

AGENDA REPORTS PACK

PLANNING COMMITTEE

24th September 2020

20P/143. Minutes

Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

Meeting held via Zoom on Thursday 3rd September 2020 at 7.30pm

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

20P/131. Chairman's Introduction and Apologies – Apologies accepted from The Clerk (personal) and Cllr Graves (work).

20P/132. Any Questions from the Public or Press – None present.

20P/133. To accept Declarations of Interest and Dispensations – Cllr Bolitho declared an Other Interest in item 20/03377/FUL. Cllr Collinson declared an Other Interest in item 20/1799/TTCA. Cllr Ward declared an Other Interest in item 20/03305/FUL.

20P/134. Minutes – Resolution that the minutes of the Committee meeting held on 20th August 2020 be signed as a correct record. Proposed Cllr Ward and seconded by Cllr Bolitho. **RESOLVED.**

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. CPC Previously responded on 6th August. 15 new documents added to planning application since. Most significant change is to access and design statement, and to biodiversity: retention of hedgerows. Reduced to 147 dwellings. No real material changes addressing CPC's previous comments. Still includes double row of houses. 3.2 Street scene - changed render of some dwellings but not addressed concerns over pitch of roofs. Resolution that Cllr Morris writes a response based on previous representation, including points raised above. Proposed Cllr Ward and seconded by Cllr Collinson. **RESOLVED** Resolution that Cllr Morris speaks on behalf of CPC at the SCDC planning committee meeting on 9th September 2020. Proposed Cllr Ward and seconded by Cllr Bolitho. **RESOLVED.** Cllr Morris to circulate speech to committee members prior to the SCDC meeting.
- **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. Noted.
- **20/03305/FUL** - Permanent retention of existing log cabin used for residential purposes, Bassenhally Farm, Broad Lane, Cottenham. Concerns raised regarding suitability for permanent residence. CPC has previously supported similar enterprises. Supported by NHP and LP. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Collinson and seconded by Cllr Morris. **APPROVED.** CPC strongly support a business in the countryside.
- **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. Within framework of existing building. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Ward and seconded by Cllr Jones. **APPROVED.**
- **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.

Noted that application is scaled down from previous application on site. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Ward and seconded by Cllr Jones. **APPROVED**.

- **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. CPC recommends approval subject to inclusion of following completion dates: Condition 31: completion date by end of October 2021 and Condition 32,33,34: completion date by end of October 2020. Proposed Cllr Ward and seconded by Cllr Jones. **APPROVED**

Tree Works

- **20/1799/TTCA** – Removal of Golden Elm, 11 Histon Road, Cottenham. CPC object to removal as no supporting information provided. Proposed Cllr Bolitho and seconded by Cllr Morris. **REFUSED**
- **20/1800/TTCA** - T1 Eucalyptus Fell Underestimated how large this tree would groww, unsuitable for garden; T2 Yew Fell Major roots encroaching on house, concerned for foundations – 12 Cundell Drive, Cottenham. CPC recommends approval of removal of Eucalyptus. Proposed Cllr Bolitho and seconded by Cllr Collinson. **APPROVED**. further details needed on size of yew, reason to remove does not seem appropriate. CPC object to removal of yew tree. Proposed Cllr Bolitho and seconded by Cllr Jones. **REFUSED**

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 – consider draft response to consultation which sets out proposals for measures to improve the effectiveness of the current planning system (by 1st October) – Cllr Morris ran through draft response. Cllr Morris and Jones to redraft, including comments from committee members, for consideration at next planning meeting.

20P/137. Enforcement – consider updates from Enforcement Officers and additional items for enforcement – Case 3/19 Clerk still waiting for a response from Tony Wallis, will be following up with Tumi Hawkins. Case 11/18 Resident has contacted Clerk with concerns regarding height of wall, and possible damage to pavement nearby. Assistant Clerk to follow up pavements with LHO.

20P/138. Date of next meeting – 22nd September 2020

20P/139. Close of meeting – 8.53pm.

