

## **AGENDA REPORTS PACK**

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**7<sup>th</sup> July 2016**

16P/115.

### Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

Meeting held in the Sports Pavilion, Cottenham on **Thursday 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2016 at 7.30pm**

**Present:** Cllrs Mudd (Chair), Graves, Morris, Nicholas, Ward, SCDC Cllr Harford and the Clerk

**In attendance:** 3 members of the public

**16P/104. Chairman's Introduction and Apologies – apologies accepted from** Cllrs Bolitho (personal), Collier (personal), Collinson (sick), Richards (holiday) and Young (work).

**16P/105. Any Questions from the Public or Press –** Standing orders to be suspended at 7.31pm. Resident living opposite 113 Rampton Road spoke regarding the Gladman application. Very concerned about the secondary access in particular and he has spoken to Andrew Filmore about it. Cllr McCarthy arrived at 7.32pm. Resident wanted to find out the difference between the primary and secondary access – concerned that if the secondary access isn't restricted then it will become the default access for most vehicles. Currently he already struggles to exit his driveway and the location of the secondary access would make this situation worse. Standing orders reinstated at 7.35pm.

**16P/106. 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.* No declarations.

**16P/107. Minutes –** Resolution that the minutes of the Committee meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> June be signed as a correct record. **RESOLVED.** It was agreed to bring the Gladman application forward on the agenda.

**16P/108. Planning Applications:**

- **S/1411/16/OL** - Resubmission of application S/1818/15/OL - Outline application for the erection of up to 200 residential dwellings (including up to 40% affordable housing) and up to 70 apartments with care (C2), demolition of no.117 Rampton Road, introduction of structural planting and landscaping, informal public open space and children's play area, surface water flood mitigation and attenuation, vehicular access points from Rampton Road and associated ancillary works. All matters reserved with the exception of the main site accesses, Land Off, Rampton Road, Cottenham. Cllr Morris stated 4 issues with the application:
  - 1) that Cottenham is the wrong place for the development – the lack of 5 year housing supply doesn't alter the fact that Cottenham is the wrong place for large scale development.
  - 2) Rampton Road is the wrong location – there will be a 20% uplift in traffic. The location relative to the core of the village doesn't fit from a sustainability point of view and doesn't enhance or maintain the location as per the NFFP requirements.
  - 3) the scale of the development is wrong – under the current local plan Cottenham is still a minor rural centre and therefore developments should be restricted to no more than 30 homes in one cluster. Flood risk – we have learnt more about the potential risk and the Lode can't cope. Potentially the village would be cut off for several days and therefore the development is untenable unless the Lode is strengthened. The reduction from 225 to 200 houses doesn't make any difference to this fact.
  - 4) the affordable houses won't be affordable.

Concerns were raised that the development had the potential to be added to in the future and the moving of the primary access further down Rampton Road.

The proposed cycle path can't be accommodated because the pathway is too narrow. The travel plan and trip generation figures have been tweaked however all information regarding access to Waterbeach and Cambridge is incorrect – Waterbeach is beyond the acceptable national level re. cycling distance. The figures regarding junction traffic levels are horrendous. Gladman are still in negotiation with County regarding the Rampton/Oakington Road junction. They have offered money towards junction improvements in Histon. Gladman accept that the areas are above capacity and if our predictions are correct there will be complete gridlock in the village. It was queried why they had move the primary access; originally opposite Ramphill Farm. On the second access there don't appear to be any bollards to restrict access.

Major fears raised about flooding/drainage despite increase in size of the balancing pond. Cottenham Lode is currently understood not to be able to withstand a 1 in 100 year flood event. While only a small number of houses in Cottenham would be directly affected, all 5 arterial roads would be impassable for several days with severe consequences. Those homes might also suffer loss of power and communications during such an event. This proposed development takes this flood risk too lightly. The run-off from this development is proposed to be well above the level that the Old West Internal Drainage Board's pumps can deal with. And it is those pumps which must prevent an overflow of the Catchwater Drain, into which the outfall from this site must pass, on its way to the Cottenham Lode.

