

AGENDA REPORTS PACK

PLANNING COMMITTEE

19th May 2016

16P/088.

Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

Meeting held in the Parish Office, Cottenham on **Thursday 5th May 2016 at 7.30pm**

Present: Cllrs Mudd (Chair), Bolitho, Collinson, McCarthy, Morris, Nicholas, Young

In attendance: 1 member of the public

16P/075. Chairman's Introduction and Apologies – apologies accepted from Cllrs Graves (personal) and Ward (personal).

16P/076. Any Questions from the Public or Press – Standing orders to be suspended. No questions.

16P/077. 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.*

16P/078. Minutes – Resolution that the minutes (circulated to members) of the Committee meeting held on 20th April be signed as a correct record. **RESOLVED.** Cllr Richards arrived at 7.32pm.

16P/079. Planning Applications:

For information only:

S/0965/16/PA - Single storey rear extension, 52 Orchard Close, Cottenham

S/0817/16/PA - Change of use from agricultural building to dwelling house, The Lakes, Twentypence Road, Cottenham. NB: Clerk has queried why this application is for info only when previous application came to CPC as a refused decision notice. Query agricultural use of the site.

SCDC Decision Notices:

Approvals

S/0266/16/FL – Single storey front and rear extensions, Brenda Gautrey Way, Cottenham

S/0529/16/FL - First floor extension to existing garage and pitched roof addition to existing flat roofed extension to rear of house, 157 High Street, Cottenham

Refusals

S/0269/16/FL - 2 storey rear extension, 15 New Town, Cottenham

S/3179/15/FL & S/0350/16/LB - Proposed installation of new timber side hung garage doors and adjustments to roof to existing carport, 193 High Street, Cottenham

16P/080. Speculative Developments – consider further responses to applications for planning permission on major projects – Cllr Morris circulated draft responses to be read at the SCDC Planning Committee on 11th May. Minor amends made to Endurance response. Awaiting comments from Philip Kratz who is unavailable for the 11th. He has suggested sending key points to all 12 Cllrs on the Committee plus the Planning Officer. Cllr Morris has also spoken to Eddie Stableford who is registered as an objector.

Minor amends made to Gladman response. Cllr Young suggested late representation of the traffic survey data. Philip Kratz has advised that Gladman may go to non-determination rather than appeal if the application is rejected which would mean that we wouldn't be able to make further representation. Discussion on whether or not there was sufficient time to pull such a report together to compare and summarise the data. It was noted that Highways are currently blocking the Gladman development and the situation isn't easily resolved. Cllr Morris outlined the background to the traffic survey. There are 'disconnections' in the Gladman data which is

highlighted by our survey but needs interpreting. We were advised to do our own traffic measurements because the TRICS data is out of date and not representative of a hyper centre like Cambridge.

Resolution to provide supplementary traffic data as an additional response towards the Gladman application. **RESOLVED.** Cllr Young to produce.

Cllr Young pointed out that the footpath shown has vehicle access permission by the neighbouring 2 properties which could make it unsuitable as a footpath. This area falls outside of the plot so therefore the footpath is speculative. Access details to be clarified.

Cllr Morris thanked for pulling together the information for the verbal response.

16P/081. Starter Homes Consultation – consider response to Government consultation on starter homes regulations (closes 18th May) – Cllrs Collinson, McCarthy, Morris & Nicholas have met to draw up a response. Cllr Collinson outlined the basis of the consultation.

Resolution to submit response to consultation on starter homes regulations as prepared by the working party. **RESOLVED.** Cllr Morris to submit.

16P/082. Date of next meeting – 19th May

16P/083. Close of meeting – 8.55pm.

Signed _____ (Chair) Date _____

16P/089.