Signed _____ (Chair) Date _____

20P/144. Planning Applications

- [20/03660/HFUL](#) - Conversion of existing garage to a study, 33 Brenda Gautrey Way, Cottenham
- [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 (AMENDMENT - Revised plans submitted 14th September following comments from Conservation Officer)
- [20/02234/REM](#) - Approval of matters reserved for access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale following outline planning permission S/0582/18/OL for two dwellings (Re-submission of S/4384/19/RM), Land At 13 Ellis Close, Cottenham (AMENDMENT: 1) Car parking; 2) Soft Landscaping; 3) Rearrangement of first floor bedroom window in Dwelling B; 4) Cycle Parking)

Tree Orders

- [20/1829/TTCA](#) – T1 - Acer, remove to ground level. T2 - Dead Cherry, remove to ground level, 60 Denmark Road, Cottenham
- [20/1879/TTCA](#) - 1 - Pear - Reduce overall height by 3m, reduce spread on all sides by 1-1.5m
2 - Triple stem Sycamore adjacent to garages - reduce height by 6m, reduce spread by 3-4m; 3 - Dying twin stem Sycamore adjacent – fell; 4 - Sycamore - reduce height by 4-5m, reduce spread by 2-3m; 5 - Cypress on rear boundary - reduce height by 2m, 2 Elm Barns, Cottenham
- [20/1930/TTCA](#) - Oak tree with split branch requires shortening by up to 5m to reduce weight. Adjacent split branch requires removal. The tree is on the East boundary and overhangs some of the most recent burials, All Saints Church, High Street, Cottenham

SCDC – Approvals

- [20/01627/FUL](#) – Installation of lighting scheme to car park, Recreation Ground, Lambs Lane, Cottenham
- [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
- [20/02599/FUL](#) - Demolition of existing bungalow and ancillary buildings and construction of 1 No.4 Bed chalet style bungalow, 113 Histon Road, Cottenham
- [20/02273/FUL](#) - Side extension to bungalow for a new double garage, Western Holme Bungalow, Smithy Fen, Engine Drove, Cottenham

SCDC – Refusals

- [S/0630/19/OL](#) - Outline application for residential development of land for a single storey dwelling with all matters reserved, Church Lane, Ashton Farm, Cottenham

For information only

- [S/4116/18/CONDA](#) – Submission of details required by condition 23 (Comprehensive construction programme) of planning permission S/4116/18/VC, Land to SW Rampton Road, Cottenham (Redrow)
- [S/4116/18/CONDB](#) - Submission of details required by condition 7 (Traffic management Plan), 12 (Species mitigation strategy), 13 (Specification for external illumination), 14 (Scheme for ecological enhancement), 15 (Written scheme of investigation), 16 (Surface water drainage scheme), 17 (Foul water drainage), 18 (Pollution control of the water environment), 22 (Measures to minimise the spread of airborne dust), 24 (Noise mitigation /insulation scheme), 28 (Artificial lighting scheme), 29 (Waste management & minimisation and refuse strategy), 30

(Renewable energy statement), 31(Water conservation strategy) & 32 (Fire hydrants) of planning permission S/4116/18/VC, Land to SW Rampton Road, Cottenham (Redrow)

- [S/4116/18/CONDC](#) - Submission of details required by condition 19 (Site Investigation and Remediation Method Statement) of planning permission S/4116/18/VC, Land to SW Rampton Road, Cottenham (Redrow)
- [S/4116/18/CONDD](#) - Submission of details required by condition 21 (Construction Noise Impact Assessment) of planning permission S/4116/18/VC, Land to SW Rampton Road, Cottenham (Redrow)

20P/144. PAS Review of Greater Cambridge Planning Committees

The Planning advisory Service has been called in to advise on improvements to the SCDC Planning service.

Apart from meeting various Officers and Planning Councillors, the PAS team arranged four focus groups of Parish Councillors / Clerks to test our experience with the system.

We covered a wide range of topics in the allotted hour:

- Time delays / overruns on planning applications
- Continued lack of engagement between Case Officers and PCs
- “System” flaws in the lack of cross-referencing of material on the planning portal
- Developer bias of Case Officers, especially when dealing with 5YS applications
- Dissatisfaction with the system of delegation
- Perceived political bias in the Planning Committee
- Lack of attention to detail when discharging planning conditions

The PAS team will be producing a report with recommended actions etc.

20P/145. Greater Cambridge Local Plan

SCDC is obliged to update the Local Plan it adopted on September 2018.

The revised plan is expected to be adopted in 2023/4 and run from 2020 to 2040 but is likely to get overtaken by the White Paper which is currently being consulted up.

Thus far, a lot of consultation has gone into setting policy priorities and gathering the evidence to support them.

It is thought unlikely that any more than 40,000 additional houses will be needed in this plan update. This step reports the sites that have been put forward as candidates for assessment – probably 5* what are actually needed.

All the sites will be assessed for suitability over the next 12 months when a short-list of qualifying sites will emerge.


Sites capable of supporting around 1,800 new homes have been suggested for Cottenham, although the provisions in the Neighbourhood Plan have already met the estimated need using a similar methodology to that advocated in the national White Paper.

