

## **AGENDA REPORTS PACK**

### **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**3<sup>rd</sup> September 2020**

## 20P/134. Minutes

### DRAFT Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

Meeting held via Zoom on Thursday 20<sup>th</sup> August 2020 at 7.30pm

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

**20P/120. Chairman's Introduction and Apologies** – Apologies accepted from Cllrs Collinson (personal) and Graves (work).

**20P/121. Any Questions from the Public or Press** – None present.

**20P/122. To accept Declarations of Interest and Dispensations** – Noted that CPC grounds contractor is the applicant for item 20/0376/HFUL. No direct financial interest.

**20P/123. Minutes** – Resolution that the minutes of the Committee meeting held on 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2020 be signed as a correct record. Proposed Cllr Ward and seconded by Cllr Morris. **RESOLVED.**

#### **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. Discussions regarding size of garage and usage. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Ward and seconded by Cllr Morris. **APPROVED.**
- **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). No further comments. Proposed Cllr Jones and seconded by Cllr Morris. **NO COMMENT.**
- **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. Proposal considered an improvement. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Ward and seconded by Cllr Jones. **APPROVED.**
- **20/03304/HFUL** - Proposed two storey side extension and single storey rear extension with front porch addition, 48 Victory Way, Cottenham. Noted that there had been recent flooding in the vicinity on 13<sup>th</sup> August 2020 and there was no information regarding the soakaway. CPC recommends approval subject to proper attention to soakaway. Proposed Cllr Ward and seconded by Cllr Jones. **APPROVED.**
- **20/03209/HFUL** - Proposed new single storey porch to the front of the property, 3 Foudary Close, Cottenham. CPC recommends approval. 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. No comments.

#### **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** – consider written representation to appeal for application S/3697/19/FL for replacement dwelling (by 2<sup>nd</sup> September) – Standby previous comments with additional comment of being contrary to Neighbourhood Plan COH/1-5c. Clerk to submit response. Proposed Cllr Ward and seconded by Cllr Jones. **RESOLVED.**

**20P/126. Appeal: 35 Beach Road** – consider written representation to appeal for application S/4411/19/FL for a detached annexe (by 8<sup>th</sup> September) – Standby previous comments with additional comment of being contrary to Neighbourhood Plan COH/1-5c. Clerk to submit response. Proposed Cllr Jones and seconded by Cllr Ward. **RESOLVED.**

**20P/127. Consultation re. changes to current planning system** – consider response to consultation which sets out proposals for measures to improve the effectiveness of the current planning system (by 1<sup>st</sup> October) – Cllr Jones outlined. May need to take in conjunction with other ongoing consultations. Cllr Jones to draft response and circulate. Item to be brought back to next planning meeting.

**20P/128. Enforcement** – consider updates from Enforcement Officers and additional items for enforcement – Case 6/19 – Cllr Morris commented that it was less than 10 years; Clerk to feedback to Enforcement. Case 3-19 – waiting case officer response. Case 5/17 – supposed to be 6 monthly checked but these haven't been done. Need to maintain pressure on SCDC to do necessary checks.

**20P/129. Date of next meeting** – 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2020

**20P/130. Close of meeting** – 8.42pm.

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

## 20P/135. Planning Applications

- [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 (AMENDMENT), Land NE of Rampton Road, Cottenham
- [20/03282/TELNOT](#) - Regulation 5 notification for the removal and replacement of 3 no. antennas, the installation of 1 no. GPS node and associated ancillary works, Existing Mast, Beach Road, Cottenham
- [20/03305/FUL](#) - Permanent retention of existing log cabin used for residential purposes, Bassenhally Farm, Broad Lane, Cottenham
- [20/03460/PRI03Q](#) - Prior approval for the change of use and conversion of an agricultural building to 1 no. dwellinghouse (Class C3), Lingwood Farm, Smithy Fen, Cottenham
- [20/03377/FUL](#) - Reduction in size of retail unit, conversion of rear part of ground floor of commercial unit to residential, conversion of first floor of retail unit to residential use and the erection of a single dwelling to rear of site, 76 High Street, Cottenham
- [S/1617/19/VC](#) - Variation of conditions 31 (Rampton Road and Oakington Road roundabout improvements), 32 (Footway/Cycleway from site entrance to existing footway), 33 (Widening of footway/cycleway to junction with Rampton Road), 34 (Widening of Rampton Road footway) and 35 (Bus Stop Improvement) of planning permission S/1606/16/OL, Land At Oakington Road, Cottenham

