

Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting

Held in the Village Hall, Recreation Ground, Cottenham on **Thursday 5th November 2015 at 7.30pm**

Present: Cllrs Mudd (Chair), Collier, Heydon, McCarthy, Morris, Nicholas,

In attendance: 5 members of the public

15P/181. Chairman's Introduction and Apologies – apologies accepted from Cllrs Bolitho (work), Richards (personal), Ward (holiday) and SCDC Cllr Harford (work).

15P/182. Any Questions from the Public or Press – Standing orders to be suspended – Neighbouring resident (50 Church Lane) has built her own property which had to be in keeping with the rural location. The proposals show 19 windows facing her house. The property isn't in keeping with a rural location. The site plan is incorrect – have placed her house in the wrong location on the plot. The elevation pictures are misleading and skewed and don't give an accurate idea of how close the property would be to her house. The field behind the site floods and there is no drainage on the site. Also feels that the way the building is sited would give access to future development behind. When building her own property there were conditions made that only allowed to plant hedges on the border, not walls. There may also be a contamination issue due to the previous siting of a petrol pump on the site. Concerned that the house is a business unit due to the proposed workshop/office.

Resident (Merton Farm) stated that he doesn't have a problem with appropriate development on the site. However as a chartered surveyor he queried whether the building fitted with the village Design Statement, particularly due to the proximity of the Conservation Area. The design is substantially bigger than the neighbouring property. There was a request to make it look 'warehouse like' but the proposed materials aren't in keeping with this request. The front brick wall with metal palisading is inappropriate and out of keeping with anything else in the village. Additionally the front of the plot is the only turning place on the road, due to the narrow nature of Church Lane; this would cause an issue for refuse collections etc. This turning area has been part of the public highway for a number of years so would constitute a loss of amenity. Soakaways don't work in this location due to the heavy clay soil and the little ditch adjacent to the plot overflows.

Resident (19 Church Lane) spoke to say that the sketches she had been shown by the applicant aren't representative of the application. She raised drainage concerns which haven't been addressed. The ditch flows along the back of houses along the High Street, under the road and into the Cut. Because it hasn't been maintained the water flows in the wrong direction at times. This affects properties in Church Close and the wood yard, all of whom have permission to drain into the ditch. The resident has done considerable work to the ditch behind her property, including installing a culvert and electric pump, which it has been necessary to use. Pat Matthews has stated that there isn't an awarded drain however the EA did a previous presentation to the CVDG where it showed the ditch in question as an awarded drain. There is a lot of water all flowing to this site and that issue needs to be addressed. Both the applicant and architect don't seem to appreciate this point. The previous application was going to be rejected due to being too intrusive; the new design is just as bad and doesn't respect or enrich the architecture of the area. Church Lane itself should be considered an amenity – there are a large number of people walking/cycling down the lane every day.

Resident (17 Church Lane) spoke to say that when she had built her neighbouring property she had to have hedging so the proposed brick wall is out of keeping with the location. Has suffered issues with flooding.

Standing Orders reinstated at 7.57pm.

15P/183. 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* – none received.

15P/184. Minutes – Amendment under item 15P/176: insidious replaced with assiduous. Resolution that the minutes of the Committee meeting held on 22nd October September be signed as a correct record.

RESOLVED.

15P/185. Planning Applications for consideration

- **S/2220/15/FL** – Change of use of warehouse/storage facility to residential, 40 Church Lane, Cottenham. The application is contrary to HG8 – 1b, 2d, 2e and 2f. It was also noted that there was no Design and Access statement provided. Don't believe that this is a change of use, renovation or in keeping. Given the former use of the site there needs to be a contaminated land report provided. There is also the danger of flood risk to the site itself and neighbouring properties and the proposed soakaway won't work in this part of the village. The drain may belong to the Old West Internal Drainage Board. Standing Orders suspended at 8.09pm. Resident stated that the road is a public highway until 19 Church Lane. Cllr Morris clarified that Church Lane is un-adopted but is still considered a public highway. Standing Orders reinstated at 8.10pm. The site is outside of the village framework, there is a risk of overlooking and therefore a loss of amenity to neighbours. The proposed wall, scale of the building and windows are out of keeping. Cllr Nicholas ran through the previous site history. The LDF states that the plans must be in keeping with the surroundings and the Planning Inspector in 2010 mentioned this. It was noted that the plan and elevations don't match in terms of the number of windows. Cllr Heydon pointed out that the advice given was to follow the existing roofline but in fact it has been raised by 30cm. Cllr Morris highlighted traffic concerns and that the parking should be screened. There will be an increase in traffic to Church Lane since the existing building is hardly used. CPC recommends refusal. **REFUSED** on the following grounds:
 - HG8 – 1a, 2e, 2f 2g and 4.
 - DP1 – 1i ,1j, 1l and 1p
 - DP2 – 1a, 1f, 2m
 - DP3 – 2j, 2k, 2l, 2m, 2p
 - Lack of contamination report, D&A report and the plans are misleading.

CPC requests that this application goes to Committee. Should the application be approved we wish to see a condition that drainage should be improved.

For residents present Cllr Mudd outlined what the SCDC Planning Committee did and the planning process.

- **S/2407/15/FL** – Erection of single storey rear extension, 57 Lambs Lane, Cottenham. Concerns raised over the size of the extension in relation to the garden. CPC recommends approval. **APPROVED**.
- **S/2504/15/FL** – First floor rear extension, 15 Histon Road, Cottenham. Considered an improvement to the previous application. CPC recommends approval. **APPROVED**.
- **S/2525/15/FL** – Single storey extensions to side and rear and outbuilding, 25 Rampton Road, Cottenham. Concerns raised over the proximity of the workshop to gardens in Pelham Way and possible loss of residential amenity. Also potential loss of light to 28 Rampton Road. CPC recommends refusal. **REFUSED**.

15P/186. S106 application from Dissenters Trustees – to consider request for donation of £20k for upgrade of plot adjacent to existing burial ground to create garden of remembrance and extension to existing burial space – Cllr Morris outlined. Our windfall from Beach Road is for open space and the Dissenters would be eligible in principle. We need more information from them as to what their actual plans are but it is a good idea that the land will be improved. From a Planning Committee perspective it appears that they are eligible for a grant. Cllr Heydon suggested supplying Dissenters Trustees with a copy of our Financial Regulations. Cllr Morris will liaise with Dissenters regarding a tighter case for their proposal.

15P/187. Date of next meeting – 19th November

15P/188. Close of meeting – 9.10pm

Signed _____ (Chair) Date _____