If the Neighbourhood Plan is adopted following a positive referendum vote next year, few, if any additional homes will need to be planned for in Cottenham. This would allow the current developments to be absorbed over the coming years.

However, there is a case for re-testing residents’ appetite for further development and the position to be taken by the Parish Council in several cases:

1. The aggregate site behind Tenison Manor which could be made more viable by inclusion of CPC land - the access gateway and Tree Belt

2. The “South-East block” which, although on Green Belt, might include a tranche of truly locally-affordable homes and a supplementary site for the Recreation Ground.
3. The South-West” block which, although on Green Belt and further from the village centre, might include a tranche of truly locally-affordable homes and a supplementary site for the Recreation Ground.



A public meeting might be appropriate in the Spring run-up to the re-instated referendum on the Neighbourhood Plan to regenerate interest in the NP and explore issues arising from the site selection process.

Planning for the Future: White Paper

White Paper August/September 2020

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/907647/MHCLG-Planning-Consultation.pdf

Summary for Cottenham Parish Council

Prepared by Tim Jones / Frank Morris

Responses by: 15th Oct 2020 (12 weeks from 6th August)

Introduction

- Current planning system too complex, favouring larger organisations
 - Consents are on a case-by-case discretionary basis rather than based on rules of what can and what can't be done, increasing risk, stifling innovation and suppressing supply of land – rules are more open to interpretation and legal challenge than clearly-stated principles / policies
 - Local plans take too long to adopt (average 7 years) meaning that policies are likely to be out of date – partly because they avoid tools like scenario planning / robustness assessment against clear objectives and start with too open a mindset when many constraints are self-evident (or could be pre-consulted).
 - Housing needs and environmental assessments are complicated, poorly understood and often contested. They don't always result in the intended benefits similar issue to scenario testing (lack of)
 - Public trust in local authorities and developers is low - mostly because there is disagreement over what is "good" or "good for you (or me)" especially when inappropriate over-expensive homes are built in the wrong places.
 - Planning process is open to all but dominated by those willing and able to navigate it – obscured by building regulations and inconsistent enforcement
 - Supporting processes (including IT) are not modern and heavily reliant on personalities rather than data
 - Developer contribution negotiations can be complex and protracted, adding to the risk and discouraging new entrants to the market
 - Process does not incentivise quality ("beautiful") in planning, design and construction. Local plans are not explicit (visual) on what constitutes acceptable design "beauty" or "low-carbon" very subjective and context-specific
 - We are not delivering enough homes, such that prices continue to rise compared to Europe, entrenching inequalities – maybe we need a Ryanair / overspill approach – building homes a little further from where they are needed to reduce costs.
-

A New Vision for England's Planning System

- Importance of NPPF in simplifying policy
- Continued protection eg GB, SSSI
- Relevance of NPs in empowering communities
- Inaccessibility (and impenetrability) of planning-relevant data
-
- Lays out a view of the case for reform
- Aims
 - More ambition in creating beautiful places with 'net gain'
 - Front-load democratic involvement in developing local plans
 - Make planning more accessible and increase engagement through digital and social tools
 - Support ownership of beautiful, affordable, safe and green homes
 - Increase land supply where required to improve affordability, support growth and a more competitive housing market
 - Support business growth, making space available where needed
 - Support SMEs and self-builders with innovative design and construction
 - Support renewal of villages, towns and cities whilst maintaining their "human scale, inheritance and sense of place "gentle densities"

Proposals

- Streamline planning, with more democratic input at the plan-making stage, replacing the entire plan-making legislation
 - Local plans focused on identifying land in three categories
 - Growth – with automatic outline permission for specified types of development, including sub-areas for self- and custom-build
 - Renewal – suitable for some development ("gentle densification")
 - Protected – development is "restricted"
 - Local plans set clear rules, standards and requirements rather than policies
 - Much greater emphasis on and expectations of engagement with communities on plan development, together with streamlined (!) consultation for planning applications
 - Simplified process for assessing local plans based on a single "sustainable development" test
 - Shorter, visual and map-based local plans
 - Statutory timescale for plan adoption (30 months) with sanctions
 - Strengthened enforcement powers to ensure that communities can see that rules are properly applied
 - Training and resources made available to local authorities to support the transition
- Implement a digital-first planning, replacing existing "document-based" process
 - Support LAs to implement new tools for local plans and planning applications
 - Ensure plan and application data are open and available to all, including Property Technology ("PropTech") entrepreneurs
- Bring a new focus on design and sustainability
 - Target areas of the NPPF that reformed planning will support environment and climate change objectives – mitigation, adaptation and improvement
 - Increased energy efficiency standards to meet net-zero by 2050
 - "Ask for beauty" – NPPF to focus on 'placemaking' and 'creation of beautiful places'

