

AGENDA REPORTS PACK

PLANNING COMMITTEE

17th August 2017

17P/151. Minutes



DRAFT Planning Committee Minutes

Meeting held in the Village Hall, Recreation Ground, Cottenham on
Thursday 3rd August 2017 at 7.30pm

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

In attendance: 1 member of the public

17P/139. Chairman's Introduction and Apologies – Apologies accepted from Cllrs Bolitho (personal), Mudd (personal), Nicholas (personal) and Young (personal)

17P/140. Any Questions from the Public or Press – Standing Orders suspended at 7.30 pm. Resident came to raise concerns regarding ref S/2057/17/FL – plans do not show proximity of surrounding dwellings, proposed extension comes up to the boundary line, rear wall of extension would be approx. 4m from her French doors, would block natural daylight. Cllr McCarthy arrived at 7.32pm. Design and Access Statement is inaccurate stating no effect on adjoining properties in terms of overlooking and states adjacent property has no windows to the rear of the property – one neighbouring property has windows on both floors, another has large French doors, both would be overshadowed by proposed extension. Would like a 3m/6m adjudication to protect property. Standing Orders reinstated at 7.34pm.

17P/141. To accept Declarations of Interest and Dispensations – none.

17P/142. Minutes – Resolution that the minutes of the Committee meeting held on 20th July 2017 be signed as a correct record. **RESOLVED.**

17P/143. Planning Applications:

- **S/2057/17/FL** - RETROSPECTIVE - proposed extension over existing ground floor and first floor extension 60, Rooks Street, Cottenham, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire, CB24 8RB. Cllr McCarthy; Design and Access Statement makes no reference to being in conservation area. Cllr Collinson has visited site; it's a small house on a confined site, can see no. 50 immediately behind, would be overshadowed by extension. No. 64 has side windows, up to boundary. Over bulky extension for small property on a confined site, particularly from garden and Corbett St sides. Cllr McCarthy - will change street view and completely block all sunlight to no 50. Standing Orders suspended 7.54pm - resident confirmed that the proposed extension would block any daylight into her living room and produced photos to demonstrate. Proposal is built on the boundary line. Standing Orders re-instated at 7.59pm. Cllrs Graves queried lack of a light study. CPC recommends refusal: Unacceptable scale and mass in conservation area, too close to boundary, loss of light to the main habitable room of immediate neighbour. **REFUSED.** Should Officer be minded to approve, we would like the application to go to Committee. Cllr Morris explained to resident that our opinion is not necessarily that of SCDC. Cllr Collinson recommended resident should send objections to SCDC too. Resident was thanked for attending and left at 8.06pm.
- **S/2541/17/AD** – 2 No. flag signs, 2 No. totem signs and 2 No. wall mounted box signs, Plot y Cambridge Research Park, Building 6100, Beach Drive, Landbeach. Cllr Collinson showed printouts of proposed signage. CPC recommends approval **APPROVED**
- **S/2592/17/FL** - RETROSPECTIVE - Proposed second floor extension on existing side extension, 71, Lambs Lane, Cottenham, Cambridge, CB24 8TB. Cllr Morris noted that applicant was a Parish Councillor for a brief time within the last 4 years. CPC recommends approval **APPROVED**

Tree Orders

- **S/2500/17/TC** – Stone Pine in rear garden: sectionally dismantle to ground level, 98 Rooks Street, Cottenham. Accepted reluctantly, subject to Tree Officers comments, CPC expects reasons for works.
- **S/2525/17/TC** – T1: Sycamore - Crown reduce by approx 50% to allow more light, 271 High Street, Cottenham. Accepted subject to Tree Officer comments.
- **S/2565/17/TC** - T 1 - Leylandii - Fell to ground level. Reason - Outgrown the area. 160, High Street, Cottenham, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire, CB24 8RX. Accepted subject to Tree Officer comments.

SCDC Decisions

Approvals:

- **S/1815/17/VC** – Variation of Condition 2 (approved plans) of planning consent S/1794/16/FL for erection of 2 dwellings with new highway access and 2 No. parking spaces for No. 32 Rampton Road, 32-34 Rampton Road, Cottenham
- **S/1192/17/LB** – Rear extension, 109 High Street, Cottenham

Refusals:

- **S/1909/17/FL** - Proposed two storey side extension including replacement of existing garage, 305 High Street, Cottenham, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire, CB24 8TX

17P/144. Enforcement – consider updates from Enforcement Officers and additional items for enforcement
Cllr Ward asked re progress on 5/17. Cllr Morris as per press release. 4/17 Cllr Graves has submitted video and photos to enforcement.

17P/145. Parish Planning Forum – consider attendance at event on 12th September 6-8pm in Cambourne -
Cllr Morris to attend the event on CPC's behalf.

