

AGENDA REPORTS PACK

PLANNING COMMITTEE

18th August 2016

16P/141.

Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

Held in the Village Hall, Cottenham on **Thursday 4th August 2016 at 7.30pm**

Present: Cllrs Mudd (Chair), Collinson, Graves, Morris, Ward and the Clerk

In attendance: 9 members of the public

- 16P/129. Chairman's Introduction and Apologies** – apologies accepted from Cllrs Bolitho (work), McCarthy (work), Richards (personal) and Young (holiday).
- 16P/130. Any Questions from the Public or Press** – Standing orders to be suspended at 7.31pm. Resident from 77 Pelham Way spoke regarding S/1794/16/FL. He has sent photos to the Committee showing the relationship of the proposal to the existing properties behind the development. Previous application for a bungalow was refused and went to appeal. The Inspector looked at access which would cause disturbance to no.s 34-40. Highways safety: access is close to the mini roundabout and the Inspector thought this was dangerous. The proposed new access has moved 17m south but there are more vehicles involved so resident suggested that this argument was still valid. The appeal was dismissed. The speculative development would impact the amount of traffic. Inspector stated visibility of 90m required and the proposed access is less than this. The height (nearly 15m high) and bulk of the buildings is significant. The houses on Pelham Way only have small gardens. The proposed dwellings would be 16m away which is less than the NPPF requirement. Therefore feels that the proposals would impact on the residential amenity of the properties on Pelham Way in terms of mass/scale/bulk and loss of residential amenity. Resident from 73 Pelham Way spoke, their property backs onto 30/32 Rampton Road. The access road would run to the back of their property. Windows from the proposed dwellings would overlook their property and there would be additional noise and disturbance. Queried how cars would turn around within the proposed roadway. Trees planted on the boundary by existing owner have been left to grow taller than informally agreed therefore taking light from their garden and now concerned that the new dwellings would further reduce their light. Not happy that they have been consulted so close to the holiday season and neighbour at 75 Pelham Way is away for the whole month leaving them no time to respond. Resident from no. 30 Rampton Road stated that the development (S/1794/16/FL) would be intrusive to his property. There is insufficient parking and he would be affected by pollution and noise. Also concerned about highway safety; there is a bus stop opposite the access and the additional vehicles will cause further stress on the roundabout. Resident from no. 28 Rampton Road raised concerns about pedestrian safety. There are already severe problems for the current properties trying to access Rampton Road at peak times. Standing Orders reinstated at 7.45pm.
- 16P/131. To accept Declarations of Interest and Dispensations** – *i. To receive disclosures of pecuniary & non-pecuniary interests from Councillors on matters to be considered at the meeting. ii. To receive written requests for dispensation. iii. To grant requests for dispensation as appropriate.* Cllr Ward declared a pecuniary interest in S/1632/16/FL and will take no part in discussions. She also declared a non-pecuniary interest in S/1080/16/FL.
- 16P/132. Minutes** – Resolution that the minutes of the Committee meeting held on 21st July be signed as a correct record. **RESOLVED.**
- 16P/133. Planning Applications:**
- **S/1794/16/FL** - Erection of 2 dwellings with new highway access and 2 no. parking spaces for No. 32 Rampton Road, Land at 32 & 34 Rampton Road, Cottenham. Cllr Collinson stated a number of issues with the site. The location is characteristically very open on Rampton

Road and it is worth preserving. The very high ridge heights would be overbearing, particularly to no. 75 Pelham Way. Element of loss of amenity for no. 30 due to noise and disturbance. Highway factors are key. In the recent Persimmon application the traffic survey acknowledged that traffic was already over capacity in the vicinity of the roundabout. The access is opposite a bus stop so this will have an affect. Cllr Morris believed the facts in the application were wrong. If the mini roundabout was involved then there would need to be 70m visibility, not the 43m stated. There is no access for emergency vehicles which the application has attempted to balance by the installation of sprinklers. NB: the other bungalows mentioned in the application are built in a developed area. Standing Orders suspended at 8.03pm. Resident stated that Cambridge Water can't confirm whether there would be sufficient water pressure for the proposed sprinkler system. Standing Orders reinstated 8.04pm.