- “Make it easier for those who want to build beautifully... to automatically permit proposals for high-quality developments where they reflect local character and preferences. “
- A quicker simpler framework to assess environmental impacts and improvements
- Locally developed design guides and codes based on “genuine community involvement”. Codes binding on planning decisions
- New body to support implementation of design codes nationally and continue work of Building Better Building Beautiful commission
- Each LPA to have officer for design and placemaking
- Protect historic buildings and areas within the revised consent framework
- Reform Developer Contributions
 - Implement the Infrastructure Levy, a flat-rate fee, replacing the CIL and planning obligations (s106). Designed to raise more funding from developers and at least as much affordable housing as current
 - Increased flexibility for LAs on how and where developer contributions are used, especially on-site affordable housing
 - Remove change of use exemptions to raise the levy from more developments
- *Ensure more land is available for needed homes and development*
 - *Nationally determined, binding housing requirement that LAs have to deliver through their local plans. Focuses on areas under affordability pressure and factors in Green Belt requirements.*
 - *Ensure masterplans for “substantial” developments include a variety of development types and builders to speed delivery*
 - *Increase openness on contractual arrangements used to control land*
 - *Ensure use of public-funded development and publicly owned land support renewal and regeneration, SME- and self-builders [where is this?](#)*

The Change we See...

- Residents
 - A more open, visible and transparent planning process
 - More affordable, green and beautiful homes
- Communities
 - Increased trust in a planning system they are involved in
 - More control over how developer contributions are spent
- Innovators, entrepreneurs and businesses
 - A system adaptable to changing needs
 - Increased land available where it is needed
 - System based on open data
- Small and self-builders, housing associations
 - System easier to navigate at lower cost than current
 - Automatic permission in principle/ outline permission
 - Simplified approach to developer contributions
- Local Authorities
 - Able to give more attention to improving quality
 - New tools, better data and automated decision making
- Children and grandchildren
 - An inheritance of environmental improvement

Pillar One – Planning for Improvement

Proposal 1: Simplified local plans- all land classified as growth, renewal or protected

Proposal 2: National development management policies for growth/renewal areas

- Design guides / codes to be within LPs and/or NPs and machine-readable
- Local plans would only address these policies where there are clear area or site specific requirements for deviation.
- Extending “LP strategic policies” restrictions on NPs to avoid NPPF/LP policy duplication.

Proposal 3: Local plans subject to a single, statutory “sustainable development” test

Proposal 4: A standard method for establishing housing requirement figures which ensures enough land is released in the areas where affordability is worst

- LAs required to allocate land for the homes identified by the standard model, with discretion over the method of delivery national quota pro-rated mostly to community size, local affordability and development constraints
- Green belt protection policies remain
- could remove the need for continual demonstration of a five year land supply, but not the Housing Delivery Test and the presumption in favour of sustainable development

Proposal 5: Areas identified as “growth” have partial (in principle) planning permission. Approvals would also be available for pre-established development types in (renewal) areas suitable for building.

- Renewal areas will have general presumption in favour of development and certain types of development will have “in principle” consent (still subject to later resolution/discharge of “conditions”
- Development in Protected areas will be via planning application to the Local Authority

Proposal 6: Decision-making should be faster and more certain, with firm deadlines, and make greater use of digital technology

- Existing time limits (8 or 13 weeks) will become fixed deadlines rather than aspirations
- Possible sanctions include fee refund or automatic approval

Proposal 7: Local Plans should be visual and map-based, standardised, based on the latest digital technology, and supported by a new template. (no mention of Building Regs)

Proposal 8: A statutory timetable for key milestones in plan-making for LAs and the Planning Inspectorate

- Stage 1 (6 months): LA calls for suggestions for areas for the three land use types
- Stage 2 (12 months): LA develops plan
- Stage 3 (6 weeks): Plan submitted to Secretary of State and published for public comment
- Stage 4 (9 months): Inspector considers plan in the context of the Sustainable Development test. Takes representations as required
- Stage 5 (6 weeks): Plan, documentation etc. finalised and come into force
- LA’s with no active plan will have 30 months to put a plan in place. Where the LA has adopted a plan within the last three years, then a new format plan will be required inside 42 months

Proposal 9: Retain Neighbourhood plans and support use of digital tools

- The proposal does not discuss whether there are any changes proposed to the process
- Some interesting hints at ideas such as increased use of NPs in urban settings and the potential for street-level NPs

Proposal 10: Enable increased speed of build-out through planning decisions

- *Especially on substantial developments by for example encouraging delivery by diverse builders where is this?*

Pillar I Questions

1. What three words do you associate most with the planning system in England?

TMJ: 1) Opaque, detailed, repetitive FJM1 opaque, inconsistent, Inappropriate

2(a). Do you get involved with planning decisions in your local area? [Yes / No]

2(b). If no, why not?