### Tree Orders

- [20/1799/TTCA](#) – Removal of Golden Elm, 11 Histon Road, Cottenham
- [20/1800/TTCA](#) - T1 Eucalyptus Fell Underestimated how large this tree would grow, unsuitable for garden; T2 Yew Fell Major roots encroaching on house, concerned for foundations – 12 Cundell Drive, Cottenham

### SCDC – Approvals

- [20/02751/FUL](#) - Conversion of an outbuilding into a 2 bedroom bungalow, Land r/o 160 Histon Road, Cottenham

### For information only

- [S/0208/18/CONDA](#) - Submission of details required by condition 4 (1:20 scale drawings of all proposed windows and doors) of planning permission S/0208/18/FL, 87 High Street, Cottenham
- [S/3672/19/CONDA](#) - Submission of details required by conditions 2 (Contamination), 3 (Surface water drainage), 4 (Foul water drainage) and 5 (Scheme of biodiversity enhancement and management) of prior approval S/3672/19/PA
- [S/2549/19/NMA1](#) – Non-material amendment of planning permission S/2549/19/RM changes to the planning layout and boundary treatments plan, Land to The South West Rampton Road, Cottenham
- [S/1510/17/CONDA](#) - Submission of details required by condition 6 (Workshop Doors) of listed building consent S/1510/17/LB, 120 High Street, Cottenham

## 20P/136. Consultation re. changes to current planning system

# Changes to the current planning system Consultation on changes to planning policy and regulations

August 2020 Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government

Summary for Cottenham Parish Council

Prepared by Tim Jones / Frank Morris

Responses by: 1<sup>st</sup> Oct 2020 (8 weeks from 6<sup>th</sup> August)

### Introduction

The [Planning for the Future](#) white paper describes a fundamental reform of planning laws, regulations and policies in England to improve efficiency and deliver the government's target of 300,000 new dwellings per year (2019 actual – 241,000).

This consultation sets out and seeks views on four main proposals:-

- *changes to the standard method for assessing local housing need, which as well as being a proposal to change guidance in the short term has relevance to proposals for land supply reforms set out in Planning for the Future;*
- *securing of First Homes, sold at a discount to market price for first time buyers, including key workers, through developer contributions in the short term until the transition to a new system;*
- *temporarily lifting the small sites threshold below which developers do not need to contribute to affordable housing, to up to 40 or 50 units to support SME builders as the economy recovers from the impact of Covid-19;*
- *extending the current Permission in Principle to major development so landowners and developers now have a fast route to secure the principle of development for housing on sites without having to work up detailed plans first.*

### The standard method for assessing housing numbers in strategic plans

- The standard method provides a first step to determining the number of houses required
- A method for determining a 'binding' housing requirement will be developed from the proposals set out in "Planning for the Future" (Para 5)
- This revised calculation described in this consultation which will be used as part of the binding calculation, but also to provide a baseline for current planning needs
- Intent is to
  - *Ensure it is more agile in using up-to-date data.*
  - *Achieve a better distribution of homes where homes are identified in more high-demand areas and in emerging demand areas (boost supply to improve affordability in high demand areas*
  - *Provide stability to the method by smoothing out areas of potential volatility*
  - *Be consistent with the Government's ambition for a housing market that supports 300,000 homes*
- Proposed method:
  - Step 1: Set a baseline

- 0.5% of current (planning authority) housing stock using the higher of existing or projected annual growth over 10 years
  - Step 2: Adjust for market signals based on affordability
    - Calculate an adjustment factor to be applied to the baseline based on the current local Affordability Ratio and the change over ten years
    - Affordability ratio (AR) is median house price divided by median income (South Cams is around 9 in 2019)
    - AR is usually fairly stable over long periods
    - If the local AR is greater than 4 (max allowed for mortgages), the adjustment factor will increase the baseline figure by 6.25% per point difference
    - Similarly if the AR is higher now than it was ten years ago the demand figure is increased by 25% for each point
    - For example, if current AR is 9 and was 8 ten years ago, the adjustment factor will be 1.56, i.e. the demand figure will be increased by 56% over the baseline
- There is a transition period for any authorities close to completing strategic plans without having to revise them based on this new calculation

