 A The Moor, Melbourn, Royston, Cambridgeshire, SG8 6ED, Mr & Mrs Jones . S/2752/17/FL. Was noted.

- c) Notification – The Council grants permission for proposed first floor bedroom & bathroom extension at 38 Fordham Way, Melbourn, Royston, Cambridgeshire. SG8 6JA. Mrs Phillis Smith. S/2945/17/FL. Was noted.
- d) Notification – The Council hereby grants permission for conservation of existing single dwellings to form two dwellings including single storey front and rear extensions and widening of existing dropped curb at 11 New Road, Melbourn, Royston, Cambridgeshire, SG8 6BX. Natalie Starkey. S/1913/17/FL. Was noted.
- e) Notification – The Planning Inspectorate – Appeal Decision – The appeal is dismissed for outline planning permission for new house and garage with all matters reserved at 18 Greenbanks, Melbourn. Mr David Blundell. SI0501/17/OL. Was noted.
- f) Notification of application to carry out tree works subject to a tree preservation order or situated within a conservation area: T.2 Ash- Fell and grind stump. (Low amenity tree) Self set. T.3 Ash- Fell and grind stump. (Low amenity tree) Self set. T.4 Ash- Fell and grind stump. (Low amenity tree) Self set. T.5 Ash- Fell and grind stump. (Low amenity tree) Self set. T.6 Ash- Fell and grind stump. (Low amenity tree) Self set. T.7 Horse Chestnut- Fell to ground level. (Low amenity tree) at Glebe House, 38 High Street, Melbourn, Royston, SG8 6DZ. S/3412/17/TC. Mr Dave.

Response received from SCDC Tree Officer – Thank you for responding to the consultation for the above application. As requested, Jay and myself visited the site to have a look at the horse chestnut (and other tree works). The horse chestnut is fairly small, in amongst other much larger trees and is struggling, or perhaps not flourishing in terms of health but it has not overwhelming health or structural condition flaw. As this is a Conservation Area application our options are limited to is the tree worthy of TPO or not. In this particular case we could not really TPO the tree as it does not have a high amenity value. Having been in the front garden though, although the horse chestnut is a little loss to the junction, I think it will open up the view of the ash tree and the very fine oak behind it. These are very nice trees and increasing their visibility might add to the streetscape. Regards Miriam Hill - Trees Officer

- g) Notification – Discharge of conditions 6 (Brick Sample), 7 (Lime Rich mortar details), 8 (Weatherboard cladding) and 10 (Roof slate sample) of planning permission S/1650/15/FL at Danesbury House, 21 High Street, Melbourn, SG8 6ER. Mr Simon Karr. S/3580/17/DC – For information only.
- h) Notification – Discharge of conditions 4,5,6,7 and 8 of planning permission S/3374/16/LB at 59 High Street, Melbourn, Royston, SG8 6DZ. S/3584/17/DC. Mr Chamberlain. Was noted.
- i) Notification – Discharge of condition 2 (Contamination) of planning permission S/2969/14/PB at Barn, Three Prospects Farm, Royston Road, Melbourn, Royston, Herts, SG8 6DA. S/3829/17/DC. Three Prospects Farm Ltd. Was noted.

PL54/17

To consider the following Planning Applications:

- a) Notification of application to carry out tree works subject to a tree preservation order or situated within a conservation area: T1 Sycamore Reduce lateral branches to clear property by 2m at 21 Station Road, Melbourn Royston, Cambridgeshire, SG8 6DX. S/3781/17/TC

IT WAS PROPOSED BY CLLR REGAN AND SECONDED BY CLLR SHERWEN TO ACCEPT THE TREE APPLICATION. ALL WERE IN FAVOUR. THIS WAS CARRIED.

- b) Planning Application – Erection of Workshop Building at Bus Compound, Grange Farm, Newmarket Road, Melbourn, Royston, Cambridgeshire, SG8 7PR at Melbourn Farms Limited. S/3874/17/FL
Members asked will this application solely be for the use of CL Travel and not for commercial use for other coaches. Melbourn Parish Council would also like clarification from Cambridge County Highways of the frequency of vehicle visits.