[Don't know how to / It takes too long / It's too complicated / I don't care / Other – please specify]

TMJ: 2a) Yes, as I'm a Parish Councillor, but also to support sustainability in the local area

FJM2: Yes; at all stages

3. Our proposals will make it much easier to access plans and contribute your views to planning decisions. How would you like to find out about plans and planning proposals in the future?

[Social media / Online news / Newspaper / By post / Other – please specify]

TMJ: 3) Online & social certainly, but there need to be methods to engage people that don't use online and/ or social. Physical newspapers with low circulation may need to be supplemented by some other method – planning newsletters?

FJM3 info on specific plans can be GIS-based with colour-highlighted red-line areas to show status or detail changes with drill-through to specific aspects of the application

4. What are your top three priorities for planning in your local area? [Building homes for young people / building homes for the homeless / Protection of green spaces / The environment, biodiversity and action on climate change / Increasing the affordability of housing / The design of new homes and places / Supporting the high street / Supporting the local economy / More or better local infrastructure / Protection of existing heritage buildings or areas / Other – please specify]

TMJ: 4) Affordability, design of homes and places, supporting the local economy

FJM4 wider range of affordability, locality and tensure to simplify movement for all

5. Do you agree that Local Plans should be simplified in line with our proposals? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

TMJ: 5) Yes with caveats:

- Local plans can only be made where there has been a strong and quantifiable level of public engagement
- Neighbourhood plans are considered in the designation of Growth, Renewal and Protected zones
- Areas not explicitly included in plan zones are treated as protected

FJM5 Yes, there is a good case to stratify the degree of attention needed:

- with increased delegation of simple "renewal" decisions, especially within a Neighbourhood Plan whose remit could be extended by removing many of the LP policies unnecessarily tagged as "strategic"
- "protected" areas do need a strategic revision from time-to-time as connurbations evolve and protection needs change
- policies on "growth" areas should only be relaxed if these areas are truly greenfield and notlikely to damage the character of established communities.

6. Do you agree with our proposals for streamlining the development management content of Local Plans, and setting out general development management policies nationally?

[Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

TMJ: 6) Agree that Local Plans should not repeat nationally set policies. However, there needs to be sufficient leeway for Local Authorities implement policies to effectively manage local circumstances, e.g. backfilling

FJM6 Most so-called "strategic" planning policies in LPs could be delegated to be within the scope of a Neighbourhood Plan, where these exist to avoid stereotypical urban development; the NPPF should focus on the broad canvas with MPs providing the details.

7(a). Do you agree with our proposals to replace existing legal and policy tests for Local Plans with a consolidated test of "sustainable development", which would include consideration of environmental impact?

[Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

TMJ: 7a) Yes, providing existing environmental standards are maintained or enhanced

FJM7a Despite 8 years of NPPF "sustainable" still has no clear definition in NPPF and assessment of sustainability is often distorted b use of out-of-date data to suit the application

7(b). How could strategic, cross-boundary issues be best planned for in the absence of a formal Duty to Cooperate?

TMJ: 7b) Cross boundary issue require close cooperation and it should be mandatory to be able to demonstrate that in the local plan. Perhaps the other interested authority should countersign that the plan prior to submission.

FJM7b Cross-boundary Issues are rare and can be dealt with through normal consultation mechanisms.

8(a). Do you agree that a standard method for establishing housing requirements (that takes into account constraints) should be introduced? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

TMJ: Yes. There must be a process where the requirement identified by the standard method can be adjusted based on local considerations and input.

FJM8a Yes to a standard method but It must be granular enough so that houses are built in or near to the communities that actually need them.

8(b). Do you agree that affordability and the extent of existing urban areas are appropriate indicators of the quantity of development to be accommodated? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

TMJ: Affordability Yes. There is no evidence presented as to how urban extent is an indicator of demand

FJM8b "Local affordability" is a better indicator of local need in separable communities. Urban sprawl is not an Indicator of development need and will drive densification around existing transport corridors.

9(a). Do you agree that there should be automatic outline permission for areas for substantial development (*Growth* areas) with faster routes for detailed consent?

[Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

TMJ: Yes. Provided automatic permission only extends to sites/ areas identified in the Local Plan and there has been sufficient consultation of those impacted by the zoning decisions

FJM9a Automatic outline permission can reduce risk for a developer but decisions may have to be based on smaller tranches of land to avoid stagnation and stereotypical development.

