

AGENDA REPORTS PACK

PLANNING COMMITTEE

20th August 2020

20P/123. Minutes

DRAFT Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

Meeting held via Zoom on Thursday 23rd July 2020 at 7.30pm

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

In attendance: SCDC Cllrs Gough and Wilson, Michael Sexton (Case Officer - SCDC) and Liz Watts (Chief Executive - SCDC), Cllr Peter Dunkley (Rampton Parish Council) and 3 members of the public

20P/111. Chairman's Introduction and Apologies – Apologies accepted from Cllr Graves (work).

20P/112. Any Questions from the Public or Press – Standing Orders suspended 7.33pm. Resident 1 and Cllr Dunkley stated an interest in the This Land application.

20P/113. To accept Declarations of Interest and Dispensations – Cllr Bolitho declared an Other interest in item S/2183/19/COND4 and will take no part in discussions.

20P/114. Minutes – Resolution that the minutes of the Committee meeting held on 9th July 2020 be signed as a correct record. Proposed Cllr Ward and seconded by Cllr Collinson.

RESOLVED.

20P/115. Planning Applications:

- **S/4207/19/RM** - Approval of matters reserved for appearance landscaping layout and scale following (after appeal) outline planning permission S/2876/16/OL for a residential development comprising 154 dwellings including access, Land North East Of Rampton Road Cottenham – Cllr Morris ran through the background to the development. Noted that the transport information regarding pedestrians was inaccurate. Resident 4 joined the meeting at 7.36pm. Potential issues considered were:
 1. 2ha conflict between outline permission and reserved matters application (T&C Art 6) – despite the smaller site compared to the Outline permission, This Land is still trying to fit in the same number of houses. Standing Orders suspended 7.58pm. Mr Sexton confirmed that after outline stage you can apply for reserved matters approval within a smaller red line boundary. Standing Orders reinstated 7.59pm.
 2. Appeal condition 4 references a masterplan with no need for access road to extended Primary School – appeal site didn't have access road going across the Recreation Ground which could have had a material effect on the appeal decision (road was shown in a different location at the top of the site). The County Council has required This Land to provide an access road stub. Noted that in the Persimmon RM application, Persimmon were prevented by County Highways from having a stub road without a specific reason.
 3. Appeal Inspector, although discounting the SCDC Local Plan and Cottenham Neighbourhood Plan, believed a plan respecting the Village Design Statement was feasible – street patterns of the VDS haven't been followed. Concerns regarding 'scene 4' behind Rampton Road existing houses - very uncharacteristic and none of them are architecturally correct for Cottenham (they have high roof pitches and lofty gables).
 4. Possible conflict of interest for County Councillors on SCDC Planning Committee as This Land Limited is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Cambridgeshire County Council – correct declarations will need to be observed by those Councillors.
 5. The layout is not substantially different from that originally refused by SCDC – it could be much better for CPC sport – but the condition, cost and area of the recreational area to be transferred isn't clear.

6. Conflict with NP COH/1-1 – a key vista will be blocked by proposed houses despite CPC slimming down Local Green Space at LKW to allow clearer views through the site – one of the original reasons for refusal was this vista. This Land/Bidwells have gone to great lengths to say that it's not important however the Neighbourhood Plan now carries significant weight and it was a strong enough reason for SCDC to refuse permission originally. The NP examiner has clarified and supported those vistas.

7. Conflict with NP COH/1-5 design and layout conflicts with VDS – house designs are too uniform and we need to push for more variety.

8/9. Conflict with NP COH/1-7 can Les King Wood be included and/or developed as POS/SUDS? and Conflict with NP COH/2-2 - drainage conditions are not robust enough (c.f. Persimmon 8 etc.) – The SUDS are incorporated into the LGS which compromises it. This could make Les King Wood unusable as LGS/public open space. Noted that the site drainage all heads towards the LGS which, once developed, will make already wet land much wetter. An underground tank is being proposed but will it be large enough to have a material effect on surface water? Noted that currently This Land don't have the legally necessary permission from the Internal Drainage Board to discharge into the Catchwater Drain. There is also no long term drainage management plan in place as would be required – and was applied to both Persimmon and Redrow RM approvals - by the equivalent of condition "Persimmon 8" in Cottenham. This Land have admitted that the land isn't permeable enough for normal drainage systems to work. Landscape Officer report notes that trees will further compromise the drainage crates under the green space in the centre of the site. Considered the drainage design is not robust enough and there was insufficient information.