IT WAS PROPOSED BY CLLR CLARK AND SECONDED BY CLLR SHERWEN

THAT MELBOURN PARISH COUNCIL CONTACT SCDC PLANNING DEPARTMENT TO REQUEST FURTHER INFORMATION RELATING TO THE POINTS ABOVE AND DEFER THE DECISION UNTIL THE NEXT PLANNING MEETING ON 11TH DECEMBER 2017. ALL WERE IN FAVOUR. THIS WAS CARRIED.

- c) Planning Application – Single storey rear extension at 30 Dolphin Lane, Melbourn, Royston, SG8 6AE. Mr & Mrs Mills. S/3857/17/FL
IT WAS PROPOSED BY CLLR GATWARD AND SECONDED BY CLLR SHERWEN TO ACCEPT THE APPLICATION WITH NO COMMENTS. ALL WERE IN FAVOUR. THIS WAS CARRIED.
- d) Planning Application – RETROSPECTIVE: Retention and continued operation of a diesel fuel tank, the retention of drainage interceptors and the continued use of the rear parking area for vehicle washing and refuelling at 10A The Moor, Melbourn, SG8 6ED. C/O Agent, Butler Meltax. S/3651/17/FL
A Councillor read out the very few comments from residents on the SCDC website.
IT WAS PROPOSED BY CLLR CLARK AND SECONDED BY CLLR SHERWEN TO ACCEPT THE APPLICATION WITH NO COMMENTS. ALL WERE IN FAVOUR. THIS WAS CARRIED.
- e) Planning Application – Reserved Matters Conditions 1) Details of appearance, and landscaping, layout and scale following outline permission S/2791/14/OL for a care home of up to 75 beds, new vehicular and pedestrian access. At Land East of New Road, New Road, Melbourn, SG8 6BX. Richard Dooley, Octopus Healthcare. S/3448/17/RM

Mr Richard Dooley from Octopus Healthcare and Mr James Wallace - Architect were present at the meeting. The following points were discussed:

- Melbourn Futures Working Party had raised their concerns to Bonnie Kwok, Principal Planning Officer from SCDC and Ms Kwok agreed that Melbourn Parish Council's letter should be forwarded to Octopus Healthcare prior to this evenings meeting. The Chair of Melbourn Futures Working Party stated that the Council is not against the development and recognise outline planning permission has been given for a care home of up to 75 Beds. The Council are concerned about the mass and scale, location and privacy for dwellings, especially East and West barns.
- Octopus Healthcare stated they have been able to purchase a set piece of land which is 1.3 acre from Peterhouse. The original outline planning application was just a block which was not feasible, and did it not have a specific plan. There were discussions about the height of the development and Octopus confirmed they are unable to build the facility anywhere else on the New Road site as Peterhouse has planning permission with Endurance Estates and this is the only piece of land that has been offered to them. Mr Dooley stated that if the Parish Council wished for the development to be moved discussions would need to be had with the landowner, Peterhouse.
- A member from the Melbourn Futures Working Party asked Octopus if they cannot move the site can they not reduce the care home to a 2 storey building reducing the overall number to a 61 bed care home instead of 75. Octopus explained it is about the articulation of the building and this is more cost efficient than proposed before. The Chair of Melbourn Futures Working Party raised there is still the issue with 15 windows and two balconies still overlooking the East and West Barn and would be able to view children playing in their back gardens. Octopus states on the west side of the building there is 36 metres overlooking distance and they have removed some windows from the 2nd floor and increased the boundary hedge. Octopus also stated they have moved the scheme further to the southern boundary and both landscaping and boundary treatment has been increased up to 2.2 metres and the balconies have obscured glass. Octopus reminded members that the care homes will be for the elderly who have dementia. A member asked why you cannot amend the area overlooking the East and West Barns to

single storey as this would be much more sensible, Octopus stated this would not make the scheme viable.