17P/146. Date of next meeting – 17th August 2017

17P/147. Close of meeting – 8.30pm

Signed _____ (Chair) Date _____

17P/152. Planning Applications:

Planning Applications:

- [S/2652/17/FL](#) – Two storey side extension & single storey rear extension, 107, Rooks Street, Cottenham
- [S/1699/17/FL](#) - Proposed First Floor Extension & Alterations. Replacement front porch, The Echo, 127, Histon Road, Cottenham
- [S/2598/17/FL](#) – Detached garage, 15, Histon Road, Cottenham
- [S/2678/17/FL](#) – Two storey rear extension, following demolition of existing single storey extension, 55, Coolidge Gardens, Cottenham
- [S/2721/17/VC](#) – Variation of conditions 3 (External materials), 4 (Surface water drainage), 11 (Glazing) and 13 (Traffic Management Plan) to planning permission S/0077/17/FL, 2 Denmark Road, Cottenham
- [S/2624/17/LD](#) - Lawful development certificate for proposed single storey rear extension, 60, Lambs Lane, Cottenham
- [S/2718/17/LB](#) – Revised plans for 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/2780/17/VC](#) - Variation of Condition 2, 3 & 4 of Planning Application C/0090/52, Mayfields, Beach Road, Cottenham

Tree Orders

- [S/2725/17/TC](#) – T1: ornamental conifer – cut back to reduce spread & height; T2: Cycpressus – now too big for site, remove, 50 Corbett Street
- [S/2736/17/TC](#) – Sycamore (T.1) Reduce Sycamore to allow more light to neighbours back garden; Sycamore (T.2) Reduce Sycamore to allow more light to neighbours back garden, 34 Telegraph Street

For information only:

- [S/0929/17/LD](#) – Lawful development certificate for the proposed re-roofing of existing conservatory, 69, Lambs Lane, Cottenham

SCDC Decisions

Approvals:

- [S/2090/17/VC](#) – Variation of Condition 10 (visibility splays) of planning permission S/2530/16/FL for a new 3 bedroom dwelling and associated parking 33 Margett Street, Cottenham
- [S/2079/17/LD](#) – Single storey rear extension, 11 The Herons, Cottenham
- [S/2624/17/LD](#) - Proposed single storey rear extension, 60 Histon Road, Cottenham
- [S/2413/17/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

Refusals:

- [S/1857/17/FL](#) - Proposed Two Storey Rear Extension, 40 Telegraph Street, Cottenham
- [S/2001/17/FL](#) - Proposed dwelling, Haelan Feld Farm, Twenty Pence Road, Cottenham

17P/154. Major planning applications - S/2413/17/OL

- This third (and near-identical to the second) Gladman application was granted outline planning permission at and after the Planning Committee meeting on 9th August.
- It was disappointing that none of our three District Councillors opposed the application.
- Gladman now has two years in which to submit a Reserved Matters application for the site details, unless a successful legal challenge can be made and accepted by the Court, in which case the application would be referred back to SCDC at a future date.
- We have to consider whether we believe this permission is legally valid and, if not, whether we should challenge it. Some possible grounds include:
 - whether the signed legal agreements are complete and correct.
 - whether some members failed to consider the application “afresh” and on its own merits or were unduly swayed by their previous consideration of the near-identical S/1411/16/OL, the subject of a Judicial Review, or the possible outcomes and cost implications of a refusal followed by successful appeal.
 - whether or not the Officers properly advised them on the increased weight attributable, following the relevant Supreme Court Judgement, to three strategic planning policies and/or whether they applied a proper planning balance in their report.
 - whether the late change in start-time from that advised to objectors, and the change in running order on the day prejudiced the ability of objectors to scrutinise properly what had been said by the Officers prior to their arrival.
- Whatever we do or don't do, we need to monitor carefully where we are and possible next steps – as we have been doing:
 1. Should we decide to prepare a challenge now, we should advise SCDC of our intentions as soon as possible so they have reasonable time to correct any misunderstandings and avoid wasted time and resource. A formal request to the Court for a Judicial Review could follow before 20th September.
 2. Should we decide that enough is enough now, we can begin to unpick our position carefully.

17P/155. Major planning applications – S/1606/16/OL

- This application was granted delegated approval and Officers must now prepare the necessary contractual paperwork for signature prior to outline permission being granted.
- Any further activity might follow the same considerations as above if and when an s.106 agreement is signed and permission granted.

17P/156. Major planning applications – S/2876/16/OL

- The County Council application was refused permission partly for the reasons “wrong scale, wrong village, wrong place” that should have led to refusal of the first two but aggravated by cumulation and lease / Local Green Space issues (we'll see what gets recorded).
- The County Council Officers have invested a lot of borrowed money in this ill-considered scheme so may not readily accept it is a lost cause.

17P/157. Neighbourhood Plan (report)

- The Housing section of our NP may now be undermined and there are serious implications for the Recreation Ground and Infant/Primary School etc, but much of the rest can benefit from the help we are getting from a freelance Planning Inspector funded by SCDC, if that continues.
- We have a Housing Needs Assessment under way with AECOM. Its outcome, and progress on the major applications and Community Land Trust, will inform the next version prior to consultation.