

MELBOURN PARISH COUNCIL – PLANNING COMMITTEE

(District of South Cambridgeshire)

A meeting of this Committee was held in the Austen Room, The Community Hub, 30 High Street, Melbourn, SG8 6DZ on Monday, 11 April 2023 at 19:30

Members of the public are reminded that copies of reports and supporting documentation for agenda items can be obtained from the Parish Council website, <http://melbournparishcouncil.co.uk> or on request to the Clerk

Present: Cllrs Kilmurray (chair), Hart, Clark, Alexander, Barnes, Barley

Absent:

In attendance: Sophie Marriage (Parish Clerk), District Councillor Hales, and 16 members of the public.

PL113/22 To receive and approve apologies for absence

Apologies were received from Cllr Wilson with appropriate reasons.

It was RESOLVED to approve apologies for absence from Cllr Wilson.

Proposed by Cllr Clark, seconded by Cllr Barley. All in favour

PL114/22 To receive any Declarations of Interest and Dispensations

- a) To receive declarations of interest from councillors on items on the agenda
- b) To receive written requests for dispensations for disclosable pecuniary interests (if any)
- c) To grant any requests for dispensation as appropriate

Cllr Barley noted an interest in item PL121/22c. He was granted dispensation to stay for the discussion but not vote.

PL115/22 To approve the minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting on 13 March 2023

It was RESOLVED to approve the minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting on 13 March 2023 as an accurate record.

Proposed by Cllr Hart, seconded by Cllr Barnes. All in favour.

PL116/22 To report back on the minutes of the Planning Committee Meetings on 13 March 2023

It was noted that item PL121/22d) had been considered at the meeting on 13 March 2023 but due to an amendment in the application, the application is being considered again.

PL117/22 Public Participation: (For up to 15 minutes members of the public may contribute their views and comments and questions to the Planning Committee – 3 minutes per item)

Members of the public were invited to address the meeting. All members of the public raised concerns about planning application [23/01134/FUL](#) to be considered by committee under PL121/22c.

- A member of the public noted concern about existing buildings being increased to three story. The increase to the height of the existing building would result in neighbouring residential properties being overshadowed and overlooked.
- Concern was raised about the light pollution from the site and from the large building which would shine into neighbouring houses. The lights will be left on at night and reduce the chance of dark skies. It was noted by a member of the public that some neighbouring residents were not consulted in the daylight assessment.
- The building work is planned to take 8 years and a member of the public raised fears that this will cause disruption, dust, noise, pollution and reduce neighbouring residents' quality of life.
- Several members of the public raised concerns about the increased volume of traffic that will be coming to the village and increasing congestion.
- A member of the public noted that Bruntwood have increased the rental fee for local businesses using the premises which is no longer affordable for local businesses.
- A member of the public raised concern about if the "pub" would truly and directly benefit the local community.
- It was noted that the Health Assessment was carried out by Savills and a query was raised if a medical professional had been consulted for the report.
- A query was raised about S106 money but it was noted that this is agreed at a later stage in the process.
- It was noted that the determination date is 14th June 2023. Any members of the public wishing to speak at the District Council's planning meeting need to contact SCDC two clear working days before the meeting. **ACTION:** Members of the public who wish to speak at the District Council's Planning meeting to contact the parish clerk who will share details of the District Council's planning meeting and how to request to speak at the meeting.
- Members of the council noted that at consultations held by Bruntwood and when speaking with some residents views on the development were a mix of in support and objecting.

Signed:.....Date.....

PL118/22 Decision Notices: To receive any Decision notices issued since last meeting.

- a) [22/05474/FUL](#) Proposal: Change of use of farm shop, tea rooms, conservatory and agricultural storage and conversion to live-work unit. Site address: Bridgefoot Farm, Bridgefoot Barn Farm Shop And Tea Room Barley Road Flint Cross Great And Little Chishill Cambridgeshire
Decision - Permission Granted
MPC original comment - support
The decision was noted.

