

## **AGENDA REPORTS PACK**

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

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

## 17P/200. Minutes

### DRAFT Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

Meeting held in the Village Hall, Recreation Ground, Cottenham on Thursday 19<sup>th</sup> October 2017 at 7.30pm

**Present:** Cllrs Morris (Chair), Bolitho, Collinson, Nicholas and Ward and the Clerk

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

- 17P/187. Chairman's Introduction and Apologies** – Apologies accepted from Cllrs Mudd (sick), Graves (work), Wilson (holiday) and Young (work).
- 17P/188. Any Questions from the Public or Press** – Standing orders suspended 7.31pm. Resident 1 spoke regarding S/3551/17/OL. Objections remain the same to the previous application – increased traffic, extreme distance from the centre of the village, loss of land for recreational purposes, loss of privacy (his property extends to the rear of the plot). Resident 2 agreed with the previous comments. Wanted to know the effect on the parish boundary with the application site going down to Les King Wood. It was confirmed that it won't affect the parish boundary, which extends to Rampton Bridge over the Lode. Standing Orders reinstated 7.35pm.
- 17P/189. To accept Declarations of Interest and Dispensations** – Cllr Bolitho declared an Interest in item S/3534/17/TC and will take no part in discussions. Cllr Morris declared an Interest in item S/3385/17/FL and will take no part in discussions.
- 17P/190. Minutes** – Minor amend made to item 17P/182 (under S/3238/17/FL). Resolution that the minutes of the Committee meeting held on 5<sup>th</sup> October 2017 be signed as a correct record.  
**RESOLVED.**
- 17P/191. Planning Applications:**
- **S/3551/17/OL** - Outline Planning Application for residential development comprising 137 dwellings including matters of access with all other matters reserved, Land north east of Rampton Road, Cottenham. Reasons for previous refusal were read out. Minutes of the SCDC meeting went further – LGS, out of scale, loss of character, not deliverable, traffic, road safety, unsustainable. SCDC still don't have a 5 year land housing supply and we don't know when this will be resolved. It was noted that the new application relied on pre-app advice taken prior to the Supreme Court ruling. Cllr Collinson commented that the site was utterly isolated despite the application stating the closeness to local facilities; this is false and the site is unsustainable. It isn't in accordance with the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. Noted that the access roads would be coming out on a hill and traffic along this part of Rampton Road is very fast. Inappropriate wording in the Q&A document sent to the Parish Council and mentions that the development will help fix County's finances. The mention of their services is tendentious as they have to provide them regardless. If this development is approved where is our extra recreational space going to be? Cllr Nicholas couldn't see much difference to the original application and it even states that it is an infill site. Cllr Ward was interested in the 55 social/rented houses but elsewhere in the documentation it referred to affordable housing which was confusing. Unsure of the effect on a CLT. Clerk noted that figure 2.2 of the D&A statement was incorrect – centre point is not on the development therefore the facilities are shown as being closer than they actually are. Standing Orders suspended 8.02pm. Resident 1 asked what the previous vote was; believed it was 7-5 against. Wanted to know what the Q&A document referred to was. Cllr Morris responded that it was a document received from County as part of an online consultation (which hadn't yet gone out to the public). It contained information that was materially wrong and both the Clerk and 2 County Cllrs had objected strongly to the Chair of the C&I Committee. Our former County Cllr has requested for information to be published for the first time in public and this will be debated at the meeting at County tomorrow. Resident 2

pointed out that the site wasn't infill and this needed to be amended on the application. Standing Orders reinstated 8.06pm.

CPC recommends refusal of this application. **REFUSED**. Reasons:

- Car dependency due to distance from settlement and nearest well-served bus stop
- Damage to landscape contrary to DP/1, DP/2, NE/4
- Failure to recognise the significance of the Supreme Court ruling on housing policies ST/5, etc.
- Damage to village character
- Traffic safety issues
- Impact on existing Rampton Road residences
- Damage to coherence of future recreation space
- Implied inducements to grant planning permission
- Misrepresentation of CCC role relative to other developers
- Misrepresentation of and failure to address reasons for earlier refusal
- Acknowledged mismatches with Cottenham's emerging Neighbourhood Plan
- Unsustainable under NPPF14 and DP/3

Cllr Morris to draft response and will circulate.

- **S/3345/17/LD** – Lawful Development Certificate for proposed chimney and single storey rear extension, 14 The Linnets, Cottenham. CPC recommends approval. **APPROVED**.
- **S/3494/17/FL** – Single storey rear extension, 9 Broad Lane, Cottenham. CPC recommends approval. **APPROVED**.
- **S/3385/17/FL** – Proposed re-roofing works to existing conservatory, single roof light, with external piers to support the roof, 69 Lambs Lane. CPC recommends approval. **APPROVED**.
- **S/3013/17/FL** - Lean to extension to a portal framed livestock building, Land to the north of the bungalow approved, Causeway Farm, Smithy Fen, Cottenham. CPC recommends approval. **APPROVED**.