### **Delivering First Homes**

- At least 25% of affordable homes in a development should be “First Homes” secured by s106 conditions
- Various examples are shown how this requirement can be fitted around existing affordable housing policies
- Exceptions being considered for example where a development is solely for rent
- Transitional arrangements in place to support the need to change existing local and neighbourhood plans, those close to completion or developments close to permission where significant effort has already gone into planning
- Minimum discount is to be 30% against market value
- LAs can require 40 – 50% discounts, but this does not change the number of units required
- First Homes will be exempt of CIL. LAs are requested to use discretionary affordable housing relief to support delivery of First Homes
- Introducing a First Homes exception sites policy for small sites not in the local plan with flexibility to include some market homes to ensure viability
- Rural exception sites will be exempt from this

### **Supporting small and medium-sized developers**

- SMEs seen as important
  - Smaller sites tend to get built more quickly
  - Diversity in building design
- Difficult business model for small developers especially where they have to compete with national developers
- Small Sites (10 units or less) do not attract developer contributions
- Proposing to increase small site designation for a limited period (initial 18mths then review)
  - Small site designation to either 40 or 50 units
  - Small site area (current max 0.5 ha) to be increased by the same proportion
- Guidance to be prepared to ensure larger sites are not developed in “small site” phases to avoid contributions
- Rural small site threshold (5 units before contributions) will not be changed

### Extension of the Permission in Principle consent regime

- “Permission in Principle” can be given to small sites on brownfield land considering land use, location and scale and lasts for 5 yrs
- The technical details consent then considers design, tenure mix, transport etc.
- Proposal is to make this process available for large developments (*not subject to EIA or habitats assessments*) effectively restricting it to 150 houses or 5 ha
- The information required to support an application for Permission in Principle for large sites will be the same as those currently required for small sites
- Local Authorities will not be able to add further requirements
- “Planning for the Future” considers extending this process to any development identified in a local plan (i.e. including greenfield)
- Publicity requirements for Permission in Principle sites are lower than standard, however it is proposed to increase the requirement for large sites to reach as many people as possible.
- Statutory notifications are not changed
- Application fees are to be reduced, reflecting lower costs for the LA

### Consultation Questions

**Q1: Do you agree that planning practice guidance should be amended to specify that the appropriate baseline for the standard method is *whichever is the higher of* the level of 0.5% of housing stock in each local authority area OR the latest household projections averaged over a 10-year period?**

We presume that “household projections” refers to MHCLG’s household growth projections; in which case we concur that this “bi-lateral” approach leads to a balance between “catch-up replacement” in less vibrant areas and stock expansion in areas of higher economic demand with a similar outcome to that projected in Cottenham’s more complex analysis for its Neighbourhood Plan.

**Q2: In the stock element of the baseline, do you agree that 0.5% of existing stock for the standard method is appropriate? If not, please explain why.**

0.5% seems to be an arbitrary %age when the quality and deficiency of housing stock vary in different areas whether in terms of home insulation, age or match to population need. However, it does provide a baseline for stock improvement over time.

**Q3: Do you agree that using the workplace-based median house price to median earnings ratio from the most recent year for which data is available to adjust the standard method’s baseline is appropriate? If not, please explain why.**

This ratio appears vulnerable to “commuter” error – many people’s workplace is in a different local authority some distance from their home. This would seem to deflate the ratio in areas of expensive housing affordable only by the highly-paid and, worse, to decrease the ratio where the lower-paid commuters actually live.

**Q4: Do you agree that incorporating an adjustment for the change of affordability over 10 years is a positive way to look at whether affordability has improved? If not, please explain why.**

In principle, an adjustment is warranted. In practice, almost all houses are not truly or locally affordable (e.g. 3\* household income) – running the risk that any algorithmic approach is insensitive to local or specific needs.

