

## **AGENDA REPORTS PACK**

### **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

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

## 20P/200. Minutes

### DRAFT Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

Meeting held via Zoom on Thursday 5<sup>th</sup> November 2020 at 7.30pm

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

**20P/187. Chairman's Introduction and Apologies** – Apologies received from the Clerk (sick)

**20P/188. Any Questions from the Public or Press** – None present.

**20P/189. To accept Declarations of Interest and Dispensations** – Cllr Graves declared an interest in item 20P/192. Waste & Minerals Local Plan Consultation, and will leave the meeting at that point. Later items to be brought forward.

**20P/190. Minutes** – Cllr Ward joined the meeting at 7.32pm. Resolution that the minutes of the Committee meeting held on 5<sup>th</sup> November 2020 be signed as a correct record. Proposed Cllr Graves and seconded by Cllr Collinson. **RESOLVED.**

#### **20P/191. Planning Applications:**

- **20/04408/PRI03Q** - Prior approval for change of use of agricultural building to 2 No. dwellinghouses (Class C3), Haelan Feld, Twentypence Road, Cottenham. Noted that Highways have objected due to lack of visibility splays and transport statement. Twenty Pence a busy and fast road. Two members of the public joined the meeting at 7.38pm. CPC recommends refusal on grounds of access not properly engineered to the road. Proposed Cllr Graves and seconded by Cllr Ward. **REFUSED.**
- **20/04468/HFUL** - Two storey and single storey rear extension, 33 Lambs Lane, Cottenham (Brought forward). Standing orders suspended 7.40pm residents had nothing to add to application. Standing orders reinstated 7.41pm. Amendment to a previously approved planning application, to add a Juliet window/balcony. Not believed to overlook neighbours, and not in conservation area. Noted that the committee know the applicants. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Ward and seconded by Cllr Jones. **APPROVED.** Two members of the public left at 7.47pm.
- **20/04296/OUT** - Outline planning for the erection of an agricultural dwelling with all matters reserved, Bassenhally Farm, Broad Lane, Cottenham. Cllr Ward declared an interest and will not take part in this item. Noted it would be a replacement dwelling to the log cabin previously approved. CPC's Neighbourhood Plan policy COH2-1 supports development proposals outside the development framework where they provide facilities for rural enterprise, application seems to qualify. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Morris and seconded by Cllr Collinson. **APPROVED.**
- **S/4116/CONDA** - Submission of details required by condition 23 (Comprehensive construction programme) of planning permission S/4116/18/VC, Land To The South West Rampton Road, Cottenham. Noted CPC have an interest as this would trigger an S106 payment. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Morris and seconded by Cllr Ward. **APPROVED.**
- **20/04440/HFUL** - Single storey rear extension and outbuilding, 87 Rampton Road, Cottenham. Queried whether there would be drainage implications on extension of garage as no mention of soakaways. Building Control would monitor this. CPC recommends approval subject to following conditions: management of surface water drainage avoiding impact on neighbours, and no occupation of outbuilding separate to the main dwelling. Proposed Cllr Jones and seconded by Cllr Graves. **APPROVED.**

- **20/04252/HFUL** - Side extension to existing property and construction of outbuilding for garage/storage/playroom, 246 High Street, Cottenham. Noted in the conservation area, have included heritage statement. Limited visual impact as only garage visible from front and will be set back from the road. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Graves and seconded by Cllr Ward. **APPROVED.**
- **20/04529/PRI03Q** - Prior approval for change of use of agricultural barn to 2 no dwellinghouses (Class C3), Fenleigh Farm, Smithy Fen, Cottenham. Noted some concerns raised by EA officer. Felt to be not in keeping with location, but would come under permitted development as within same footprint of existing barn. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Ward and seconded by Cllr Jones. **APPROVED.**