CPC recommends refusal. **REFUSED**. There is poor access, insufficient parking (layout would result in vehicles constantly having to shuffle round in a restricted turning circle), highways safety issues, noise/nuisance to neighbouring properties, loss of biodiversity (due to loss of trees), loss of light to neighbouring properties (DP2/1a, DP2/1f, DP3/1b, 2j, 2k, 2m, 2n, NE6/1). Request that the application goes to the Planning Committee. Chair informed residents present of next steps in the process. Cllr Nicholas joined the meeting at 8.10pm.

- **S/1080/16/FL** – Demolition of B8 Industrial Units and Erection of 9 Residential Dwellings, Unit F, Broad Lane, Cottenham. Concerns raised about the suggestion that the drainage will run off into the ditch on Broad Lane and the access for the 2/3 bed properties via the industrial estate. No material considerations. CPC recommend approval. **APPROVED**.
- **S/1768/16/FL** – Proposed single storey rear extension and first floor front extension, 6 Pelham Way, Cottenham. CPC recommends approval. **APPROVED**. Cllr Ward left the meeting at 8.25pm.
- **S/1632/16/FL** – Change of use for land for siting of a mobile home, Land at North Fen Drove, Broad Lane, Cottenham. CPC recommends approval. **APPROVED**.

SCDC Decision Notices:

Refused

- **S/0582/16/FL** – Creation of independent dwelling, The Annexe, 11a Church Lane,

Tree Orders

53 High Street – 2x Beech plants on right hand side of boundary, reduce height to approx. 5ft. Ash on left hand side, fell to height of fence panel (at 3ft). Approved subject to Tree Officer comments.

16P/134. Planning Appeal – consider comments, modifying/withdrawing previous representation regarding appeal for S/1818/15/OL – outline application for erection of up to 225 residential dwellings and up to 70 apartments with care, Land off Rampton Road, Cottenham. NB: appeal will be determined on the basis of an inquiry. Initial response was fragmented whereas our response regarding the application for 200 houses was more integrated. There was some confusion over the type of inquiry; this may yet to be decided.

Resolution that CPC submit a modified/integrated response to the appeal for S/1818/15/OL.

RESOLVED. Cllr Morris to draft and submit.

16P/135. Enforcement – consider updates from Enforcement Officers and additional items for enforcement. Clerk to chase Tree Officer for response regarding Jolly Millers.

16P/136. Date of next meeting – 18th August. Apologies received from Cllr Mudd (holiday), Graves (work) and the Clerk.

16P/137. Close of meeting – 8.45pm

Signed _____ (Chair) Date _____

16P/142.

- [S/1963/16/FL](#) & [S/1664/16/LB](#) – Pitched roof extension to form stairwell access to proposed loft conversion for additional accommodation along with internal alterations, The Chequers, 297 High Street, Cottenham
- [S/0106/16/FL](#) - Retention of extension and conversion of garage to form granny annexe, 90 Rooks Street, Cottenham
- [S/2037/16/OL](#) - Outline planning permission for the erection of a dwelling garage with some matters reserved except for access, land to the rear of 160 Histon Road, Cottenham
- [S/1932/16/FL](#) – Single storey rear extension and garage conversion, 52 Denmark Road, Cottenham
- [S/1952/16/FL](#) – Two storey rear extension, 70 High Street, Cottenham

SCDC Decision Notices:

Approved

- [S/1217/16/FL](#) & [S/1218/16/LB](#) - Conversion of outbuildings to form an annexe, erection of a single storey extension to form en-suite to annexe and erection of a single storey store behind the garage, 333 High Street, Cottenham
- [S/1272/16/FL](#) & [S/1273/16/LB](#) – Extension and alteration, 109 High Street, Cottenham
- [S/3188/15/LD](#) – Single storey rear extension, 14 Courtyard Way, Cottenham
- [S/0880/16/PA](#) – Change of use from agricultural building to dwelling house, 144-146 Histon Road, Cottenham (prior approval not required)
- [S/3172/15/OL](#) – Proposed new 3 bedroom dwelling, 33 Telegraph Street, Cottenham
- [S/1114/16/FL](#) – Retention of condensing units to the rear of a Costcutter retail store, 288 High Street, Cottenham
- [S/1100/16/OL](#) – Demolition of existing music room (Previously a garage). Site for the erection of 2 bed bungalow and detached garage, Land rear of 129 High Street, Cottenham

