

AGENDA REPORTS PACK

PLANNING COMMITTEE

17th March 2016

16P/048.

Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

Held in the Village Hall, Recreation Ground, Cottenham on **Thursday 3rd March 2016 at 7.30pm**

Present: Cllrs Mudd (Chair), Collinson, Graves, McCarthy, Nicholas, Young and the Clerk

In attendance: 2 members of the public

- 16P/038. Chairman's Introduction and Apologies** – apologies accepted from Cllrs Bolitho (personal), Morris (personal) and Ward (work).
- 16P/039. Any Questions from the Public or Press – Standing orders to be suspended** – Resident spoke on behalf of 10/12/14 Pelham Way regarding S/0269/16/FL. Cllr Richards arrived at 7.31pm. Resident objections still stand to this latest application. Standing Orders reinstated at 7.33pm.
- 16P/040. 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 received.
- 16P/041. Minutes** – Cllr Heydon requested that the minutes were amended to reflect her query regarding Standing Orders. Chair stated that minutes don't have to be a verbatim record and should only record decisions. At the time Cllr Heydon raised the query the Chair had already ruled and move onto the next item. For future reference Cllr McCarthy should have been allowed to speak in relation to item S/3172/15/OL. Resolution that the minutes (circulated to members) of the Committee meeting held on 18th February be signed as a correct record. **RESOLVED.**
- 16P/042. Planning Applications for consideration.** Chair brought S/0269/16/FL forward on the agenda for the benefit of resident.
- **S/0269/16/FL** – 2 storey rear extension, 15 New Town, Cottenham. Standing Order suspended at 7.47pm. Cllr Heydon asked resident whether the objection to the 1st floor windows were due to the size or something else. Resident confirmed that the balcony would still overlook. Standing Orders reinstated at 7.50pm. Cllr Collinson queried whether the proposed extension had been drawn back. Standing Orders suspended at 7.51pm. Resident clarified that there was approx. 1m difference to the previous application. Standing Orders reinstated at 7.51pm. Cllr Young commented that the light survey stopped at 3pm so was slightly misleading. Would expect impact to be later in the day. There is a very large blank wall which houses on Pelham Way would look onto which is contrary to DP/2. CPC recommends refusal. **REFUSED.** Reasons for refusal:
 - Overbearing in bulk, size and scale
 - Out of keeping with the character and isn't subservient to the existing property
 - Doesn't relate sympathetically to existing properties (similar properties in one direction but not the other)
 - Loss of residential amenity to houses in Pelham Way due to ability to look into the rear gardens/living areas from the balcony
 - **S/0106/16/FL** – Extension and conversion of garage to form granny annexe, 90 Rooks Street, Cottenham. The design is very unprepossessing and not desirable in a

Conservation Area. The materials (uPVC) aren't acceptable in a Conservation Area. The annexe would be capable of independent living. CPC recommend refusal. **REFUSED.** Not in character with the existing surroundings and doesn't reflect or enhance the CA.

- **S/0054/16/FL** – Single storey rear extension, two storey side extension and front porch, 19 Courtyard Way, Cottenham. Changes do not impact on neighbours and similar extensions are already evident in the street. CPC recommends approval. **APPROVED.**
- **S/0327/16/LD** – Erection of double wooden gates with additional side gate to one side and wooden "fill in" to the other side, Mulberry Cottage, 28 High Street, Cottenham. CPC recommends approval. **APPROVED.**

For Information Only:

- **S/0272/16/PA** - Single storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory, 22 Rooks Street, Cottenham. NB: it was noted that that this would come within permitted development.
- **S/3131/15/NM** – Non material amendment to application S/2470/13/FL (erection of 3 bedroom dwelling, 2 Denmark Road, Cottenham)

SCDC Decision Notices

Approved:

- **S/3198/15/FL** – Single and two storey rear extensions, 2 Curringtons Close, Cottenham

Refused

- **S/2659/15/PA** – Prior approval for proposed change of use and alterations of agricultural building and land to 2 residential dwellings, Barn 1, The Lakes, Twentypence Road, Cottenham. Cllr Nicholas ran through the reasons for refusal for both this and S/2648/15/PA.
- **S/2648/15/PA** - Prior approval for proposed change of use and alterations of agricultural building and land to residential dwelling, Barn 2, The Lakes, Twentypence Road, Cottenham