PL119/22 Correspondence

- a) To receive any updates and consider actions
Correspondence was noted from residents related to application [23/01134/FUL](#)

The Chair amended the order of the meeting

PL121/22 Planning Applications:

- c) [23/01134/FUL](#) Proposal: Demolition of 13,594sq.m of existing buildings, alterations and extensions by 1,127 sq.m to retained buildings to allow use within Class E within Ash House, Class E(b) within Moat House and Class C1 within the new wing rear of Moat House, development of 46,031 sq.m of new office and technology research facilities (Class E(g)(i), (ii) and (iii)) including continued use of DaVinci building and 22,941 sq.m of ancillary buildings for vehicle and cycle parking, together with temporary and permanent plant and infrastructure works including formation of two additional vehicular accesses and one additional vehicular egress from Cambridge Road and landscaping.
Site address: Land At Melbourn Science Park Cambridge Road Melbourn Cambridgeshire
Applicant: Bruntwood SciTech Melbourn Limited.

There was discussion about concerns regarding the height of the buildings, light pollution, overshadowing, increased traffic through the village, the increased number of car parking spaces, the impact of the construction working on neighbouring residents, and the increased rental fee for local businesses using premises on the site.

It was noted that the park needs re-developing. The positive impacts of the development were noted as more green areas, the park would be more open, the public can access open spaces, employees encouraged to use sustainable travel, the site will be using sustainable energy, the creation of job opportunities, and it would attract more people to the village.

A member noted that Bruntwood had not previously had a site in a village location, and their current sites are on the outskirts of towns or in remote areas.

It was noted that issues with construction traffic would be management by planning enforcement.

It was RESOLVED to support the application with the following comments highlighting serious reservations about the development:

- The height and scale of buildings resulting in overshadowing and overlooking of neighbouring properties
- The light pollution from lights on site and the lights from the taller buildings
- The increased amount of traffic travelling through the village and ensuring the correct conditions are put in place.
- The increased number of car parking spaces and how sustainable travel will be encouraged
- Clarification that the health assessment carried out by Savills did consult a medical professional
- The increased rental fee which has made use of the premises on the site unaffordable for local businesses

Proposed by Cllr Kilmurray, seconded by Cllr Barnes.

In favour: Cllr Kilmurray, Clark, Hart, Alexander, and Barnes

Against:

Abstain: Cllr Barley

All members of the public left the meeting at 20:35

The Chair resumed the order of the meeting in accordance with the agenda.

PL120/22 To note the following applications for tree work:

- a) [23/0312/TTPO](#) Site address: Oak Cottage 6A Vicarage Close Melbourn Cambridgeshire Proposal: T.1 Oak - Crown reduce by 2.5M to reduce wind sail. Following the loss of the adjacent Horse Chestnut tree, the Oak (T.1) is now exposed to wind forces to which it is not accustomed. This means they are predisposed to a greater than usual risk of failure at the root plate (whole tree failure). I recommend the remaining tree be considerably reduced in size to reduce their sail area
No comments received
It was noted.

- b) To receive any updates and consider actions

None were received.

PL121/22 Planning Applications:

- a) [23/01048/HFUL](#) Proposal: Two storey side extension and single storey front porch extension.
 Site address: 6 Victoria Way Melbourn Cambridgeshire SG8 6FE
 Applicant: Mr & Mrs Chris and Dominique Baker

It was RESOLVED to support the application with the comment that the side window should be fixed and fully obscured.

Proposed by Cllr Clark, seconded by Cllr Barnes.

In favour: Cllr Kilmurray, Clark, Hart, Alexander, and Barnes

Against:

Abstain: Cllr Barley

- b) [23/01051/HFUL](#) Proposal: Replacement of existing windows and french doors.
 Site address: 137 High Street Melbourn Cambridgeshire SG8 6AR
 Applicant: Mr Andrew Whyley

It was RESOLVED to support the application with no comment.

Proposed by Cllr Clark, seconded by Cllr Barnes. All in favour.

- d) [23/00709/PRIOR](#) Proposal: Change of Use of Agricultural Buildings to 5 No. Dwellinghouses (Use Class C3), and for building operations reasonably necessary for the conversion
 Site address: Hillside Farm Newmarket Road Melbourn Cambridgeshire
 Applicant: Mr David Dodds.

It was noted that the amendment did not address the concerns raised at the meeting on 13 March.