Refused

- [S/0640/16/FL](#) – Outbuilding, 20 Histon Road, Cottenham

For information only:

- [S/1272/16/FL](#) & [S/1273/16/LB](#) – Amendment: Proposed solid gate omitted and the existing 5 bar gate retained, 109 High Street, Cottenham

Tree Orders

- **82 High Street** – Oak: fell – young tree growing too close to adjacent wall. Structural damage will occur if left to develop

16P/143. Enforcement update

Ongoing:

Jolly Millers – Trees Officer is looking at issuing a voluntary replanting notice. Have contacted Ian Lorman; awaiting response.

Three Horseshoes – Owner will shortly receive letter from Enforcement requesting that the wall is repaired as soon as possible. Charlie will let us know when he has received a timetable for the works. As to the storage of bricks these are to be used in connection with works on site therefore no further action can be taken. Clerk has queried what those works are because there is no visible sign of anything going on and the bricks have been in situ for some considerable time.

Co-op – The additional two signs to the front fascia, security bollard advertising and the free-standing advertising units all require advert consent. A letter has been raised by Enforcement requesting that either they remove them or apply retrospectively for advert consent. There are obviously no guarantees that they would get support for them but the Parish will of course be consulted in any event.

50 Lambs Lane – The cars are not in breach of planning and currently the garden does not justify a S215 amenity notice. The informal advice on this case is that the Parish should raise a general letter of concern to the owner. This could then be used at a later date should the site deteriorate. Clerk has queried how much worse the site would need to get before a S215 would be justified. **Waiting response.**

Old Labour Hall – issue of rear garden has been raised. **Not bad enough for a s215 notice but we can write to the owner ourselves requesting that they tidy it up within a reasonable amount of time. Failure to comply could result in a Community Protection Notice being issued but Enforcement would need a copy of the letter as part of the evidence.**

For info:

The Old Rectory – owners have now submitted a retrospective application for works to the entrance gates; we should receive this shortly. Issue regarding herras fencing being followed up directly with owners.

Trees – meeting has been set up with Ian Lorman and Julie Baird for 1st September to discuss tree problems in Cottenham and how better to inform residents of their responsibilities.

16P/144. Devolution

<http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/devolution>

We want your views on devolution to help Councillors debate the issue and help shape any deal with the Government that may go forward. Please read the information and deal as well as making sure [you have your say](#).

What's happened so far?

In March the Chancellor published an offer to 22 local authorities and one LEP for [East Anglia Devolution](#). That deal was to form an East Anglia Combined Authority covering Norfolk, Suffolk, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

You can read the initial [East Anglia devolution deal on GOV.UK](#).

However since then, Cambridgeshire County Councillors voted to say that deal was unacceptable. Peterborough City Councillors voted to say that the deal offered by Government did not appear to be acceptable.

A Cambridgeshire and Peterborough devolution proposal

Building on the original government devolution deal, council and Local Enterprise Partnership leaders are now proposing a devolution deal for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and have agreed to put it out to public consultation.

The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough proposal includes forming a Combined Authority that would include the following organisations – Peterborough City Council, Cambridgeshire County Council, Fenland District Council, Huntingdonshire District Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council, Cambridge City Council and the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership.