10. County Council have confirmed to CPC their intention to expand CPS despite safety issues with traffic on Lambs Lane which will make a rear access essential yet affects safety of sports area. Need to raise this matter with the decision makers to decide how important this factor is. There are site and safety factors which need more consideration.

11. The application proposes the installation of a low-level wooden fence around the rear of the site, replacing the existing hedgerow. It was noted that section 3.3 of the Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy prepared on behalf of This Land believed the hedgerow habitats were to be retained throughout the development (including the one at the front of the site). The report states that the hedgerows were considered to be a 'habitat of principal importance' and that their retention will continue to provide a 'wildlife corridor for commuting bats (protected species) as well as habitat for birds and other invertebrates'. Therefore the removal of these hedgerows would be contrary to policy NH/4.2, 4.3 and 4.6 and go against the strong green ethos of SCDC. The Neighbourhood Plan policy COH/1-1 also advocates that screens of hedges should be incorporated within and around sites to create wildlife corridors. Standing Orders suspended 8.33pm. Mr Sexton stated that this was a useful observation and a material consideration. Standing Orders reinstated 8.35pm.

Standing Orders suspended 8.40pm. Resident 1 spoke regarding his principal objection to the houses proposed behind the existing row on Rampton Road. No regard has been given to existing residents and how they will be overlooked,

especially as his house extends fully to his boundary adjacent to the site. Resident 1 as also concerned that the vistas from the Recreation Ground and allotments will be lost. Liz Watts stated that the meeting was really helpful and she was thanked for attending. Cllr Peter Dunkley spoke on behalf of Rampton PC regarding site access and traffic. There are grave concerns that Rampton will be used as a rat run so they will be looking at traffic calming again. SCDC Cllr Gough stated that Rampton should come along to the next developer liaison meeting and will arrange an invite.

Resident 2, a neighbour of Resident 1, spoke to reiterate comments regarding loss of privacy to existing Rampton Road residents, drainage concerns and site access safety. Standing Orders reinstated 8.51pm.

Cllr Morris and the Clerk to collate response and suggest changes to the application. CPC recommend refusal subject to recommendations to make the application more acceptable. Proposed Cllr Ward and seconded by Cllr Collinson. **REFUSED**. Residents, SCDC Cllrs Gough and Wilson, Liz Watts and Michael Sexton left the meeting at 8.52pm.

- **S/2183/19/CONDA** - Condition 4 Roof light information, 193 High Street, Cottenham – CPC recommends refusal unless it is confirmed that there is no permanent structural change. Proposed Cllr Morris and seconded by Cllr Jones. **REFUSED**.
- **20/02575/FUL** - Erection of a two-storey dwelling and garage, Land At The Back Of 69 Rooks Street Cottenham – Noted that Millfield isn't an adopted highway with no safe pedestrian access and a very narrow entrance. Discussion regarding whether the development was out of scale for the plot size. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Collinson and seconded by Cllr Ward. **APPROVED**.
- **20/02599/FUL** - Demolition of existing bungalow and ancillary buildings and construction of 1 No. 4 Bed chalet style bungalow, 113 Histon Road, Cottenham – CPC recommend approval subject to adequate arrangements for construction traffic management, landscaping and drainage. Proposed Cllr Jones and seconded by Cllr Ward. **APPROVED**.
- **20/02608/HFUL** - Proposed demolition of existing garage and erection of new single storey extension to the rear/side of the property, 40 Pelham Way, Cottenham – concerns that there is no room for parking once the garage is removed and that the proposed extension was overdevelopment of the site. CPC recommends refusal. Proposed Cllr Ward and seconded by Cllr Collinson. **REFUSED**.
- **20/02751/FUL** - Conversion of an outbuilding into a 2 bedroom bungalow, Land rear of 160 Histon Road, Cottenham – inaccuracies in the Design and Access statement noted ie. Location is more than a 'short walk' from the centre of the village. No landscaping plans provided or report to back up that the building is structurally sound. No details given regarding access road width. CPC recommends approval subject to satisfactory parking, access, landscaping arrangements. Proposed Cllr Ward and seconded by Cllr Morris. **APPROVED**.