**Q5: Do you agree that affordability is given an appropriate weighting within the standard method? If not, please explain why.**

Yes, affordability is a simple measure of the degree to which demand has outstripped supply and needs to be given appropriate weighting; the complication lies in the design of the corrective algorithm which may need an approach which is non-linear over time.

**Do you agree that authorities should be planning having regard to their revised standard method need figure, from the publication date of the revised guidance, with the exception of:**

**Q6: Authorities which are already at the second stage of the strategic plan consultation process (Regulation 19), which should be given 6 months to submit their plan to the Planning Inspectorate for examination?**

Time invested is not a good measure of fitness for purpose; a better test would be the degree to which the plan is expected to deliver the relevant housing shortfall.

**Q7: Authorities close to publishing their second stage consultation (Regulation 19), which should be given 3 months from the publication date of the revised guidance to publish their Regulation 19 plan, and a further 6 months to submit their plan to the Planning Inspectorate?**

Time invested is not a good measure of fitness for purpose; a better test would be the degree to which the plan is expected to deliver the relevant housing shortfall.

If not, please explain why. Are there particular circumstances which need to be catered for?

Many areas will have discrepancies between progress and status of Local Plans and Neighbourhood Plans. Given the stronger local input to Neighbourhood Plans and focus on local needs, NPs should be protected from arbitrary errors in the Local Plan for the surrounding area.

**Q8: The Government is proposing policy compliant planning applications will deliver a minimum of 25% of onsite affordable housing as First Homes, and a minimum of 25% of offsite contributions towards First Homes where appropriate. Which do you think is the most appropriate option for the remaining 75% of affordable housing secured through developer contributions? Please provide reasons and / or evidence for your views (if possible):**

1. i) Prioritising the replacement of affordable home ownership tenures, and delivering rental tenures in the ratio set out in the local plan policy.
2. ii) Negotiation between a local authority and developer.
3. iii) Other (please specify)

No view

**With regards to current exemptions from delivery of affordable home ownership products:**

**Q9: Should the existing exemptions from the requirement for affordable home ownership products (e.g. for build to rent) also apply to apply to this First Homes requirement?**

No view

**Q10: Are any existing exemptions not required? If not, please set out which exemptions and why.**

No view

**Q11: Are any other exemptions needed? If so, please provide reasons and /or evidence for your views.**

No view



**Q12: Do you agree with the proposed approach to transitional arrangements set out above?**

(regarding change in affordable housing provision for 25% First Homes)

No view

**Q14: Do you agree with the approach of allowing a small proportion of market housing on First Homes exception sites, in order to ensure site viability?**

Viability of small sites is an issue and prevents many Community Land Trusts and other small developers from bringing sites forward.

**Q15: Do you agree with the removal of the site size threshold set out in the National Planning Policy Framework?**

While the reduction in site size threshold may incentivise small developers to bring sites forward, this may penalise villages that have developed Neighbourhood Plans and might expect 25% of CIL payments.

**Q16: Do you agree that the First Homes exception sites policy should not apply in designated rural areas?**

Yes, flexibility is key if sites are to be brought forward in certain rural areas.

**For each of these questions, please provide reasons and / or evidence for your views (if possible):**

**Q17: Do you agree with the proposed approach to raise the small sites threshold for a time-limited period?**

Planning and delivery timescales are sufficiently long that the threshold would need to reduce for at least 5 years to provide sufficient certainty for small-scale developers.  
(see question 18 for comments on level of threshold)

**Q18: What is the appropriate level of small sites threshold?**

1. i) Up to 40 homes
2. ii) Up to 50 homes
3. iii) Other (please specify) smaller – no more than 30 homes

**Q19: Do you agree with the proposed approach to the site size threshold?**

**Q20: Do you agree with linking the time-limited period to economic recovery and raising the threshold for an initial period of 18 months?**

No, this period is too short to affect the market. The Community-Led Housing Fund is an example where many projects have been cut off because the availability of funding was a year or 18 months too short to realise many projects.