9(b). Do you agree with our proposals above for the consent arrangements for *Renewal* and *Protected* areas?

[Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

TMJ: Yes. The presumption in favour of development for renewal areas is appropriate. Pre-approved designs and forms of development must be at the Local Planning Authority level or as amended by a Neighbourhood Plan. Maintaining the existing planning application process in restricted areas is appropriate

FJM9b The presumption in favour of development for renewal areas is flawed unless the proposal is within the policies of an adopted Neighbourhood Plan to avoid stereotypical approaches and conserve local character where appropriate. In protected areas, the presumption should be against development unless the application provides locally affordable housing (< 3*household income) for local people.

9(c). Do you think there is a case for allowing new settlements to be brought forward under the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects regime?

[Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

TMJ: No. Planning decisions for settlements must continue to be made at a local level

FM9c Yes, where these projects provide for adequate transport infrastructure and are sufficiently removed from established communities of significant size

10. Do you agree with our proposals to make decision-making faster and more certain?

[Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

TMJ: Faster yes, but not at the expense of individual and local scrutiny. There should be an opportunity for local people and representatives to request that a decision be “un-delegated” from officers

FJM10 faster yes as the existing system is not really democratic as local people generally only become aware of a significant proposal quite late in the process when the investment has become too high to stop. Decentralisation and much better clarity and democratic review at key milestones in the process:

- how many additional houses do we need HERE? the standard method can be adapted for this.
- what size / clustering is appropriate HERE? NPs or area/Village Design Guides are ideal for this
- Which designs are appropriate HERE? architects or area/Village Design Guides are ideal for this

11. Do you agree with our proposals for accessible, web-based Local Plans? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

TMJ: Yes, provided that they are truly accessible to everyone

FJM: Web-based plans help industry not democracy; 3D virtual models in Estate Agent windows (and websites) and published with Council Tax demands are much more effective

12. Do you agree with our proposals for a 30 month statutory timescale for the production of Local Plans?

[Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

TMJ: Yes, along with a statutory refreshment cycle

FJM12 Possibly in some places; rate of change should drive frequency of response. If planning were scenario-driven, changes in key indicators would indicate partial updates were necessary.

13(a). Do you agree that Neighbourhood Plans should be retained in the reformed planning system?

[Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

TMJ: Yes, a Neighbourhood Plan, consistent with the Local Plan, supports a more localised response to development needs

FJM 13a Neighbourhood Plans should be retained and expanded in scope to override some policies regarded as strategic (but stifling) by Local Planners. The embrace Localism with extensive "bottom-up" input into the planning process and usually take much less time to develop.

13(b). How can the neighbourhood planning process be developed to meet our objectives, such as in the use of digital tools and reflecting community preferences about design?

TMJ: For preference, the same or a subset of tools and processes used in preparation of Local Plans and Design Codes suitable for use by non-professional planners are available for Neighbourhood plans. Where design requirements in the Neighbourhood Plan amend or supplement those in the Local Plan, then this should happen automatically whenever a site or application is reviewed

FJM13b NPs, like LPs, are heavily based on maps with policies linked to areas and/or situations. National availability of a simple-to-use GIS-based system, hyper-linked to the NP evidence base could form the basis of future NPs AND help local groups, including Parish Councils, with routine asset management. Upward data aggregation could form the LP seamlessly. Grants could be made to pilot such an approach (not unlike the grants and specialist support made available to the developers, like Cottenham, of the first Village Design Guides.

14. Do you agree there should be a stronger emphasis on the build out of developments? And if so, what further measures would you support?

[Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

TMJ: Not Sure – minimising the disruption to existing residents and new occupants to long-running developments would be a benefit. However incentivising completion ahead of the market capacity might result in developments being under-occupied for extended periods

FJM14 Yes, the current approach to outline and reserved matters applications with outstanding conditions and obligations to be discharged is an opaque process with the need to comply with building regulations often altering significant details of the permission with minimal consultation. A simpler system retaining a single reference number for the entire development with all supplementary applications to vary detail being readily traceable is a start, adequate consultation is important to avoid defective condition discharge in critical circumstances (e.g surface water drainage) supported by realistic enforcement.

Pillar Two – Planning for Beautiful and Sustainable Places

Proposal 11: Make design expectations more visual and predictable through design guidance and codes developed locally, binding upon development decisions

- National guidance enhanced by local input.
- Local input only given weight if provably sourced from the community

Proposal 12: To support transition to local design codes a national body will set up and LAs will have a chief officer for design and place-making where is this?

