

MINUTES OF AN EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF HADDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL held on Monday 24th March 2014 at 7.30pm at the Arkenstall Village Centre, Station Road, Haddenham, Cambs.

Attendance: Cllrs Bush, Goddard, Haigh, Hugo, Lyon (Chairman), Page, Parr, Smith, Tindall and G Wilson.

- 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE** were received from Cllr Fairchild – ill health and Cllr P Wilson – previous commitment. Apologies for late arrival had been received from Cllr G Wilson.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Lyon declared a personal interest in planning application 14/00130/OUM.

3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

It was agreed that members of the public would be allowed to speak whilst the applications were being discussed.

- 4. 14/00130/OUM Land South of 18 Wilburton Road, Haddenham:** Outline application for up to 100 residential units with all matters reserved except for means of access.

Cllr Lyon outlined the application that had been received highlighting certain points within the plan and the supporting documents.

Cllr G Wilson joined the meeting at 7.50pm. He requested it to be minuted that he is also a member of the District Council Planning Committee and although he would take part in discussions regarding all applications on the agenda he would keep an open mind until they have been considered at District level.

Members of the public were then invited to speak and voice their views/concerns regarding the planning proposal.

Cllr Parr proposed and Cllr Bush seconded that the Parish Council should recommend outright refusal for the following reasons:

1. that Gladman are interfering with due process of Local Plan Submission and seeking to secure planning permission using NPPF "loophole" in order to build outside the village envelope. We expect ECDC to defend their position with respect to their figures on the housing trajectory.
2. that, even if Gladman is found to be correct and the 5 year deliverable land supply is insufficient for ECDC as a whole, that does not *automatically* mean that the shortfall should be met by allowing this proposal to go ahead in this location.
3. that this proposal is NOT a sustainable development in the sense that the proposed development does not "enhance or maintain the vitality of the community" in this location. (NPPF definition) It is sited on the village extremity with no connection to the rest of the village, and as such, would be difficult to regard as integrated. The document supporting their argument can and should be challenged, as many of the opinions are just that – opinions. There are few employment opportunities within the village and this would force new residents to become commuters to other communities. There are concerns that their report glosses over the very real issues of over-crowding of the surgery (which has advertised several times for GPs without success) and the primary school. Simply ticking a series of boxes does not amount to proof that this development is sustainable.
4. that, despite Gladman obtaining professional opinion to support their case, the proposed site entrance is dangerous and could lead to accidents and traffic