

## **AGENDA REPORTS PACK**

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**9<sup>th</sup> March 2017**

## 17P/040. Minutes



### To: Members of Cottenham Parish Council

You are hereby summoned to attend a Planning Committee Meeting  
To be held in the Village Hall, Cottenham on **Thursday 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2017 at 7.30pm**

**Present:** Cllrs Mudd (Chair), Collinson, Graves, Morris, Nicholas, Wilson and the Clerk

**In attendance:** 6 members of the public

**17P/029. Chairman's Introduction and Apologies** – apologies received from Cllrs Bolitho (sick), McCarthy (personal) and Richards (work). Cllr Ward arrived at 7.31pm.

**17P/030. Any Questions from the Public or Press – Standing orders suspended 7.32pm.** Resident 1 spoke re. S/0378/17/FL. The proposed building is 2 storeys and goes right up to the pavement. Their bedroom window will be blocked, facing onto a brick wall. It will be dangerous to get out of their driveway since the visibility will be blocked. Resident 2 spoke re. S/1411/16/OL. Cllr Young arrived at 7.34pm. Resident 2 felt that the heritage statement didn't meet the requirements of the SCDC Planning Committee where a statement from Historic England (formerly English Heritage) was mentioned. Wanted to know why SCDC have allowed the application to be tabled and who WYG were. Resident 3 spoke to say they were interested in the comments regarding the heritage statements for S/1411/16/OL and S/1606/16/OL.

**17P/031. 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 Mudd declared a non-pecuniary interest in S/1606/16/OL and S/1411/15/OL and will take no part in discussions.

**17P/032. Minutes** – Resolution that the minutes of the Committee meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> February 2017 be signed as a correct record. **RESOLVED.**

### **17P/033. Planning Applications:**

- **S/1411/16/FL** - 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 - **addition of Heritage statement.** Cllr Mudd spoke as a resident to ask whether Crowlands Moat should be mentioned in the heritage statements as a scheduled monument. Re. S/1411/16/OL the heritage statement mentions 8 almshouses; there are 7. Carter Jonas wrote the Persimmon statement and they have a conflict of interest. Standing Orders reinstated 7.41pm. Cllr Morris took the Chair and outlined the background and reason for the heritage statement. They haven't used Historic England. It's a long report but whilst it contains several photos of the surrounding area it doesn't contain any of the almshouses themselves. He didn't consider the report detailed enough for the Case Officer and SCDC to make an informed decision. If they let the traffic closer to the almshouses it could affect the social and economic environment of the almshouses. There is an issue with the surface water in that area and towards the Green there has been flooding. Structural consultant for the almshouses has produced a report which mentions damage to the frontage due to splashback from water on the road. Cllr Collinson felt that the statement wasn't independent and had concerns about the approach taken. The Case Officer has said that the area is already impacted. The other issue is at the

end of the document where they just look at the almshouses as if it was a work of art and treat it as a historic monument – under section 6.16 they say the setting won't be altered and that the effect will be neutral. There is nothing mentioned about the residents, setting and traffic and is a very inadequate report. Cllr Young stated that the existing setting is relatively close to the road and already half impaired so we need to pull out the curtilage issue. There is an issue of safety for the residents who are a vulnerable section of the community and there would be damage to the amenity of the residents. Cllr Nicholas said it was up to the 12 members of the SCDC Committee to get their heads around the report. We must emphasise the affect on the residents. Cllr Morris outlined a personal response he'd submitted. Cllr Collinson mentioned that the purpose of listing a building and the setting is to preserve it. Cllr Morris mentioned that the almshouses were truly affordable housing. Cllr Nicholas requested that a copy of our response be sent to all Members of the Committee. Cllr Morris said that Neil Gough had provided a detailed picture of the roundabout overlaid onto the existing site and he had provided that with his personal submission. Standing Orders suspended 8.04pm. Malcolm Dee, Trustee of the almshouses, said that the vulnerability of the building hasn't been stated nor the additional traffic. Resident 1 said there is a clear implication that SCDC had not done its job properly but the roundabout design wasn't part of the original application. Cllr Morris said we need to flag but the design wasn't made public until Christmas. Resident 1 stated that regarding the statement it says there's already a sign blocking the view of the almshouses but in the photo there's no blockage. Resident 4 asked if there was any Officer in SCDC who could make a comment? Cllr Morris said yes and that the application should have been referred to the Urban Design group but that was up to SCDC. Resident 5 asked who owned the verges? We can't be sure of ownership. Resident 1 asked whether our District Cllrs were making statements? Malcolm Dee mentioned a conflict of interests for Cllr Harford, a Trustee of the almshouses. Resident 5 asked if the SCDC meeting was just to discuss the heritage statement. No, the whole application. Standing Orders reinstated 8.10pm. Cllr Young mentioned a disinformation point; the Case Officer isn't an expert on heritage. Traffic – we need to pick up on increased vehicle emissions and the environmental effect on the brickwork of a listed building. Cllr Morris presumed there would be an amended report from the Case Officer. CPC recommends refusal. **REFUSED.** Cllr Morris to draft a response and will also send bullet points to the Members of the Committee on Tuesday along with graphics. Resolution that Cllr Morris represents CPC at the SCDC Planning Committee on 1<sup>st</sup> March 2017. **RESOLVED.** Cllr Morris will speak to Philip Kratz in the morning. If there is a strong view that he speaks instead of Cllr Morris then Cllr Morris will speak as a resident. Standing Orders suspended 8.22pm. Malcolm Dee could possibly speak in principle. Nominations required by 12 noon on Monday. Clerk will submit the nominations. Standing Orders reinstated 8.25pm