Proposal 13: Homes England’s strategic objectives to give greater emphasis to delivering beautiful places

Proposal 14: Introduce a fast-track for beauty to incentivise and accelerate high quality development which reflects local character and preferences.

- Update the NPPF
- Require that a masterplan and site-specific code are published along with automatic consent in principle for substantial developments in Growth areas
- Legislate to enable pre-approval of popular and replicable designs (“Pattern Books”) in Renewal areas

Proposal 15: Amend the NPPF to play a role in mitigating and adapting to climate change and maximising environmental benefits where is this?

Proposal 16: Simpler framework for assessing environmental impacts and opportunities

Proposal 17: Conserving and enhancing our historic buildings, areas and views in the 21st century.

- review and update the frameworks for listed buildings and conservation areas, to ensure their significance is conserved
- Allowing appropriate, sympathetic changes to support their continued use and address climate change

Proposal 18: Facilitate improvements in the energy efficiency standards for buildings to help deliver net-zero by 2050 *where is this?*

Pillar 2 Questions

15. What do you think about the design of new development that has happened recently in your area?

[Not sure or indifferent / Beautiful and/or well-designed / Ugly and/ or poorly-designed / There hasn’t been any / Other – please specify]

TMJ: Recent housing developments pay little regard to the existing built environment and could be anywhere. Minor concessions are made in the use of exterior colours and materials, but these are generally minor changes to “cookie-cutter” designs

FJM15 Only scant regard is paid by LPA's Design officers to Village Design Guides and Neighbourhood Plans allowing developers to use their standard designs for efficiency at the expense of village character

16. Sustainability is at the heart of our proposals. What is your priority for sustainability in your area?

[Less reliance on cars / More green and open spaces / Energy efficiency of new buildings / More trees / Other – please specify]

TMJ: Minimised impact on drainage infrastructure protecting existing settlements. Energy efficiency. More communal amenity within developments and open spaces

FJM16 Sustainability is a relative term and can be in short supply in villages with poor public transport, and in which many residents depend upon cars in their daily lives; yet open spaces and trees can be abundant and pollution is minimal. These villages are at risk of violating the rights of the elderly and less mobile for which cycling may not be viable and pavements can be so rough and narrow as to provide little protection from vehicular traffic.

In Cottenham's Neighbourhood Plan the higher usage local facilities have been identified so improvements can be made to encourage walking to and between them, with improved cycling facilities for those who chose to use them but retaining provision for cars, especially EV, for those who depend upon them.

Managing and improving surface water drainage infrastructure compromised by recent developments and/or neglect is also a priority

17. Do you agree with our proposals for improving the production and use of design guides and codes?

[Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

TMJ: Yes, provided that there is a simple and achievable process to develop local input to design guides

FJM17 Probably not. Building codes already provide a strong framework which can be supplemented by Neighbourhood Plans to conserve local character. National codes will tend to stultify design flexibility and move further towards a single building style.

18. Do you agree that we should establish a new body to support design coding and building better places, and that each authority should have a chief officer for design and place-making?

[Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

TMJ: Yes

FJM18 Seems to be a move in the wrong direction unless you want everywhere to look the same, especially with the proposed lighter touch to design in "growth " areas

19. Do you agree with our proposal to consider how design might be given greater emphasis in the strategic objectives for Homes England?

[Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

TMJ: Yes, provided that that the consideration is completed quickly and results in positive action supporting improvements in development design and quality

FJM19 Yes, provided local character is a key part of design guides.

20. Do you agree with our proposals for implementing a fast-track for beauty? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

TMJ: Yes

FJM20 No. "Beauty" is the new "sustainability"; it is too subjective.

Pillar Three – Planning for Infrastructure and Connected Places

Proposal 19: Reform the Community Infrastructure Levy to be charged as a fixed proportion of the development value above a threshold, with a mandatory nationally-set rate or rates. Abolish the current system of planning obligations

- Charged on final value of a development above a minimum value threshold
- Levied at first occupation, collected and spent locally
- Rates set nationally may vary dependent on location

- LAs allowed to borrow against Infrastructure Levy revenues to support timely delivery of infrastructure

Proposal 20: Extend the scope of the Infrastructure Levy to capture changes of use through permitted development rights

- Change of use that doesn't change floorspace doesn't currently always attract developer contributions
- Examples include: office to residential conversions; demolish and rebuild
- Self- and custom build will continue to be exempt

Proposal 21: Infrastructure Levy should deliver affordable housing

- At least at present levels
- LAs able to use infrastructure levy to secure affordable housing (can't currently use CIL)
- Requires mitigation to manage new risks transferred to the LAs

Proposal 22: More flexibility in how LAs spend the infrastructure levy

- Neighbourhood Share (25%) to be kept
- More flexibility on how LAs spend their share
- Once core infrastructure obligations are met, surplus could be spent on policy priorities or subsidising Council Tax *where is this?*

Pillar 3 Questions

21. When new development happens in your area, what is your priority for what comes with it? [More affordable housing / More or better infrastructure (such as transport, schools, health provision) / Design of new buildings / More shops and/or employment space / Green space / Don't know / Other – please specify]]

TMJ: All of the above! Infrastructure and other amenity is probably first.