Tree Works

- **20/1534/TTCA** - Eucalyptus on left hand side of house adjacent to boundary wall - fell in sections, clear brushwood and leave firewood in log length rings, 307 High Street, Cottenham. Noted that the application has now been approved.
- **20/1581/TTCA** - Corkscrew Willow in rear garden - repollard at original pollard points (unless slight alterations are necessary to improve shape / balance), 305 High Street, Cottenham. Noted that the application has now been approved.

SCDC – Refusals

- **20/01562/REM** - Approval of matters reserved for access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale following outline planning permission S/1930/19/OL for the erection of one dwelling, Land at the back of 64 Histon Road, Cottenham

20P/116. Anglian Water consultation – consider response to consultation to relocate Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant (by 19th August) – Cllr Jones to draft response.

20P/117. Enforcement – consider updates from Enforcement Officers and additional items for enforcement – Resolution for the Clerk to draft letter to express concerns regarding lack of enforcement regarding case 6/20. Proposed by Cllr Ward and seconded by Cllr Jones.

RESOLVED.

20P/118. Date of next meeting – 6th August 2020

20P/119. Close of meeting – 9.40pm.

Signed _____ (Chair) Date _____

20P/124. Planning Applications

- [20/03276/HFUL](#) - Proposed new two storey and single storey extensions to the rear of the existing property to replace existing single storey extension and new garage/workshop to the garden area, 33 Lambs Lane, Cottenham
- [S/4207/19/RM](#) - Approval of matters reserved for appearance landscaping layout and scale following outline planning permission S/2876/16/OL for a residential development comprising 154 dwellings including access, Land North East Of Rampton Road Cottenham (**AMENDMENT:** Submission of Affordable Housing Tenure Plan)
- [20/03317/HFUL](#) & [20/03318/LBC](#) - Proposed demolition of existing rear outbuildings / extensions and erection of single storey extension and internal alterations, 214 High Street, Cottenham
- [20/03304/HFUL](#) - Proposed two storey side extension and single storey rear extension with front porch addition, 48 Victory Way, Cottenham
- [20/03209/HFUL](#) - Proposed new single storey porch to the front of the property, 3 Foudary Close, Cottenham

Tree Works

- [20/1534/TTCA](#) - Eucalyptus on left hand side of house adjacent to boundary wall - fell in sections, clear brushwood and leave firewood in log length rings, 307 High Street,

SCDC – Refusals

- [20/01562/REM](#) - Approval of matters reserved for access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale following outline planning permission S/1930/19/OL for the erection of one dwelling, Land at the back of 64 Histon Road, Cottenham

For information only

- [S/1225/17/CONDA](#) - Submission of details required by conditions 7 (Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree protection strategy) and 8 (Construction Method Statement (CMS)) of planning permission S/1225/17/OL, Land Between 117 & 123 Histon Road, Cottenham
- [S/1225/17/CONDB](#) - Submission of details required by conditions 5 (drainage and soakaway, 6 drainage and soakaway) of planning permission S/1225/17/OL,

20P/125. Appeal: 85 Histon Road

Reference: S/3697/19/FL
Proposal: Replacement dwelling
Site address: 85 Histon Road Cottenham Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB24 8UQ
Appellant: Mr Clark
Inspectorate Ref: APP/W0530/W/20/3255174
Appeal Start Date: 29th July 2020

I refer to the above details. An appeal has been made to the Secretary of State against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council to refuse the application.

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 online at <https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk>. If you do not have access to the internet, you can send your comments to: The Planning Inspectorate, Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Bristol, BS1 6PN. (Email: RT2@planninginspectorate.gov.uk).

All representations must be received by 2nd September 2020 . 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 comments 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 online at <https://applications.greatercambridgeplanning.org/online-applications/PLAN/S/3697/19/FL> .

Due to the impact of Covid-19 our normal arrangements to make appeal documents freely available to view in our offices is not possible to support at this time.

The Council's Statement should be available by **2nd September 2020**.