It was RESOLVED to object to the application with the following comments:

- There are concerns around road safety as residents will have to access and enter the site on a 60mph road
- There are no footpath or safe greenway routes to the site for pedestrians.
- The application seems to contravene SCDC's sustainability policy.

Proposed by Cllr Barley, seconded by Cllr Alexander. All in favour.

- e) To receive any updates and consider actions

None were received.

PL122/22 Compliance updates: To consider any compliance updates received since last meeting

To receive any updates and consider actions

None were received.

PL123/22 To note the date of next meeting : Tuesday 9 May 2023

The date of the next meeting was noted as Tuesday, 9 May 2023.

Meeting closed at 20:52

MELBOURN PARISH COUNCIL – PLANNING COMMITTEE

(District of South Cambridgeshire)

A meeting of this Committee was held in the Austen Room, The Community Hub, 30 High Street, Melbourn, SG8 6DZ on Monday, 13 March 2023 at 19:30

Members of the public are reminded that copies of reports and supporting documentation for agenda items can be obtained from the Parish Council website, <http://melbournparishcouncil.co.uk> or on request to the Clerk

Present: Cllrs Kilmurray (Chair), Barnes, Hart, Wilson, Clark, Alexander

Absent: Cllr Barley

In attendance: Sophie Marriage (Parish Clerk), District Cllr Hales and one member of the public

PL101/22 To receive and approve apologies for absence

None were received

PL102/22 To receive any Declarations of Interest and Dispensations

- a) To receive declarations of interest from councillors on items on the agenda
- b) To receive written requests for dispensations for disclosable pecuniary interests (if any)
- c) To grant any requests for dispensation as appropriate

It was noted that items PL109/22a) related to an application by Cllr Davey and therefore would not be discussed by committee.

No other declarations of interest and dispensations were received.

PL103/22 To approve the minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting on 13 February 2023

It was RESOLVED to approve the minutes of the Planning committee Meeting held on 13 February 2023 as an accurate record.

Proposed by Cllr Clark, seconded by Cllr Wilson. All in favour.

PL104/22 To report back on the minutes of the Planning Committee Meetings on 13 February 2023

There was nothing to report.

PL105/22 Public Participation: (For up to 15 minutes members of the public may contribute their views and comments and questions to the Planning Committee – 3 minutes per item)

One member of the public was in attendance to discuss application 22/0574/FUL under item PL109/22d). It was noted that there had been confusion previously due to several applications being submitted under similar names in close proximity. The previous objection to the application from committee had been due to concerns about residents of the live-work unit having access to the commercial kitchen. The member of the public confirmed that anyone living in the accommodation above the kitchen would have the appropriate food safety training to use the kitchen because they will also be working in the kitchen.

The chair amended the order of the agenda to discuss item PL109/22 with the member of the public in attendance.

PL109/22 Planning Applications:

- d) [22/05474/FUL](#) Proposal: Change of use of farm shop, tea rooms, conservatory and agricultural storage and conversion to live-work unit

Site address: Bridgefoot Farm, Bridgefoot Barn Farm Shop And Tea Room Barley Road Flint Cross Great And Little Chishill

The application had been amended since it was last considered by committee.

It was RESOLVED that following amendments to the application to withdraw the committee's previous objections and to support the application with the comment that all residents of the live-work unit should have the appropriate training to use the kitchen.

Proposed by Cllr Hart, seconded by Cllr alexander. All in favour.

(the member of the public left the meeting at 19:42)

The chair returned to the order of the agenda.

PL106/22 Decision Notices: To receive any Decision notices issued since last meeting.

- a) [22/05607/LBC](#) Proposal: Single storey extension to the existing detached garage in the rear garden. Site address: 4 The Moor Melbourn Cambridgeshire SG8 6ED Applicant: Mr & Mrs Andrew Mutty

Decision – Permission Granted

MPC original comment - support

The decision was noted.

- b) [22/05606/HFUL](#) Proposal: Single storey extension to the existing detached garage in the rear garden. Site address: 4 The Moor Melbourn Cambridgeshire SG8 6ED Applicant: Mr & Mrs Andrew Mutty

Decision – Permission Granted

MPC original comment - support

The decision was noted.