FJM21 Currently better healthcare and formal sport facilities

22(a). Should the Government replace the Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 planning obligations with a new consolidated Infrastructure Levy, which is charged as a fixed proportion of development value above a set threshold?

[Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

TMJ: Yes

FJM22a Yes, especially if the 25% direct pass-through applies for areas with adopted NPs.

22(b). Should the Infrastructure Levy rates be set nationally at a single rate, set nationally at an area-specific rate, or set locally? [Nationally at a single rate / Nationally at an area-specific rate / Locally]

TMJ: Locally – preferably with a neighbourhood component

FJM22b Locally with 25% pass-through as above.

22(c). Should the Infrastructure Levy aim to capture the same amount of value overall, or more value, to support greater investment in infrastructure, affordable housing and local communities? [Same amount overall / More value / Less value / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

TMJ: Not Sure – current level of investment of s106 and CIL in infrastructure and affordable housing should be ring-fenced or otherwise protected where possible

FJM 22c The s106/affordable housing contract obligations do not provide locally affordable homes for local people; CIL should capture more value, especially where Community Land Trusts can use the contribution to deliver locally-affordable homes

<p>22(d). Should we allow local authorities to borrow against the Infrastructure Levy, to support infrastructure delivery in their area? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] TMJ: Yes, but only once development is reasonably assured, for example once detailed planning or reserved matters is approved FJM22d No; CIL payment is contingent on housing delivery not planning permission</p>
<p>23. Do you agree that the scope of the reformed Infrastructure Levy should capture changes of use through permitted development rights? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] TMJ: Yes FJM23 Yes</p>
<p>24(a). Do you agree that we should aim to secure at least the same amount of affordable housing under the Infrastructure Levy, and as much on-site affordable provision, as at present? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] TMJ: Yes JM24a Yes; off-site provision is difficult where it is most needed. as a result of land scarcity / affordability.</p> <p>24(b). Should affordable housing be secured as in-kind payment towards the Infrastructure Levy, or as a 'right to purchase' at discounted rates for local authorities? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] TMJ: Yes. On-site delivery of affordable housing should be maintained FJM24b neither; approach works very well when land is scarce.</p> <p>24(c). If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, should we mitigate against local authority overpayment risk? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] TMJ: Yes the local authority should be protected from the market risk FJM24c No view</p> <p>24(d). If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, are there additional steps that would need to be taken to support affordable housing quality? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] TMJ: The proposal for the local authority to require cash in lieu of any affordable homes not sold due to poor quality should be sufficient, although this risks opening up legal arguments over assessment of quality FJM 24d No view</p>
<p>25. Should local authorities have fewer restrictions over how they spend the Infrastructure Levy? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] TMJ: Yes, subject to ring-fencing FJM25 Yes, but ensure 25%age or more goes to PCs with NPs</p> <p>25(a). If yes, should an affordable housing 'ring-fence' be developed? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] TMJ: Yes – affordable housing should at least be maintained as well as funding key infrastructure – e.g. schools, sustainable transport, etc. FJM 25a No view</p>

Delivering Change

Proposal 23: Develop a comprehensive resources and skills strategy for the planning sector to support the implementation of our reforms.

- Cost of operating the reformed planning system to be funded by beneficiaries of planning gain – landowners and developers
- A small proportion of developer contributions should be allocated to cost of developing local plans
- Planning Inspectorate and statutory consultees should become self-funding *where is this?*

Proposal 24: Strengthen enforcement powers and sanctions, including flood risk.

What Happens Next

- Local Plan reform, changes to developer contributions and development management require primary legislation followed by secondary legislation.
- The proposals allow 30 months for new Local Plans to be in place so a new planning framework
- expect new Local Plans to be in place by the end of the Parliament.
- Implement policy changes, including to set a new housing requirement, by updating the National Planning Policy Framework in line with the new legislation

Question

26. Do you have any views on the potential impact of the proposals raised in this consultation on people with protected characteristics as defined in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010?

TMJ: Yes, the concepts of beauty, quality and place-making should consider suitability and integration for disabled people

FJM 26 No view

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