#### Tree Orders

- **S/3514/17/TC** – T 1 - Fir - Reduce the crown by 25% to balance and create a more aesthetically pleasing shape, 160 High Street, Cottenham. Noted that the applicant is a former member of CPC. **APPROVED** subject to Tree Officer recommendations.
- **S/3534/17/TC** - Walnut in front garden - crown reduce by 2-3m and remove dead wood, 194 High Street, Cottenham. **APPROVED** subject to Tree Officer recommendations.
- **S/3576/17/TC** - 4. Oak adjacent to bungalow - remove all major dead wood 37. Beech hedge around churchyard - cut sides back to line where previously trimmed and reduce height by approximately 1m on bottom hedge and same line all round, All Saints Church, High Street, Cottenham. **APPROVED** subject to Tree Officer recommendations.

#### SCDC Decisions

##### Approvals:

- **S/2726/17/FL** – Single storey rear extension, 61 Histon Road, Cottenham
- **S/2867/17/LD** – Proposed roof windows in rear roof slope, 6 Sovereign Way, 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

##### Withdrawn:

- **S/3077/17/LD** - Lawful development certificate for proposed rear and side extensions, Willow Acre, Twenty Pence Road, Cottenham

- 17P/193. Neighbourhood Plan** – Consider progress and next steps on the emerging Neighbourhood Plan – Cllr Morris outlined the report. Will have the responses to the mini-consultation next week. Hoping to re-run the Regulation 14 consultation in early November and will host consultation events as previously. SCDC would then screen the Plan and fund a Neighbourhood Plan Examiner, the Plan would then be modified as necessary and probably put to referendum in May.
- 17P/194. 2018/19 budget** – consider requesting a specific budget for planning / legal assistance with planning applications – Cllr Morris outlined the rationale. Suggestion of allowing for printing of 200 copies of the full Plan and £1k towards referendum costs. Resolution to recommend a budget of £3k towards Neighbourhood Plan costs to bring to referendum. **RESOLVED.**
- 17P/192. Enforcement** – consider updates from Enforcement Officers and additional items for enforcement – Case 5/17: queries have been raised regarding the collection of foul water and this is currently being investigated. Clerk to chase up cases 1/16 and 5/16 with Tree Officer. Concerns raised over the lack of progress regarding case 6/16 and possible SCDC liability issues. Resolution that the Chair writes to the relevant Officers at SCDC to request an onsite meeting to consider the dangerous dilapidation of Gothic House. **RESOLVED.**
- 17P/195. Date of next meeting** – 9<sup>th</sup> November 2017
- 17P/196. Close of meeting** – 8.59pm.

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

## 17P/201. Planning Applications:

### Planning Applications:

- [S/3615/17/RM](#) - Application for approval of reserved matters for access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale following outline planning permission S/1952/15/OL for the demolition of existing barn and construction of up to 50 dwellings, Land at Oakington Road, Cottenham
- [S/3365/17/FL](#) – Single storey side extension to replace existing rear conservatory, 13 Bullfinch Way
- [S/3607/17/FL](#) & [S/3608/17/LB](#) – Rear first floor extension and an addition to create a link from the main house to the existing annexe, 87 High Street, Cottenham
- [S/3664/17/FL](#) & [S/3665/17/LB](#) - Removal of modern farm style gates and replacement with taller solid timber gates and posts, 109 High Street, Cottenham
- [S/3434/17/LB](#) - Extension to existing lean-to shed, brick and ceiling repairs to the existing lean-to shed, 309 High Street, Cottenham
- [S/3691/17/FL](#) & [S/2807/17/LB](#) - Re-building of single storey side extension to enlarged footprint, The Old Rectory, 2 High Street, Cottenham
- [S/3796/17/FL](#) – Proposed dwelling, Haelan Feld Farm, Twenty Pence Road, Cottenham
- [S/3385/17/FL](#) – Proposed re-roofing works to existing conservatory, single roof light, with external piers to support roof, 69 Lambs Lane, Cottenham. **AMENDMENT:** Alteration to design of side elevation

### Tree Orders

- [S/3647/17/TC](#) – Holly (T1) - Crown reduce approx. 15-20% to give a more uniform crown shape. Crown lift to 3m - Strip out Ivy & remove deadwood - Thin out conflicting & crossing branches. Sever Passion Flower & remove from crown, 85 Rooks Street, Cottenham
- [S/3686/17/TC](#) - Weeping Ash in centre - reduce weight by shortening damaged limb within 1m of guard top, The Pond, High Street, Cottenham
- [S/3706/17/TC](#) - 1. 2no Yew trees on frontage left hand side of driveway - reduce spread over driveway & path to front by approx. 1.5m, crown lift to approximately 3m, remove ivy & clean out crown 2. Holly - remove ivy & prune to clear house by approx. 2m, clean out crown 3. Viburnum tinus left hand side of driveway - crown reduce by approx. 20% to reduce size & shape 4. 5no small Holly trees - fell to ground level & treat stumps to prevent re-growth 5. Pleached Hornbeam hedge on left hand boundary - trim top & both sides, remove low hanging growth but retain low screen (do not raise crown) 6. Chinese Privet tree in left hand rear corner - crown reduce by approx. 30% 7. Leaning pollarded Elm on left hand boundary - sectionally dismantle to ground level 8. Beech in centre of rear garden - crown thin by 20-25% & clean out crown 9. Climber on back of house - reduce height to bottom of 1st floor windows, 343 High Street, Cottenham
- [S/3718/17/TC](#) - 1. Ash - crown reduce by 4-5m & remove dead wood & epicormics 2. Lime on right hand side - crown thin 35% & prune to clear Hawthorn 3. Juniper - fell & grind stump, 328 High Street