PL107/22 Correspondence

- a) **Notice of withdrawal** 23/00336/HFUL Proposal: Detached single storey outbuilding for storage and use of home office. Site address: 16 Dolphin Lane Melbourn Cambridgeshire SG8 6AE Applicant: Mr & Ms Daniel And Kirsty Bradley And Caldwell.

The notice of withdrawal was noted.

Signed:.....Date.....

- b) To consider a request to transfer the open spaces at Rosemary Place
It was noted that the proposed sum of £1,295 per annum appeared to be suitable which would be a commuted sum of £12,950 over 10 years.
It was RESOLVED to recommend to full council to accept the commuted sum of £12,950 offered by R2 Developments Ltd.
Proposed by Cllr Kilmurray, seconded by Cllr Wilson. All in favour.
- c) To consider a response to the consultation on Cambridgeshire County Council's proposed 2023 revision of Local Validation List.
The committee had no comments on the proposed Local Validation List
- d) To receive any updates and consider actions
None were received.

PL108/22 To note the following applications for tree work:

- a) [23/0227/TTCA](#) Proposal: T2 The 19-foot-tall and densely Ivy covered dead / dying Apple (Malus Domestica) tree which is leaning in the rear garden to be safely dismantled down to a low stump.
T3 The 22-foot-tall, dead, and also densely Ivy-covered tree (unidentified conifer) to be safely dismantled down to a low stump.
Site address: 31 High Street Melbourn Cambridgeshire
No comments received
It was noted.
- b) To receive any updates and consider actions
None were received.

PL109/22 Planning Applications:

- a) [23/00680/S73](#) Proposal: S73 to remove condition 2 (Occupancy) of planning ref; S/0860/10/F (Use of premises as vets)
Site address: 7 Mortlock Street Melbourn Cambridgeshire SG8 6DB
Applicant: Button End Holdings Ltd .
As noted under PL102/22 committee could not discuss the application.
- b) [23/00726/PRIOR](#) Proposal: Change of Use of Agricultural Building to 1 No. Dwellinghouses (Use Class C3), and for building operations reasonably necessary for the conversion (resubmission).
Site address: Foxfield Farm Fowlmere Road Melbourn
Applicant: Vladlena Papazyan.

It was RESOLVED to support the application with no comment.
Proposed by Cllr Wilson, seconded by Cllr Barnes. All in favour

- c) [23/00709/PRIOR](#) Proposal: Change of Use of Agricultural Buildings to 5 No. Dwellinghouses (Use Class C3), and for building operations reasonably necessary for the conversion
Site address: Hillside Farm Newmarket Road Melbourn
applicant: Mr David Dodds
It was noted that there were no comments from Highways on the application and concerns about road safety and safe pedestrian access to the site were raised.
It was RESOLVED to object to the application with the following comments:
 - There are concerns around road safety as residents will have to access and enter the site on a 60mph road
 - There are no footpath or safe greenway routes to the site for pedestrians.
 - The application seems to contravene SCDC's sustainability policy.

Proposed by Cllr Hart, seconded by Cllr Barnes. All in favour.

- e) To receive any updates and consider actions
None were received.

PL110/22 Street Trading applications

- a) [267308F](#): Name of applicant: Keith Miller, Trading name: Smell the Bacon, Trading days: Monday – Friday, Trading hours: 07:30 – 14:30. Goods traded: Food and Drink, Location: A505 Layby

It was noted that the location is suitable and that the applicant has previously traded in the location. Concern was raised regarding littering, however it was noted that the location is a truck stop and litter is generated by a range of users.
It was RESOLVED to support the application with the comment that any litter as a consequence of trading is cleared at the end of each trading day.
Proposed by Cllr Clark, seconded by Cllr Wilson. All in favour.

- b) [267209](#): Name of applicant: Tsz Cheung Tse, Trading name: Hitwrap, Trading days: Monday – Sunday, Trading hours: 16:00 – 20:00, Goods traded: Hong Kong / Asian Style Hot Food Locations: Various
The locations in Melbourn are proposed at the Science Park, The Moor (outside the village college), The Hub.

It was noted that if the trader wanted to trade on the science park they would need permission for the science park. No permission documents were visible to support the application. The location along Cambridge road is not suitable due to road safety issues. It was noted that the layby is being removed. The location at the Hub would require permission from Hundred Houses who own Brooksbank which is a private road. No permission documents were visible to support the application. In accordance with the car park lease, no street food trader, except for the kebab van, can trade on the car park, so the location on the car park is not suitable. The location outside the village college would not be suitable due to road safety issues.