Planning Inspectorate Decision Notices:

- **S/1195/15/FL** - replacement of existing detached garage with 3 bay oak-framed garage with barn style doors, 30 High Street, Cottenham. NB: interesting comment from the Inspector about proximity to listed buildings

Tree Orders

- 24 High Street – Larch in rear garden (adjacent to cart lodge): due to the poor specimen of this tree, we recommend the reduction by 40% and shape remaining crown to leave naturally balanced. CPC approves subject to Tree Officer comments.

16P/043. Date of next meeting – 17th March

16P/044. Close of meeting – 8.38pm.

Signed _____ (Chair) Date _____

16P/049.

Planning Applications for consideration

- [S/0266/16/FL](#) – Proposed new single storey front and rear extensions, 38 Brenda Gautrey Way, Cottenham
- [S/0529/16/FL](#) - First floor extension to existing garage and pitched roof addition to existing flat roofed extension to rear of main dwelling house, 157 High Street, Cottenham

SCDC Decision Notices

Approved:

- [S/2220/15/FL](#) – Change of use from warehouse to residential, 40 Church Lane, Cottenham

Withdrawn

- [S/0178/16/LB](#) – Removal of outbuilding, 2 storey extension and alterations to existing detached house, 81 Rooks Street, Cottenham

Tree Orders

- 24 High Street – Holly (to right & front of house): fell to ground level
- 11 Histon Road – T1: weeping ash, light crown reduction. T2 – Holly, fell. T3 – Laurel, reduce by half its height

16P/050. Planning appeal – to consider whether to submit further/amended written representation for application S/2713/15/RM, land r/o 31 Histon Road, Cottenham

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

Site Address: Land to rear of 31, Histon Road, Cottenham, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire, CB24 8UF

Description of development: Reserved Matters Application for Access, Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale following approved Outline Consent for erection of dwelling and garage (S/0900/15/OL)

Application reference: S/2713/15/RM

Applicant: Malcolm Dee

Appeal reference: APP/W0530/W/16/3143124

Appeal start date: 04 March 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 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 Planning Portal at <https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk> or by emailing ct3@pins.gsi.gov.uk. If you do not have access to the internet, you can send **three** copies to:

The Planning Inspectorate
Room 3/04
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN.

All representations must be received by 08-Apr-2016. 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 Planning Portal.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'JB' with a stylized flourish.

Julie Baird

Head of Development Management, Planning and New Communities

16P/051. Planning appeal – to consider attendance at planning hearing at 10am on 19th April for S/1248/15/FL, erection of 4 dwellings, land NW of 14 Ivatt Street, Cottenham

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

Site Address: Land North-West of 14, Ivatt Street, Cottenham,
Cambridge, Cambridgeshire, CB24 8SJ

Description of Development: Erection of Four Dwellings

Application reference: S/1248/15/FL

Applicant: Aspire Residential Ltd

Appeal reference: APP/W0530/W/15/3134422

I am writing regarding the above appeal which is to be decided by way of a Hearing.

An Inspector has been appointed by the Secretary of State, under paragraph 1(i) of schedule 6 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to determine this appeal.

The hearing will commence at 10.00am on 19-Apr-2016 at the Council Offices, South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambourne Business Park, Cambourne, Cambridge CB23 6EA. The sitting days are at the Inspector's discretion and may be changed once the hearing has opened.

Copies of the Council's and Appellant's statements and any further representations can be inspected at South Cambridgeshire Hall during office hours. You are advised to telephone beforehand to ensure the relevant documents are available when you visit. You can contact our offices on 03450 450 500.

You may attend the hearing if you wish and at the Inspector's discretion, give your views.

If you attend the hearing by car, the car park at the Council Offices, South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambourne is on a first come first serve basis. Please do not park in the visitor car parking bays as these are for short-term parking only.

If you require disabled facilities please telephone 03450 450 500 and ask for our main reception desk to confirm suitable arrangements such as parking, access and seating.