The proposal to Government to form a Combined Authority for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough is being submitted to Government – our bid to Government includes:

- A new £20million annual fund for the next 30 years (£600million) to support economic growth, development of local infrastructure and jobs.
- £170 million for affordable housing, including £100 million for affordable, rent and shared ownership – particularly in response to housing issues in South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City. There is a proposed specific £70 million fund to meet housing needs in Cambridge which Cambridge City Council have indicated would be spent on new Council housing.
- Supporting the delivery of the Wisbech Garden Town and the Wisbech-Cambridge rail connection.
- Providing new homes across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough including affordable homes in Greater Cambridge.
- Transport infrastructure improvements such as A14/A142 junction and upgrades to the A10 and the A47 as well as Ely North Junction. Also it would support development at Wyton and St Neots.
- Rail improvements, including a new station at Soham, (new rolling stock, improved King's Lynn, Cambridge, London rail)

- Investment in a Peterborough University with degree-awarding powers.
- A local integrated job service working alongside the Department of Work and Pensions.
- Co-designing with Government a National Work and Health Programme focused on those with a health condition or disability, as well as the long-term employed.
- To integrating local health and social care resources to provide better outcomes for residents.
- Devolved skills and apprenticeship budget – to give more opportunities to our young people.
- Working with Government to secure a Peterborough Enterprise Zone – attracting investment from business leading to more and better quality jobs for residents.
- Working with Government on the continued regeneration of Peterborough City Centre.
- This proposal to be the first in a series of proposals which devolve more funding and powers from Government to this area.

Government says in order to secure a devolution deal, and the decision making powers and funding that come with it, there must be a combined local authority with a single person in charge, usually referred to as a mayor.

The combined authority would mean a sharing of certain powers to make sure decisions benefitted the whole area and how this is governed would be up to the authorities set out in the deal.

Read the [full details of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough devolution proposal here](#).

Cambridgeshire County Council would keep its sovereignty and continue to deliver services for residents as we do currently – even if we are part of a combined authority.

16P/145. Tenison Manor adoption

Work is currently planned / quoted to bring the drainage system into reasonable order at Persimmon expense:

- Broad Lane ditch (LHS heading towards Cottenham Lode) – overgrowth being cleared, guards cleaned out, and ditch slubbed out
- Retention Pond (including flap valve into Little Cut) – surrounding overgrowth being cleared, grass pathways cut, entry cleared and 30% of reed-mace cleared out
- Little Cut (including flap valve into Lode) – flap valve to be cleared out and seating checked, overgrowth being cleared, guards cleaned out, and ditch slubbed out

Once cleared out an annual maintenance programme might comprise:

- Broad Lane ditch (LHS heading towards Cottenham Lode) – overgrowth cleared, guards cleaned, and ditch slubbed out
- Retention Pond (including flap valve into Little Cut) – overgrowth cleared, grass pathways cut, entry cleared and 30% of reed-mace cleared out
- Little Cut (including flap valve into Lode) – flap valve operation checked, overgrowth cleared, guards cleaned out, and ditch slubbed out

Persimmon might pay CPC on asset transfer the sum of ...

16P/146. Village Hall

The Working Party has finalised the general design ready for application for full Planning Permission from SCDC.

A key decision is needed on opening hours quoted for the hall (or parts thereof):

	Earliest opening	Latest closing	Usage
Monday to Thursday	7am (for nurseries)	10.30pm	Nurseries, meetings, bar
Friday	7am (for nurseries)	11pm?	Nurseries, functions, bar
Saturday	9am?	Midnight?	Functions, bar
Sunday	10.30am?	10pm?	Functions, bar
Bank Holiday	10.30am?	10.30pm?	Functions, bar

Assume a member of CPC staff or an agent (e.g. CUS&SC) opens / secures relevant parts of the building and is present whenever alcohol is being sold.

16P/147. Major developments

Generally we have accepted requests by a developer in order to understand better what is being proposed, generally using the nine development principles to gauge benefits and dis-benefits.

The meetings have been with a delegated group of Councillors drawn from David, Ian, Frank and Tony and minuted and published by the Clerk.

We have not facilitated any exhibitions or local consultations, beyond advising on possible non-Council venues and means of advertisement.

We have generally refused requests for follow-up meetings unless there has been a significant material change to the proposed application.

Is the policy still valid and, if so, how material a change would be necessary to permit a follow-up meeting?