It was RESOLVED to object to the application with the comment about road safety concerns and permission needed from other parties.

Proposed by Cllr Wilson, seconded by Cllr Barnes. All in favour.

(Cllr Hart and District Cllr Hales left the meeting)

PL111/22 Compliance updates: To consider any compliance updates received since last meeting

To receive any updates and consider actions

None were received.

PL112/22 To note the date of next meeting : 11 April 2023

It was noted that the next meeting will be held on 11 April 2023.

Meeting closed at 20:14

Correspondence from residents regarding the proposed science park development:

Are you aware of the proposals to redevelop the Science Park? What are the views of the Parish Council?

The proposed development seems totally out of keeping with a village environment, they intend to remove the boundary walls and replace two storey buildings with tall buildings open to the road with no boundary wall, I believe one of these proposed buildings will be a hotel, a complete change of use, that will further change the village.

This whole development seems totally out of character with anything existing in the village, thus urbanising the village. These proposals are more in keeping with a large scale development for a town or city, not a village location.

I assume you will be opposing the planning application?

Melbourn Science Park, Melbourn, South Cambs

I am strongly objecting to the proposals to redevelop and enlarge Melbourn Science Park by 400% in size.

Firstly, the documents state that local residents were consulted on the proposals in October, November and December 2022, however, I only received one invitation to an open afternoon on a Sunday, which unfortunately I was not able to attend due to prior arrangements, and I was assuming there would be further opportunity to see the proposals, however, I did not receive any further notification of any other dates.

Then, this week we received the letter informing us that a planning application had been received by the Council. I have heard of some residents in Hale Close being totally unaware of any proposals to redevelop the site at all.

It seems the consultation was done somewhat discretely. If the developer really wanted to gain the views of Melbourn residents, then perhaps they should have published their proposals, site plans and artist impression in the local paper, the local Melbourn Magazine and The Listing, which local residents receive free of charge.

This is a massive development which will blight surrounding properties, it will cause untold stress, noise and pollution to surrounding properties, adversely affecting the mental health of residents for years and years.

Over the past two years, local resident have already had to suffer the huge extension to this Science Park, causing a huge increase in heavy vehicles access and egressing the site all day, along with dust, pollution, and noise including the noise of a large generator which was on continually for months, 24 hours a day.

If this massive redevelopment is allowed to go ahead, many surrounding properties will suffer a loss of privacy being overlooked due to the height of the proposed buildings.

The buildings on this site already cause massive light pollution as many have lights on 24 hours a day, causing disturbance to locals, the huge scale and height of the proposed structures will increase this problem enormously.

This is a village, people moved here because of the quiet location, and would not have expected to be faced with such a massive high rise redevelopment on their doorstep. This is not a suitable location for this size redevelopment!

The environmental impact upon the entire village will be enormous, residents of Melbourn will not benefit in any way by these proposals, it will only increase traffic problems, noise and pollution and have a massive detrimental effect on the village as a whole, changing the character of a historic village for ever.

The proposals to demolish 14,000sq m of existing buildings and 1,200 sq m of other minor structures, and replace it with 42,000sq m of buildings and 23,000sq m of transport hub, is an immense increase at any location, but to propose such a huge development within a village is totally unacceptable.

The current buildings, as seen from the High Road, are two stories high behind an attractive boundary wall/mature hedge, they are not obtrusive in any way and in keeping with the residential developments along the road and throughout the village.

However, as can be seen from the artist impression of the site, the intention is to replace the two story buildings with at least four story structures and remove the boundary walls/hedges entirely, this is totally out of keeping with anything already existing in the village. These proposals are more in keeping with a town or city location, most definitely not a village location.

There appears to be only one **major** access and egress to the site, for a site of this size, it will inevitably cause traffic issues. The fact that the developer is building a multi-story car park, proves they expect a huge increase in traffic being generated.

Thousands of extra vehicular journeys will be passing through the village, exacerbating the traffic issues already acknowledged by the Council. Some traffic will access and egress via the A10, however, inevitably most will access and egress via the centre of the village and also via New Road, past the Primary School, to access the A505 towards the M11.