CPC recommends refusal. **REFUSED**. Would like the application to go to Committee. Cllr Morris to draft response document and circulate. IDB response to be chased. Standing Orders suspended at 8.06pm. Resident asked for clarification of the process regarding the appealed application. SCDC Cllr Harford clarified that the situation was similar to Foxton and that 2 refused applications for the same site were heard at the same time by the Inspector (in this case both were dismissed). Gladman can submit as many applications as they want at the same time as long as they are materially different i.e. there's a reduction in numbers. Standing Orders reinstated at 8.08pm.

- **S/1390/16/FL** – Provision of external wall insulation, 358 High Street, Cottenham. CPC recommends approval. **APPROVED**.
- **S/1272/16/FL & S/1273/16/LB** – Extension and alteration, 109 High Street, Cottenham. The extension would appear contrary to section 4.10 of the SPD document on Listed Buildings which quotes Section 3.13 of PPG15 ("every building has a finite capacity for extension. Therefore, when considering the purchase of a Listed Building, it is better to determine if the existing building meets the current needs as opposed to assuming that the building could be extended further. The individual needs of a particular owner should not impose on the needs of the building"). CPC recommends refusal. **REFUSED**.

#### **SCDC Decision Notices:**

##### **Withdrawn**

- **S/1203/16/VC** – Removal of condition 2 (agricultural occupancy) contained within planning permission S/1217/87/O, 100 Histon Road, Cottenham

##### **For information**

- **S/1447/16/PN** – Prior notification of erection of farm building for storage, Cuckoo Hill Farm, Oakington Road, Cottenham

**HM Inspectorate:**

**Appeal allowed**

- **S/2713/15/RM** – Reserved Matters Application for Access, Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale following approved Outline Consent for the Erection of a Dwelling and Garage (S/0900/15/OL), Land rear of 31 Histon Road, Cottenham

- 16P/109. Enforcement** – consider updates from Enforcement Officers and additional suggestions for enforcement. Clerk to speak to Enforcement regarding a Section 215 notice for 50 Lambs Lane.
- 16P/110. Date of next meeting** – 7<sup>th</sup> July. Cllr Wards gave apologies in advance.
- 16P/111. Close of meeting** – 8.30pm.

Signed \_\_\_\_\_ (Chair) Date \_\_\_\_\_

## 16P/116.

- [S/1606/16/OL](#) – Outline planning permission for the erection of up to 126 dwellings, formation of a new vehicular & pedestrian access onto Oakington Road and associated infrastructure and works (All matters reserved apart from access), Land at Oakington Road, Cottenham
- [S/1346/16/LD](#) – Certificate of lawful development for the standing of a mobile home, Land To The East Of Chear Fen Boat Club, Twentypence Road, Cottenham
- [S/1348/16/FL](#) – Second storey side extension over garage, 7 Goldfinch Drive, Cottenham
- [S/1352/16/LD](#) - Lawful Development Certificate for existing use of the land and buildings for B1, B2 and B8 activities, Elm Tree Farm, Hay Lane, Cottenham
- [S/1547/16/FL](#) – Single storey rear extension, 52 Orchard Close, Cottenham
- [S/1503/16/FL](#) - Proposed dwelling to side of existing dwelling plus alteration and modernisation of existing dwelling including loft conversion. Extended dropped kerb and parking to frontage plus removal of existing single garage, 11 Oakington Road, Cottenham

### For information only:

- [S/1476/16/E2](#) - Request for a Scoping Opinion under Section 13 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 2011, Waterbeach Barracks and Airfield, Denny End Road, Waterbeach

### SCDC Decision Notices:

#### Approved

- [S/1089/16/FL](#) & [S/1090/16/LB](#) – Installation of timber side-hung double garage doors, 193 High Street, Cottenham
- [S/0806/16/FL](#) – Conversion of barn to form 3 bed dwelling, 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
- [S/0817/16/PA](#) – Change of use from agricultural building to dwelling house, The Lakes, Twentypence Road, Cottenham

#### Prior approval not required

- [S/1447/16/PN](#) – Prior notification of erection of farm building for storage, Cuckoo Hill Farm, Oakington Road, Cottenham

### HM Inspectorate:

#### Appeal allowed

- [S/1248/15/FL](#) – Erection of 4 dwellings, Land north west of 14 Ivatt Street, Cottenham

## **16P/117. Enforcement update**

### **Ongoing:**

**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 again and is awaiting comments following his investigation.

**Cottenham Doctors surgery** – Treeworks were undertaken on 12<sup>th</sup> April to mature tree in the garden. This is within the CA but no application was made to SCDC. Tree Order has been received but SCDC aren't processing. Trees Officer is looking into the case and will decide what action to take.

