

Minutes of the extra-ordinary meeting of the Caxton Parish Council

Held on Thursday the 7th June at 7.45pm in the Village Hall

Present: Councillors: K Howard (Chairman), H Barbour, S Bushby and R Jack.

In attendance: Approximately 20 members of the public, and District Cllr N Wright

1.1 Apologies were received from Cllr R Millard due to ill health.

1.2 K Howard and H Barbour declared that they live in Ermine Street and have dispensation to talk and vote.

1.3 None

Comments & Observations from the public.

The Chairman read out the list of objections that had been received and a residents added concerns about surface water drainage and that this was valuable agricultural land.

2 Planning application S/1849/18/OL – Land off Ermine Street – Outline Planning for 30 Houses.

Resolved unanimously ^(Pro. HB, Sec. SB) to object to the proposal on the following grounds:-

1 - The proposed development is outside the Village Envelope and therefore fundamentally contravenes the Planning Policies of SCDC.

2 - There are no amenities within the village other than the village hall and two children's play areas. No shop, no school (we are in the catchment area of Bourn and Comberton – not Cambourne!) no Surgery and no Dentist.

3 - The transport assessment by Croft Transport Planning and Design – shows a complete lack of local knowledge. It is stated that “the existing pedestrian infrastructure will facilitate safe and direct pedestrian linkages between the site and local destinations” such as The Co-op Shop - Lower Cambourne, various Schools - Cambourne (where incidentally Cambourne residents take priority over Caxton Residents) and McDonalds - Caxton Gibbet.

The access via the PROW referred to is a field edge which requires either walking or wellington boots for many months of the year and is uneven and not usable by anyone with young children or a pram for example. The Developers stated at our public meeting that as this was a ‘small’ development they would build these houses quickly BUT their pedestrian traffic assessments are heavily reliant upon the facilities that West Cambourne will EVENTUALLY bring!

The bus service through the village to Cambridge is 2 per morning and evening. The City4 runs regularly from Cambourne but pedestrian access from Caxton is largely impractical as stated above. Despite this CPTD claim that

“These services ensure that residents have a choice to make travel by bus a real alternative to traveling by car for commuting trips, in particular” (3.4.8)

Amazingly they further conclude that “...it is considered the site is accessible by non-car modes and will cater for the needs of the development’s residents and assist in promoting a choice of travel modes other than the private car.” (3.5.3)

The Traffic Impact Assessment is based on the recent development of 58 units in Caldecote. There is no similarity between Caxton and Caldecote as far as traffic is concerned. Caxton stands on a main north/south route (A1198 Huntingdon/Royston) and although it has its own bypass the village is plagued by vehicles trying to beat the slower traffic on it. Rush hour traffic from the west travels up and down through the village to gain access to and from the A428. All this traffic passes the entrance to the proposed development.

Residents who live in the new houses at the entrance to the proposed site have complained that the junction with Ermine Street is already dangerous as it is difficult to see to the north if there are any parked cars.

4 – The current Sewage arrangements at the north of the village are already under stress and the subject of complaints from residents.

5 - The proposed development is on agricultural land and will also have major impact on the wild life in the adjacent area – Deer, Monk jacks, Foxes and some Badgers.

6 - Although the developer claims this is a ‘small’ development it represents an increase of nearly 13% on a village that has already practically doubled in size over the past 25 years and lost a substantial part of its parish to Lower Cambourne and West Cambourne.

Caxton is in danger of losing its identity and becoming an annex of Cambourne.

We ask that this application goes before the Planning Committee and that our District Councillor – Nick Wright speaks on our behalf.

3 Potential 106 Requirements

It was proposed ^(pro. KH, Sec. RJ) that

1 - As there will inevitably be a substantial no of young children from this development it was agreed that we should ask for play equipment of our choosing to be installed and sited on the Brockholt Road open space along with a substantial sum provided, to be reserved in our accounts, to cover maintenance, upkeep and insurance.

2 - We should ask for a sum of money to go to reserves to pay for the upkeep of the proposed pond and green spaces,

3 - We should ask for a contribution towards ‘gateway’ features at the entrance to the village as have been recommended by Highways to assist in getting drivers to slow down as they enter the village. Particularly as there are safety concerns with the

development site junction with Ermine Street and its relative proximity to the village boundary.

4 – We should ask for funds towards a Village Sign to help alleviate our concern that our identity as a rural village is under pressure.

4 There being no further business the meeting closed at 8.35pm