- **S/0378/17/FL** - First floor side extension single & storey rear extension, 107 Rooks Street, Cottenham. Cllr Young left the meeting at 8.26pm and returned at 8.28pm. Cllr Ward commented that the proposed extension was very close to the boundary of 109 Rooks Street and would shade the property. Standing Orders suspended 8.29pm. Resident stated that their front door and main bedroom window are on the side of their house, facing 107 Rooks Street. The extension will be approximately 12ft away. Standing Orders reinstated 8.30pm. It was noted that the hedge is being removed and replaced with a fence to widen up space along the boundary. Standing Orders suspended 8.31pm. Cllr Collinson asked the resident if their house was a bungalow; no. Standing Orders reinstated 8.31pm. Clerk mentioned the installation of uPVC windows in a Conservation Area. CPC recommends refusal. **REFUSED.** Reasons: loss of amenity to neighbouring property (DP3 2/J); highway safety; design doesn't preserve or enhance the property. If Case Officer is minded to

approve we would like the application to go to Committee. For the benefit of the residents Cllr Mudd outlined the next steps in the planning process.

- **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 – **addition of Heritage statement**. Cllr Morris outlined. Noted that Persimmon have used their own agent to write the heritage statement, it has been badly done and is littered with mistakes where the text has been lifted from another document. CPC recommends refusal. **REFUSED**. Cllr Morris to draft response.
- **S/0387/17/LD** – Certificate of lawful development for a single storey rear extension, 20 Lyles Road, Cottenham. CPC recommend approval. **APPROVED**.
- **S/3286/16/LB** - Re-Plaster/Plasterboard Internal Walls. Cover Exposed Brickwork of all External Wall Areas Internally with NHL 3.5 Plaster @ Ratio of 2:1 Sand & Lime@ Depth of 8-10mm. Erect Stud Walls using 50 x 50mm Treated Timber, insulated with 50mm Insulated Board. Joints to be Foil Taped. 12.5mm Gypsum Plasterboard Fixed to Stud Work & Plastered with 2 Coats of Thistle Multi-Finish. Include Vents to Introduce Air Flow. Install Multi-Fuel Wood burning Stove, Install Multi-Fuel Stove. Fit Bird Cowl, Brick Hearth. 86 High Street, Cottenham. CPC recommends approval subject to Conservation approval of the materials. **APPROVED**.
- **S/0526/17/DC** - Single Storey Rear Extension and Internal Alterations, 250 High Street, Cottenham. Unable to comment; refer to Tree Officer.
- **S/0538/17/FL & S/0539/17/LB** – demolition of workshop/store and erection of dwelling, Victoria House, 214 High Street, Cottenham. Cllr Collinson commented on the Highways information and that there was no way of improving visibility. It was generally noted that there will be an intensification of the access contrary to what is stated in the report. Cllr Wilson was concerned about the proximity to Goode Close. Concerns about method of removal of the asbestos. CPC recommends refusal. **REFUSED**. Contrary to PPFG 15 and CH5.

#### For information only

#### Approved by SCDC

- **S/3596/16/FL** - Construction of a carport, 73 Rampton Road, Cottenham

#### Tree Works

- **S/0424/17/TP** - Fell to ground level 1 x self-seeded sycamore situated on the boundary, 31a Denmark Road, Cottenham. No real reason given for the removal of a significant tree and no way to prove that it was a self-seed. CPC recommends refusal. **REFUSED**.
- **S/0466/17/TC** - 1. Bay tree - fell 2. Sycamore – re-pollard 3. Apple - crown reduce 1m and crown thin 20%, 23 High Street, Cottenham. CPC recommends refusal of bay tree felling. **REFUSED**. CPC recommends approval of works to Sycamore and Apple. **APPROVED**.

**17P/034. Enforcement** – consider updates from Enforcement Officers and additional items for enforcement. Case 16/16 – letter hand delivered to owner by Building Control yesterday giving them 28 days to respond. Case 8/16 – Clerk to contact resident. Case 4/17 – pollution issues in the ditch had been reported and the Pollution Officer and EA attended promptly resulting in works ceasing. Clerk waiting update from Enforcement regarding the current status.

**17P/035. Date of next meeting** – 9<sup>th</sup> March 2017

**17P/036. Close of meeting** – 9.21pm.

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

## 17P/041. Planning Applications:

- [S/0522/17/FL](#) – Demolition of existing bungalow and construction of new dwelling, r/o 11 New Town, Cottenham
- [S/0634/17/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, Land at 32 & 34 Rampton Road, Cottenham
- [S/2876/16/OL](#) – Outline application for residential development comprising 154 dwellings including matters of access with all other matters reserved, Land North East of Rampton Road, Cottenham.  
**Heritage statement and revised transport assessment.**
- [S/0615/17/FL](#) – Single storey extension, 69 Victory Way, Cottenham
- [S/0731/17/LD](#) - Certificate of lawful development for a single storey rear extension, 13 The Herons, Cottenham

### Approved by SCDC

- [S/2802/16/FL](#) - Variation of condition 2 (Approved Plans) of planning permission S/1248/15/FL for the erection of four dwellings, Land North West of 14 Ivatt Street, Cottenham
- [S/3047/16/FL](#) - Erection of Dwelling Following Demolition of Outbuildings and Frontage Wall, r/o 45 Telegraph Street, Cottenham
- [S/3624/16/FL](#) – Single storey rear extension, 7 Orchard Close, Cottenham
- [S/3356/16/FL](#) – New Dwelling to Replace Part Demolished Warehouse, 40 Church Lane, Cottenham

### Refusals

- [S/3080/16/OL](#) - Outline planning permission for 8 dwellings and garages (Access to be determined), r/o 160 Histon Road, Cottenham