**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 conservation officer and is awaiting comments. **Juliette Wilson (Historic Buildings Officer) is talking to Enforcement directly.**

**Co-op** – new swing sign has been erected to the left of the front entrance. No permission has been sought for this. Enforcement investigating.

**50 Lambs Lane** – resident has complained about the numerous vehicles left in the front garden which are being used as a storage facility. Unsightly and a potential hazard – rubbish could attract rats and this is in close proximity to the primary school. Enforcement investigating.

### **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 with Graham Armstrong at County Highways.

**Millfield** – it now appears that demolition has commenced.

## 16P/118. Appeal: 15 Newtown

### TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 APPEAL UNDER S78 AGAINST REFUSAL OF A HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION

**Site Address:** 15, New Town, Cottenham, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire, CB24 8TL  
**Description of development:** Two storey rear extension to dwellinghouse  
**Application reference:** S/0269/16/FL  
**Applicant:** Ms G Fraser  
**Appeal reference:** APP/W0530/D/16/3151490  
**Appeal start date:** 28 June 2016

I refer to the above details. An appeal has been made to the Secretary of State against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council. The Decision of the Planning Application was: Refused.

The appeal will be determined on the basis of **written representations**. The procedure to be followed is set out in Part 1 of the Town and Country Planning (Appeals) (Written Representations Procedure) (England) Regulations 2009.

As this appeal is proceeding under the **Householder Appeals Service**, there is no opportunity for you to submit comments. However, we have forwarded all the representations made to us on the application to the Planning Inspectorate and the appellant. These will be considered by the Inspector when determining the appeal.

If you wish to withdraw any representations you made on the application, you must make this request to the Planning Inspectorate within 4 weeks of the appeal start date. You can do this by emailing [teamp15@pins.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:teamp15@pins.gsi.gov.uk). If you do not have access to the internet, you can write (quoting the appeal reference) to:

The Planning Inspectorate  
Room 3K  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Bristol  
BS1 6PN.

The Planning Inspectorate will publish appeal documentation, including copies of representations received, on the GOV.UK website. Information provided in your representation will be published. This may include your name and address, but personal telephone numbers and email addresses and signatures of individuals will be removed. If you object to publication in this way, please contact the Planning Inspectorate.

The appeal documents can be inspected on the GOV.UK Website at <https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk> or at South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambourne between 08:30 and 17:00 Monday to Friday. You are advised to telephone beforehand to ensure the relevant documents are available when you call. You can contact our offices on 03450 450 500.

The Planning Inspectorate aims to deal with appeals following this procedure within 8 weeks of the appeal start date. When made, the decision will be published on the GOV.UK Website.

## **16P/119. Neighbourhood Plan**

We are under some pressure to submit a preliminary draft plan to SCDC as part of the defence against poorly-scaled or located speculative applications (e.g. Gladman, Persimmon and County Council) but care is needed to address enough of the issues and not to “open too many new doors”.

Survey findings and suggested options have been translated into draft planning policies for discussion and refinement with SCDC before preparing a full draft for local “pre-submission” consultation.

Distinct development policies are being developed for four areas of the village:

- a) The Conservation Area & Lanes
- b) An Extended Residential Framework
- c) An Extended Employment Framework
- d) The Rural Parish

Preliminary “short-form” versions have been sent to the 250 Neighbourhood Plan Ambassadors and were displayed at the Cottenham Festival.

Once we have feedback from SCDC, these will be worked up into a full “pre-submission” draft for a 6-week formal consultation locally and with statutory consultees etc.

Feedback will guide refinement into the “pre-submission” draft on which SCDC arrange formal 6-week consultation and examination. That draft will include supplementary information on policies towards traffic management, local green spaces and trees, heritage features, desirable design aspects etc.

Completion of this consultation allows SCDC Planners to take some account of the proposed policies.