- The Chair of Melbourn Futures asked in relation to car parking if 30 car park spaces is sufficient. Octopus stated they have carried many surveys out over many years and for the size of the care home 25-30 spaces would be sufficient. Members of staff would work a 3 system shift pattern and there would be no restriction on visiting times. Octopus stated it is not common to have large amounts of car parking, but more landscaping features for residents. The Chair of Melbourn Futures stated there will be staff/visitors/ambulances and delivery vehicles and how does Octopus propose to deal with the amount of vehicles and this will encourage parking on the 5 metre wide road. Also if there was a large vehicle on the road, how would an ambulance get past? And stated he would like to see evidence that parking is sufficient.

Standing Orders was suspended at 8.25pm

- A resident commented on the parking and what would happen if Octopus's calculations were wrong? Octopus stated that they have worked for lots of schemes and not one required more car park spaces. Octopus design to what has been witnessed by their operations team. Octopus went onto say that it would be the responsibility of the operator to bring in some sort of transport system for their own staff or arrange a car sharing service. A member stated that human nature will dictate that if a person cannot park on site they will park on a nearby road.
- A resident raised his concerns that where did the number '75' come from? As there appears to be no evidence and justification for this. He went onto speak about the aspirations of the area and that Melbourn had to close an old care home recently, but there are also plans for a new Bupa Site to be built just up the road. The resident also pointed out that due to the nature of the clients who will be living in the care home there will be a need for staff to have the necessary expertise and they will most probably not live locally and therefore will need to travel to work by car. The resident spoke about material planning considerations such as noise, smell, fumes and in particular the overshadowing and lack of privacy. The resident stated that by Octopus's recommendation to plant trees at a considerable height will prevent any light reaching into the gardens belonging to East and West Barn. The resident suggested to Octopus that their application has not considered any of these points at all.
- A member stated that care homes of this size and nature often contain GP surgeries and will that happen in Melbourn? Octopus replied that the operator are in discussions with one particular national care home about offering local GP visits and that means the GP would run a surgery in the care home and see the resident rather than the residents having to be taken to the surgery. The member stated that due to the 199 homes being built it is known that the current GP surgery will not be able to cope with the facilities the village has now and she cannot see how that is going to work. Octopus stated that statistically people who move into care homes have normally lived within a 3 mile radius of the care home and will already be registered with a GP surgery. The member stated if this were to happen this would become a disadvantage to the residents of Melbourn as the GP would then be taken away from the surgery which would reduce their availability and appointments. Octopus disagreed as these surgeries could be carried out at different times during the time, so this would not be affected.
- A member stated that Melbourn has 5 GP's who look after 12500 patients, there is no way of re-financing the surgery as it is a business and it is not practicable to take a doctor away from a day shift.
- A member stated as Octopus has given statistics tonight, can they as the landlord confirm if they are in discussion with a potential operator and if so they are able to name them? Octopus was not able to disclose the name. Octopus as landlord will follow the

planning application, in terms of how the operator runs the building and there will be strict criteria to follow. Octopus also stated that it is in their interest to ensure parking is correct as potentially occupancy levels could drop and this is not what they would want.

- Octopus confirmed they were aware of the new Bupa Care Home being built locally as they have access to a database called CACI which shows all proposed, existing and new care homes along with other information.

The Chair reinstated Standing Orders at 8.49pm.

- Octopus explained they have tried to give an authentic look for example household dining, dementia gardens and The Street which includes hairdressers, cinema etc. and this means the residents are able to leave their accommodation and go to a more communal base area.
- A member asked how many staff would be working in the care home. Octopus confirmed there would be 60-70 part time members of a 3x shift change. Octopus stated the shift patterns would operate out of peak period.
- A member asked is Octopus familiar of the Grampian rules? Mr Dooley stated the infrastructure for this development is being provided by Hopkin Homes.
- Due to other Parish Council business starting at 9pm the meeting needed to come to a close. Mr Dooley was asked if he could reply to the answers that had been sent to him by the Parish Council as soon as possible and there would be a further Melbourn Futures Working Party meeting held before the 27th November 2017 in order for a written response to be submitted to the Parish Council for approval on 27th November 2017.