- [S/0850/16/FL](#) – Two storey rear extension, enlargement and repair of existing rear roof, addition of new sedum-planted flat roof to single storey areas and replacement of existing garage, 12 Telegraph Street, Cottenham
- [S/0806/16/FL](#) - Conversion of barn to form 3 bedroom house, Holme Dean, 294, High Street, Cottenham
- [S/0805/16/FL](#) - Rebuilding of a range of outbuildings to form car lodge / shed & annexe, Holme Dean, 294, High Street, Cottenham

Tree Orders

- **The Surgery, 188 High Street, Cottenham** – Pine: crown lift 4m (emergency vehicle access) and shorten heaviest limb over access roadway by approx. 50% to reduce end weight. **NB: this is a retrospective application**
- **206 High Street, Cottenham** – Variegated holly in rear garden, prune to clear car port and crown reduce by 1m; Holly on LHS of rear garden, reduce sparse top of crown by 4-5m, prune to clear car port and by 1-2m on garden side; Robinia on LHS, shorten dead top by 3-4m and drastically shorten or remove lateral limb over garden shed; Holly in LHS corner of rear garden, reduce longest straggling branches by approx. 2m to the dense part of the crown

16P/091. SCDC Planning Committee feedback

Two items of great concern to Cottenham were considered by the South Cambridgeshire District Council Planning Committee on Wednesday 11th May.

Item 6 on the agenda was the Endurance Estates application to build up to 50 dwellings on land behind 36 Oakington Road. The Planning Officers had already recommended that approval should be delegated to them within an agreed framework of conditions. Various last-minute representations were read out or summarised. Traffic volume and safety and isolation from the rest of Cottenham were major issues in the presentations by Parish Councillors Nicholas (on behalf of a resident) and Morris, who also stressed the issue of cumulative development as other applications come forward in the next few months. District Councillor Edwards reinforced these points in his address which was read by Councillor Harford. The applicant and the County Highways team argued that Endurance had estimated that the generated traffic would indeed be higher than in our measurements, relying on their Travel Plan to bring the traffic levels down to an acceptable level. District Councillors Kindersley, Roberts, Bradney and Harford all spoke against the development in principle but all, bar Councillor Roberts, voted it through 10:1 with the added condition that the 20 affordable homes would be for Cottenham residents in perpetuity. A more detailed application for full planning permission will be submitted eventually but some development here appears inevitable.

Item 7 on the agenda was the Gladman Developments application to build up to 225 homes and up to 70 residential homes with care on land along Rampton Road. Various last-minute representations had been passed, or were read to, the Committee. Here the County Highways team have serious concerns about the safety of proposed modifications to the Oakington Road / Rampton Road junction to handle the increased traffic and this was the main reason for the Planning Officer recommendation of refusal. Traffic volume and safety and isolation from the rest of Cottenham as well as the issues of cumulative development as other applications come forward in the next few months were the major issues in the presentation by Parish Councillor Morris. The application was refused unanimously 11:0 on two grounds – both traffic safety and a number of non-compliances with National and District Planning policies. A further meeting between the developer and County Highways is scheduled for 13th May. An appeal is expected shortly.

16P/092. Enforcement

Updates:

Jolly Millers – Ian Lorman, SCDC Tree Officer, is in touch with Admiral Taverns' solicitor at the moment regarding the removal of the trees. He responded to Ian's letter very promptly and has gone away to establish whether the works were under the instruction of AT or whether the landlord acted unilaterally. Either way AT are ultimately responsible as it is their land but it will be useful to know the facts of the case so that he knows how to direct the investigation. Please bear in mind that any information CPC might gain yourself will not be admissible to the Council (hearsay). Ian will be required to read a caution before taking evidence. ***This has now been passed to Enforcement. Clerk has followed up with Charlie Swain and is awaiting comments.***

Cottenham Doctors surgery – Treeworks were undertaken on 12th April to mature tree in the garden. This is within the CA but no application was made to SCDC. ***Tree Order now received.***

Three Horseshoes – consider possible further action regarding complaints about The Three Horseshoes in respect of poor maintenance of curtilage wall and large-scale brick store in vicinity of Listed Building reducing the amenity value of the neighbouring Conservation Area, 133 and 135 High Street. ***Clerk has written to Julie Ayre and is awaiting comments.***

Wilkin Walk (Japanese Knotweed) – SCDC Cllr Harford is following up with Enforcement Officers about possibly getting a S215 regarding the dangerous state of the fence along the side of the pathway. *Enforcement have said they couldn't find any issues regarding fencing causing a problem. They said they saw that some work had recently taken place at number 48 and wondered whether this was a result of a fence being removed. Asst Clerk has been to inspect and there is now no fence between the pathway and garden.*