### SCDC Decisions

#### Approvals:

- [S/3110/17/PA](#) – Prior approval for a proposed single storey rear extension, 59 Coolidge Gardens, Cottenham
- [S/3004/17/FL](#) - Creation of a vehicle recovery depot including the erection of a portable office and portable building for vehicle inspection and storage, Dickerson Industrial Site, Ely Road, Landbeach

#### Refused:

- [S/3018/17/LB](#) - Internal alterations to form bathroom and alterations to existing internal doorways along with insertion of rooflight to new bathroom, 193 High Street, Cottenham
- [S/3238/17/FL](#) - Proposed demolition of existing outbuildings and erection of 1No detached dwelling, Cambridge Alpine, Histon Road, Cottenham

## 17P/203. Planning Appeal (Land between 117 & 123, Histon Road, Cottenham)

### TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 APPEAL UNDER SECTION 78

**Site Address:** Land between 117 & 123, Histon Road, Cottenham,  
Cambridge, CB24 8UQ  
**Description of development:** New Dwelling  
**Application reference:** S/1225/17/OL  
**Applicant:** Mr & Mrs Hardy  
**Appeal reference:** APP/W0530/W/17/3184497  
**Appeal start date:** 24 October 2017

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 2 of The Town and Country Planning (Appeals) (Written Representations Procedure)(England) Regulations 2009, as amended.

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 make comments, or modify/withdraw your previous representation, you can do so on the GOV.UK website at <https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk> or by emailing EAST1@pins.gsi.gov.uk. If you do not have access to the internet, you can send **three** copies to:

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

**All representations must be received by 28-Nov-2017.** Any representations submitted after the deadline will not usually be considered and will be returned. The Planning Inspectorate does not acknowledge representations. **All representations must quote the appeal reference.**

Please note that any representations you submit to the Planning Inspectorate will be copied to the appellant and this local planning authority and will be considered by the Inspector when determining the appeal.

The appeal documents are available for inspection at South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambourne between 08:30 – 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.

You can get a copy of one of the Planning Inspectorate's 'Guide to taking part in planning appeals' booklets free of charge from GOV.UK at <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/taking-part-in-a-planning-listed-building-or-enforcement-appeal> or from us.

When made, the decision will be published on the GOV.UK website.

## 17P/204. Planning Appeal (40 Telegraph Street, Cottenham)

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

**Site Address:** 40 , Telegraph Street, COTTENHAM, CB24 8QU  
**Description of development:** Proposed Two Storey Rear Extension  
**Application reference:** S/1857/17/FL  
**Applicant:** Ms JENNA MURPHY  
**Appeal reference:** APP/W0530/D/17/318386  
**Appeal start date:** 24 October 2017

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 NSI.HAS@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 NSI.HAS@pins.gsi.gov  
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.

## 17P/205. Fly tipping

Not a PC issue as such but one which, I think, it should now involve itself directly.

a) There is a trailer which has been dumped in the lay-bye directly opposite the new Jone's bungalow on Lockspit; Chris Bradley hopes to get it sorted (and I'm confident that he will) but technically (as with below) there is a County involvement being highways related, and raises

b) the bigger issue on Setchell. For some years now I, David Norman, and others have made various complaints about the fly-tipping on Setchell Drove, but it continues unabated and the cumulative, visual, impact on that area of the 'open countryside' is, now, simply disgraceful, intolerable and a shameful stain on the so-called beautiful SC (thus Cottenham) open vista described in the SC Local Plan.

SCDC are responsible for environmental health; the County for highways and the verges; landowners for their margins. In a show of respect for the countryside, the wider community, and their relative responsibilities it is, surely, time that each of the parties was forced to discharge their duty to the community from which, in 2 of 3 cases, they levy taxes to pay for such!

Landowners are victims of fly-tipping and may use builders rubble, in some entrances, to prevent encroachment on their land; but they are innocent bystanders regarding tipped household waste et al and so, given the inequity of existing law, should not have to share in the removal costs of such.

The three District Cllrs have long been aware of the problem but have been only too happy to accept Environmental Health contentions that: (i) highways issues are not their problem (true) and (ii) there is no risk to health from the nature of the 'dumps' - this is, of course, the proverbial "b-s": a dump is a dump and no less hazardous than the land-fill sites bordering Long Drove. Perhaps PC could put pressure on the DC's to take a more pragmatic approach to 'rubbish'.

I can only hope that PC will look beyond its framework and grapple with this problem - a "site" visit by 4 or 5 would be an eye opener for all - for it's a problem that will not be resolved until the "authorities" decide that protection of the open countryside is not just planning rhetoric but an environmental goal in which urban filth has no part to play