**Q21: Do you agree with the proposed approach to minimising threshold effects?**

No view

**Q22: Do you agree with the Government's proposed approach to setting thresholds in rural areas?**

Yes

**Q23: Are there any other ways in which the Government can support SME builders to deliver new homes during the economic recovery period?**

This could be the single most valuable outcome from this consultation. On-site operations can be seriously affected by COVID-19 safety procedures which often limit working within each house to just one person at a time ( a productivity loss of up to 30%) yet many tasks require co-operation between several workers. Specific just-in-time training and rapid certifications in the most-affected procedures could avoid uncertainties and safety breaches, especially if the costs of this training is incentivised by subsidy etc.

**Q24: Do you agree that the new Permission in Principle should remove the restriction on major development?**

Yes, but that does not make it right. Many smaller communities will be overwhelmed by inappropriate development as we have already seen with the consequences of 5-year land supply issues removing.

**Q25: Should the new Permission in Principle for major development set any limit on the amount of commercial development (providing housing still occupies the majority of the floorspace of the overall scheme)? Please provide any comments in support of your views.**

There must be a limit, otherwise a substantial non-hazardous chemical or other manufacturing plant could be embedded within a small housing community. Maybe the scale of the commercial development (in terms of expected employment count) could be related – within an acceptable range - to the housing development (in terms of expected occupation)?

**Q26: Do you agree with our proposal that information requirements for Permission in Principle by application for major development should broadly remain unchanged? If you disagree, what changes would you suggest and why?**

Transparency with the local community will be key and only satisfied by providing sufficient information for sufficiently long for trust to build.

**Q27: Should there be an additional height parameter for Permission in Principle? Please provide comments in support of your views.**

Yes, an isolated spike in the middle of a site cannot be right. Some limit on differential height between neighbouring buildings must be necessary.

**Q28: Do you agree that publicity arrangements for Permission in Principle by application should be extended for large developments? If so, should local planning authorities be:**

- i) required to publish a notice in a local newspaper?**
- ii) subject to a general requirement to publicise the application or**
- iii) both?**
- iv) disagree**

**If you disagree, please state your reasons.**

Publication in a local newspaper has very limited value these days, whereas “Contract Finder” and, even more so with COVID advice, “gov.uk” have become “go to” places for specific information such as this – why not an obligation to publicise on “PiP.uk” or equivalent?

**Q29: Do you agree with our proposal for a banded fee structure based on a flat fee per hectare, with a maximum fee cap?**

The cost of providing support infrastructure must vary across the country; a flat fee structure incentivises the developer to operate in the areas of highest margin, not highest need.

**Q30: What level of flat fee do you consider appropriate, and why?**

No view

**Q31: Do you agree that any brownfield site that is granted Permission in Principle through the application process should be included in Part 2 of the Brownfield Land Register? If you disagree, please state why.**

No view.

**Q32: What guidance would help support applicants and local planning authorities to make decisions about Permission in Principle? Where possible, please set out any areas of guidance you consider are currently lacking and would assist stakeholders.**

Local Planning Authorities often have inappropriate or out-of-date measures for the sustainability of their communities. There should always be an opportunity for the local Parish Council to update the key parameters to ensure relevance and accuracy whenever an application is put in train.

**Q33: What costs and benefits do you envisage the proposed scheme (Permission in Principle by Application for Large Sites) would cause? Where you have identified drawbacks, how might these be overcome?**

There is significant potential for a PIP to clash with an examined Neighbourhood Plan which should be allowed to take precedence over the PIP application.

**Q34: To what extent do you consider landowners and developers are likely to use the proposed measure (Permission in Principle by Application for Large Sites)? Please provide evidence where possible.**

Very likely and not necessarily in the ways intended. It could open up another wave of “5-year land supply” forced permissions in villages lacking the infrastructure to absorb them sustainably.

**Q35: In light of the proposals set out in this consultation, are there any direct or indirect impacts in terms of eliminating unlawful discrimination, advancing equality of opportunity and fostering good relations on people who share characteristics protected under the Public Sector Equality Duty?**

No view.

**If so, please specify the proposal and explain the impact. If there is an impact – are there any actions which the department could take to mitigate that impact?**



## 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	SCDC Decision
20/01562/REM	Back of 64 Histon Rd	07/05/2020	Refusal	NA	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	REFUSED
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	NA	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	REFUSED