Butchers – Two CCTV cameras installed outside the shop without prior approval. *The situation has been assessed by the council. PSCO Fuller has passed information to the Director regarding obligations to businesses under the Data protection act and their obligations to the information commissioner's office. Any further concerns re the business would need to be referred to the ICO to follow up. The owners have also installed CCTV on their house and PSCO Fuller has advised that the Camera for the front door side does see the road and will be adjusted to minimise this – the view is zoomed out and is unlikely to capture any private information. SCDC have attended and will follow up.*

358 High Street – Gordon Mills attended. The front of the house has been insulated. The rear of the house has not as the owners are hoping to apply for an extension. He spoke to the mother of the owner who stated that once the external insulation was finished they will then render it as before. The building does not have a cavity wall hence it is cold. Gordon consulted with Julie Ayres and owners are now submitting a retrospective planning application for the works due to it being in the CA.

Long Drove - Officer visited the RIFT Airsoft site on Long Drove which is near to Alborough Farm, although in different ownership. The company website <http://www.riftairsoft.com> states that an event is held on this site on 3rd Sunday of each month.

He advises that use of the land for 12 days a year would be allowed under permitted development rights and not require a planning permission for change of use. The structures on site are all constructed of wood or logs and are of a very temporary nature and are obviously there to facilitate the game playing. Aerial photographs of the site show that the play equipment appeared sometime between 2008 and 2013 so may be immune under the 4 year rule. He will discuss the matter with the Planning Team Leader but at the moment He says he struggles to identify any harm if they have been operating since at the least 2013 with no complaints. Let SCDC Cllr Harford know if we have further comments that he should include in his discussion with Julie.

Possible action required:

33 Brenda Gautrey Way – Appears that owners have removed the wall and replaced it with a wooden fence, the walls no longer match and the height will be significantly higher than before. Planning rules state that if increasing the height of a wall/fence then permission is required. This area was previously considerably overgrown and the plants/trees have been removed which clears up the pavement encroachment issues that have been reported by residents.

NB: The EH Officer came into the office on Monday 9th May to say he was investigating a number of other issues in the village involving noise.

16P/093. Planning Training

At the Forum we confirmed that we will run parish planning training for 2016/7. It would be really helpful to have your input into this programme, for example the topics to be covered and format. To help us, a short questionnaire is attached. I would be grateful if your Parish Council could complete this and return it to me **by 13th June 2016.**

In the meantime, please do make a note of two training dates for your diary:

Friday 15th July 2016 10am – 1pm
Wednesday 23rd November 2016 1.30-4.30pm –

Both of these sessions will be open to Council Members and Parish Councillors. They will cover National Planning Policy Guidance and recent changes, and milestone appeal decisions and high court judgments that are pertinent to proposals in our district. The meetings will be held at South Cambridgeshire Hall in Cambourne. Nearer the time we will be in touch and ask you to confirm whether a representative of your Council will be attending these sessions.

In addition the planning committee chair has also extended the invitation to attend training for Planning Committee Members which take place at 9.30am on the mornings of Planning committee, which are largely the first Wednesday of every month and will be in the Council Chamber.

To help us plan a programme of appropriate planning training it would be helpful of you could complete the attached questionnaire by **13th June 2016.**

1.What are the topics you would most like to see included? (*please tick*)

- Planning policies
- What is a material consideration?
- What is permitted development?
- Conservation and Listed Buildings?
- Trees and landscape
- Enforcement
- S106 Agreements

2. Any others, please list here.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

3. Can you give any examples of particular cases that as a Parish Council you would like us to review together, which would assist with making future recommendations?

.....
.....
.....

.....
4. We are thinking about arranging training for specific groups. Would this assist and if so which groups would you be interesting in attending (*please tick*)?

- a) Parish Clerks
- b) Members of Parish Planning Committee
- c) An introduction to planning for new Parish Councillors

5. Any other comment you would like to make to assist with planning the training programme e.g venue, timing, length of meetings.

**Please return your questionnaire to planning@scambsgov.uk
f.a.o Jane Green Head of New Communities by 13th June 2016.**