If you wish to be notified of the outcome of the appeal, a copy will be published on the Planning Portal. <https://acp.planningportal.gov.uk/>. The Council does not notify parties of appeal decisions.

Yours faithfully



Julie Baird

Head of Development Management, Planning and New Communities

16P/052. Major planning applications – Consider 1st follow-up representations to SCDC on major planning applications – Cllrs McCarthy/Morris/Young

Draft submission:

Further to our letter of xx/xx/2015 Cottenham Parish Council has undertaken a community survey as part of the Neighbourhood Plan process. This questionnaire-based survey was completed by over 20% of the residents of the village aged over 16. The advice we have from the marketing company employed to assist us in this work is that the results are sufficiently robust statistically to represent the views of the entire village population. Some of the emerging findings are relevant to this planning application and reinforce some of our earlier comments. They are detailed below:

1. The survey indicated that 45% of residents already have concerns about the volume of traffic and speeding in the village. 84% of respondents feel that development will bring more traffic and as such the additional traffic generated is sufficient in itself to refuse DP/3 2k.
2. 63% of residents wanted to see improvements in public transport links to Cambridge with only 11% currently using the bus 4 or more times a week. Bus services run at 20 minute intervals and a shorter journey time to Cambridge was the single most-cited (78%) incentive to use bus services more. This issue is not sufficiently addressed by the Travel Plan.
3. The survey indicated that 66% of residents were not in favour of large developments and, as we have commented previously, built on the periphery of the village environment. As such the development fails to be sustainable (DP/1 1 b – minimise the need to travel and reduce car dependency) and NPPF 34, 35, 37 and 38.
4. 90% of respondents considered that preserving the character of the village and conservation area is important. This very real perception of residents and the need for protection is supported by NPPF 131, 132, 134 and 138.
5. In the survey the need to increase pre-school provision was identified by 44% of respondents. The development fails to meet NPPF 72.
6. Increased pressure on Medical facilities was identified as a significant problem by 75% of residents. Also as previously commented these facilities are currently located an unsustainable distance from the development site. The development fails to meet DP/1 1 m and DP/3 1f
7. The survey identified that 57% saw the development of local employment as being important. The development fails to meet NPPF 17 and 19. Without local provision it will increase local commuter traffic. (DP/1 1b – minimise the need to travel and reduce car dependency).
8. Leisure facilities were seen as inadequate by 68% of residents in the survey. The proposed development is located an unsustainable distance away from the core of the village. The development fails to meet DP/1 1 m and DP/3 1f. There is no meaningfully sustainable way for residents from established areas of the village to use any facilities onsite due to its remoteness. NPPF 59
9. A clear view (62%) from the survey is the value of having one primary school serving the whole village. Alterations to this structure are perceived as having a detrimental effect and overloading of a Primary School is contrary to NPPF 72. The recently-completed extension was only built to cope with the current capacity of 630; already one of the largest in Cambridgeshire. Any increase in capacity would need to be handled sensitively to limit damage to the cohesive role the school plays in the village. DP/1 1m, DP/4 2 15.
10. Residents were also asked to consider that if development did take place what benefits could arise. Of the benefits that residents listed, the current development proposal would make a negligible contribution that would be significantly outweighed by the adverse impacts of the proposals. Indeed the 2030 vision that residents have for the village is that it should be an attractive village (59%) accessible(57%), improved access around and out of the village, rural and not suburban (95%). The development would have a detrimental impact in village amenity in this regard. In the survey, most residents (68%) are concerned about the potential loss of the village's character as a result of development.

In addition, our assessment of the Transport Plan indicates that traffic generated will be significantly higher than can be predicted from a TRICS analysis due to the difficulty of replicating the particular characteristics of an affluent village adjacent to a unique fast-growing city like Cambridge, especially its north and west. Many of these jobs are in high technology and related services requiring long hours by a committed, work-force which cannot be supported by slow bus services. The development is likely to create severe traffic issues.

An added complication is the likely reversal of significant traffic flows on Oakington Road when its access to the A14 is closed in the planned development; a change which is likely to bring more traffic NW up Oakington Road, adding to the congestion on Rampton and Histon Roads.