The worst increase in traffic will be generated between 8am and 9am just when children are travelling to this school, putting the children and parents at even more risk.

This massive development will have no benefit to Melbourn residents, the developer has acknowledged that the majority of the workforce will be coming from outside and will have to travel to and from the village. The Hotel and Gastro Pub will not benefit the local residents, and will potentially cause other local establishments to suffer, as the workforce will stay onsite at lunchtimes and not need to use local shops, cafés and pub.

The proposed change of use to accommodate a hotel will not benefit the villagers, this will not be a beautiful country hotel but be, more likely, a Premier Inn or Travelodge type hotel). The village already has hotel accommodation as well as a large motel a short distance along the A10, again, this will detrimentally affect existing local businesses.

The developer is proposing to remove the existing site boundary walls and hedges, opening the site to the High Road, thus the impact will be even greater, making the large high rise

buildings even more obtrusive, changing the whole skyline and character of the village completely.

I am concerned that the majority of Melbourn residents have not been properly consulted, despite what has been stated in the submitted documents.

I am certain that the majority of the people who live in Melbourn have not seen the artist impression showing the developer's vision of the Science Park.

I am also certain that the majority of Melbourn residents are not aware that the village will suffer from ten years of additional noise, pollution, disruption, environment damage, and eventually leading to a massive increase in traffic throughout the village, changing the entire character whole character of the village, thus the first step of urbanising the area.

In conclusion, the huge scale of these proposals are not suitable for a Historic Village location. Any redevelopment should be sympathetic to the surrounding village and should be unobtrusive, to fit in with and compliment, the existing street scene and character of the area.

I and many other people in the village of Melbourn need your help as we object to the proposed plan for development of the Science park in our village.

Please take the time to study and consider the objections listed on the council planning permission web site.

Planning reference number ;- 23/01134/FUL

While I understand that you are very busy, I ask to you actively support the villager's concerns and objections,

Many thanks for your good work in the community.

-
- The size of all the new buildings that you are intending to erect in place of what is already there are all substantially taller. Currently 13,629 sq m of floor space is being demolished and when the site is complete the floor space will total 68,113 sq m by adding an extra 2 storeys. This demonstrates the impact it will have dwarfing adjoining grade 2 listed buildings and residential dwellings on 3 sides of the plot. They will be the tallest buildings in Melbourn. The light pollution will be unbearable. We can state this from experience of the light pollution from the new "Birchwood "site (at the rear of Melbourn Science Park), which already effects the local residents greatly. This development is only a single story that is not in such close proximity. Your new proposed three-story buildings will be far worse. We also note in your letter that you have not responded to the request for privacy glass, particularly on Building F that you proposed at the last meeting.
 - We do not believe the Gastropub/hotel you are proposing is being built for the benefit of Melbourn residents. It is in fact being built for the benefits of the businesses you are hoping to attract. We would suggest the village does not need a GastroPub. There was one on the site of the old Star Pub, which failed as a business and the site is now being redeveloped. The Sheene Mill was an upmarket restaurant but now only survives as a dedicated events

venue. The only thing this Gastropub will do it take business away from the three local pubs we already have as well as competing against the local Hub and Hot Numbers Roastery.

- The “ investment ” in the new Transport Facility is not being developed for any benefit to the local community, it is simply a multi storey car park to cope with the parking needs of the additional business you hope to attract to the site. This site, as you have informed us, will generate at least a further 700 car visits. These cars will all have to come in and out of the village at both ends. We note there is no proposal to improve access from the village onto the A10. The Frog End entrance to the village is a known accident hot spot, with regular accidents over the last 20 years.

These routes to and from the village are already heavily congested at peak times e.g. school collections/drop offs, commuter rush hours. Even now, people use the single lane road to Fowlmere and the villages beyond to avoid the congestion. There is no doubt this development which is going to be 4 times bigger than its current size will push more congestion through the local, smaller villages. The crossroads in the middle of the village is currently extremely congested at various times in the day. With all the additional traffic created by the redevelopment there will undoubtedly be an increased risk of serious traffic accidents occurring as foot, bike and car fight for space.