When made, the decision will be published online at <https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

Yours sincerely

Sumaya Nakamya
Planning Officer

20P/126. Appeal: 35 Beach Road

Reference: S/4411/19/FL
Proposal: Detached Annex
Site address: 35 Beach Road Cottenham Cambridge Cambridgeshire
Appellant: Mr & Mrs Greg & Sue Benson
Inspectorate Ref: APP/W0530/W/20/3249946
Appeal Start Date: 4th August 2020

I refer to the above details. An appeal has been made to the Secretary of State against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council to refuse the application.

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 online at <https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk>. If you do not have access to the internet, you can send your comments to: The Planning Inspectorate, Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Bristol, BS1 6PN. (Email: RT2@planninginspectorate.gov.uk).

All representations must be received by 8th September 2020 . 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 comments 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 online at <https://applications.greatercambridgeplanning.org/online-applications/PLAN/S/4411/19/FL> .

Due to the impact of Covid-19 our normal arrangements to make appeal documents freely available to view in our offices is not possible to support at this time.

The Council's Statement should be available by **8th September 2020**.

When made, the decision will be published online at <https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

Yours sincerely

Sumaya Nakamya
Planning Officer

20P/127. Consultation re. changes to current planning system

Consultation description

This consultation sets out proposals for measures to improve the effectiveness of the current planning system. The 4 main proposals are:

- changes to the standard method for assessing local housing need
- securing of First Homes through developer contributions in the short term until the transition to a new system
- supporting small and medium-sized builders by temporarily lifting the small sites threshold below which developers do not need to contribute to affordable housing
- extending the current Permission in Principle to major development

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/907215/200805_Changes_to_the_current_planning_system_FINAL_version.pdf

Appendix 1.

List of applications where CPC has asked for it to go to SCDC Committee. NB: Incomplete list – still going through previous minutes

Planning Ref	Address	Mtg date	CPC recom'd	Referral allowed	Reason for refusal	Decision
20/01562/REM	Back of 64 Histon Rd	07/05/2020	Refusal		Concerns regarding access; track not wide enough to support pedestrian footway. The high-pitched ridge height makes it higher than the cottages in front. The proposal is overbearing in terms of mass and scale, particularly when sited adjacent to the greenbelt. The drainage proposals, such as they are, are inadequate in relation to the Neighbourhood Plan and no mention is made of run off rates. Numerous documents missing that are required under Outline permission	
20/01575/FUL	Labour Hall, 138 High St	07/05/2020	Refusal		Concerns that 2nd building was being packed in. Access to the rear property would be compromised if a car was parked outside the front building. Considered overdevelopment of the site. Only 1 parking space for the front property. Design of rear property doesn't relate to the existing buildings. The substation isn't disused and is still accessed occasionally; needs investigating further. No space for a turning circle for either property. Noted that the Tree Officer hasn't yet visited the site. The tree is large and a good specimen, visible from some distance along the High Street conservation area. Suspicion that there is Japanese Knotweed on the site which would require professional removal.	
S/4411/19/FL	35 Beach Rd	23/01/2020	Refusal		Occupancy condition on annexe	
20/02217/FUL	8 Mill Field	25/06/2020	Refusal		location of the site is well outside the development framework and is therefore contrary to Neighbourhood Plan policy COH/2-1 and Local Plan policy S/7.2.	

20/02234/RM	13 Ellis Close	25/06/2020	Refusal	Proximity to other buildings would seem to be closer than 25m to no.1 Cossington Close. Query regarding the 5m width as required under condition 5 of the outline permission – doesn't appear to comply. Inadequate parking provided for no.13 Ellis Close. Access is very close to no.11 Ellis Close, therefore impacting on residential amenity. Contrary to Neighbourhood Plan policy COH/1-5 c and f. Contrary to Local Plan policy H/16 bii, biii, biv, and bv
20/02283/FUL	9 Histon Road	25/06/2020	Refusal	application within the conservation area. Visibility onto the public highway is extremely poor and highway safety is of concern. The pavement is very narrow outside the existing property and vehicles turning right out of the access would have to pull onto the pavement to be able to see vehicles approaching from the direction of Histon. The south west elevation has a window that will overlook the garden, therefore impacting on neighbour amenity; noted that obscure glass has been mentioned as an option. Application is contrary to policy HQ/1a b) and d – it changes the linear pattern feature of Histon Road and is therefore out of keeping in terms of siting. No reference has been made to the Neighbourhood Plan and the application is contrary to COH/1-5 c