The Chair closed the meeting at 9.03pm.

MELBOURN PARISH COUNCIL

Clerk: Sarah Adam
Melbourn Parish Council
Melbourn Community Hub
30 High Street
Melbourn
SG8 6DZ

E-mail: parishclerk@melbournpc.co.uk

Telephone: 01763 263303

<http://www.melbournparishcouncil.co.uk>

Please note: New Parish Office opening hours:

Monday: 10.00am-1.00pm, Wednesday: 1.00pm-3.00pm, Friday: 10.00am-1.00pm

Alternatively, please call to arrange an appointment.

1 November 2017

Bonnie Kwok
Planning and New Communities
South Cambridgeshire Hall
Cambourne Business Park
Cambourne
Cambridge
CB23 6EA

Proposal: Application for the approval of reserved matters for the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale following outline planning permission S/2791/14/OL for a new care home of up to 75 beds, new vehicular and pedestrian access

Application Reference: S/3448/17/RM

Location: Land to the east of New Road, Melbourn, SG8 6BX

Applicant: Richard Dooley, Octopus Healthcare

Reference our letter dated 4th September 2017 relating to comments on the previous Octopus Healthcare application S/3448/17/RM. Melbourn Parish Council (MPC) have now received a revised Octopus Healthcare application S/3448/17/RM for comment.

MPC note that the latest application recognises the need to reduce the ridge height to comply with Conditions 15 and 18 of the outline planning permission (Para 3 of our letter of 4th September refers). It is with some concern that MPC note that no account has been taken of the other design issues outlined in our letter. Notably:

1. Building scale, mass and location

On the original outline application the footprint of the care home was shown as a rectangular block in the corner of the site adjoining New Road and the existing properties of East and West Barns. The principle of where the care home was to be located on the site was not part of the formal outline planning application, and the disproportionate scale of the proposed design needs to be given serious consideration.

The care home design is estimated to have approximately 4200 square metres of floor space, which is more than 40 times the size of an average residential property. There is no such development in Melbourn where a building of this magnitude is located in amongst domestic properties.

Given this scale of building when sited adjacent to existing properties along New Road, and its visual landscape impact even with a strategic buffer as both residents and visitors

enter the village along New Road, the Parish Council do not believe that it is the most suitable location for the care home of up to 75 beds.

2. Site layout

The layout proposed is significantly different from that shown on the illustrative masterplan at the time of the outline planning permission, which showed a care home building located to the side of East Barn and residential gardens backing onto the rear boundaries of both West and East Barns. The current proposal shows the operational area of the care home wrapping around East Barn completely. This is a significant change in design, and one only given to MPC at a recent meeting. The design change has generated a number of the problems detailed in this letter. MPC request that this aspect of the design is revised in the subsequent Reserve Matters submission from Octopus. The general lack of communication and engagement from Octopus, is worrying, and better communication going forward would avoid this type of issue;

Section1 (f) of the South Cambridgeshire Development Control Policy, Design of new development, states “Be compatible with its location and appropriate in terms of scale, mass, form, siting, design, proportion, materials, texture and colour in relation to the surrounding area”, and would therefore seem to support the MPC’s position.

3 Care home Layout

MPC is aware that the outline planning permission allows for a Care Home for up to 75 people. At the time of the Appeal, we did not know what the clientele of the Care Home would be. We now understand that residents will be high dependency. This has a knock-on effect for the accommodation and facilities which will need to be provided and this, in turn, has an impact on the area of land which will be needed. MPC has noted that the footprint of the building has increased. In turn this seems to have resulted in a reduced area being available for car parking and for a landscape buffer between the Care Home and East and West Barns. MPC would like some feedback from South Cambs Planning Authority as to how a decision is made about whether a design is too big for the planned site.

4 .Overlooking / privacy

As mentioned earlier the proposed footprint which effectively wraps around the existing properties of East and West Barns is considered to be significant in terms of mass and scale within and adjacent to a domestic development. It will therefore dominate any adjacent domestic residential properties.

MPC understands that every resident should be entitled to an element of privacy, and that overlooking is a material consideration when considering a design. On the basis that 15 of the care home windows and two balconies will overlook East and West Barn, and that East Barn will be left without any private amenity space this is a significant concern. It is noted that the design for the 199 home development avoids excess overlooking between the houses, as would be expected from good designs and MPC would like to know why this important design principle has not been consistently applied to East and West Barn.

The “daylight/Sunshine” section is completely wrong and misleading. It suggests that no shadow will be cast over East or West Barn, which will be in shadow for quite significant parts of the day at certain times of the year. Not only does this potentially impact the right to light, but it would also prevent the fitting of solar panels to the only south facing roof space.

5. Landscaping

The Parish Planning Pack” (Advice Note 5) detail “overlooking/loss of privacy” as a material consideration that should be taken into account in deciding a planning application will this be a consideration particularly with respect to East and West Barn? It had been hoped that there would be a strategic landscape buffer between the care home and these properties and this

does not appear to be the case. During the outline planning process, great emphasis was placed on the landscape mitigation measures – for example section 6.1 of the design statement “Planting to application site boundaries which abut existing residences (northern and western boundaries) to be strengthened to limit visual intrusion on local residents”. The implementation of landscape buffers are referenced in the appeal decision and outline planning permission. Whilst the main strategic buffer has been included within 199 Homes Reserve Matters submission, no such measures have been included with the care home design. Is this not another breach of the outline planning permission? MPC request that this aspect of the design is revised.

6. Inadequate provision of car parking

The plans indicate 30 parking spaces and given the number of staff serving the facility on a shift basis it is thought that the number of spaces will be inadequate for staff let alone visitors. Can you confirm what the overflow car parking facilities will be and where visitors will be expected to park.

A subsequent knock on effect of the care home size has been inadequate provision of car and cycle parking spaces. Based on the South Cambridgeshire’s own guide lines we understand that the care home should have parking for 46 cars (one space for every three beds, 1 space for every member of staff, assumed to be one for each member of staff for each shift) and 13 cycles. Whilst there may be some flexibility in this model, for example where the site is in easy reach of public transport (which it is not), providing parking for only 30 cars and 10 cycles, seems grossly inadequate. The impact from lack of on-site parking will result in cars over spilling into the new housing estate and New Road. Again the conclusion must be that the care home is either in the wrong place or the current design too large for the site. MPC would expect the Planning Authority to implement the councils own guidelines, or at least have a satisfactory explanation as to why they do not need to be met for this situation. MPC request that this aspect of the design is revised in the subsequent reserve matters submission from Octopus.

8. Grampian

It is not clear at this stage where the sewage effluent from the care home will discharge. We would wish it to be confirmed that the effluent discharges into the new pumping station located within the 199 home development and as such would be subject to the same Grampian application.

9. Commercial drivers

Octopus suggest that there are commercial restrictions to how the design and location of the carehome can be changed. Octopus may have entered into a commercial arrangement for the land, and with this commercial arrangement came commercial risk – which was not having full planning permission for the design which delivers the best financial return. If this argument is accepted, then the commercial imperative is driving planning decision. Should it not be planning policy made by the local planning department making these decisions?

In summary, MPC have identified a number of important issues of concern with this Reserved Matters application. It would appear that the chosen site is incapable of supporting a 75 bed care home together with its operational support system without contravening the outline planning recommendations. As a consequence it is suggested that the number of beds in the care home needs to be reduced on the current site to reduce its mass and scale or if up to a 75 bed capacity is maintained relocated to another site within the 199 development where it would sit more aesthetically compatible within the proposed 3 storey buildings.

In view of the scale and sensitivity of these issues MPC believe that it is essential if we could meet with you on site to discuss the revised design parameters. If you are in agreement could you let me know the dates you will be available in the near future.

Yours sincerely

Sarah Adam

Sarah Adam
Melbourn Parish Clerk