### Tree Orders

- **20/2271/TTCA** - Notification of felled Horse Chestnut, The Bungalow, Cottenham Village College, High Street, Cottenham. Concerns raised that CPC were not notified prior to felling but welcomed offer to replace.
- **20/2186/TTCA** - Proposal: 1. Birch - crown lift over drive to 3.5m, clear adjacent roof by 1.5m and shorten low branch over table by up to 1m, 81 High Street, Cottenham. Noted already approved by SCDC.
- **20/2193/TTCA** - Proposal: (T1) Copper Beech - reduce in width on all sides by 50-70cm. - 'round top' to make more conical removing no more than 1 metre. To maintain this tree in its current location, 25 Corbett Street, Cottenham. Noted already approved by SCDC.
- **20/2242/TTCA** - Proposal: 1. 2no Yews closest to road - crown reduce 1m. 2. Pleached hornbeams - prune to top of previous reduction points and remove side growth to maintain two dimensional screen. 3. 2no Pears - tidy smaller tree to shape and reduce larger to match as closely as possible (by up to 1.5m). 4. Privet - crown reduce to previous pruning points (by up to 1m). 5. Lime - fell and treat. 6. Beech - crown thin 25%. 7. Olive - crown reduce to shape (by up to 0.5m). 8. Copper Beech in adjacent garden - prune overhang to wall (by approx 2.5m), 343 High Street Cottenham CB24 8TX. Noted no detail of size of trees to establish scale of work proposed. Some trees would have different requirements as to when the work should be carried out. Would like detail as to why 5. Lime needs to be felled. Clerk to write to homeowner to request permission for tree officer to inspect trees. Clerk to write to SCDC to make them aware, and request that no approval be granted prior to this. Noted that homeowner is an SCDC councillor, and SCDC should be made aware of this.
- **20/2257/TTCA** - Proposal: 1. Walnut on left hand side of house - remove low branch over parking at 4m, primary branch towards house at 3.5m and at 4.5m. Also secondary branches above, 4 Curringtons Close, Cottenham. Noted already approved by SCDC. Committee expressed concerns that tree orders were being approved before CPC have commented on them. Request that the Clerk keep a note of when notified of applications by SCDC, and the time scale of when they are being approved.

### For information only

- **20/04438/ CL2PD** - Application for a Certificate of lawfulness under section 192 for the erection of an outbuilding in the rear garden, 22 Hawking Way, Cottenham.

### SCDC – Approvals

- **20/02575/FUL** - Erection of a two-storey dwelling and garage, Land to the rear of 65 Rooks Street, Cottenham
- **20/03917/HFUL** - Two storey front extension, Victory Way, Cottenham
- **20/03701/ADV** - Installation of illuminated and non-illuminated signage, 273 High Street, Cottenham
- **20/60001/S106BA** - Application for the modification or discharge of planning obligations (Schedule 2, Part 1, Section C) in respect of intermediate affordable housing and the parameters for minimum and maximum percentages for shared equity to accord with Homes England requirements, Land At Oakington Road Cottenham

#### **SCDC – Refusals**

- **20/02217/FUL** - Change of use of land to form part of residential curtilage and the erection of a double garage, 8 Mill Field, Cottenham

#### **SCDC – Withdrawn**

- **2/4271/VC** - Variation of condition 3 (Occupation) pursuant to planning permission S/0725/18/FL, 19 Broad Lane, Cottenham

#### **HM Planning Inspectorate – Refusal**

- **S/4411/19/FL** – Garden annexe, 35 Beach Road Road, Cottenham

**20P/193. Bellway & Persimmon s106 variations** - consider response to draft variation of s106 text. Brought forward. Discussion regarding timing of new footpath between Persimmon and Bellway estates. Persimmon will need to move carriageway across to make space for footpath. CPC and Cllr Wotherspoon have been working with developers and County Highways to move pavement work forward. Cllr Morris to draft a letter to current residents of Persimmon estate informing them of what the likely timescale is for the pavement to be completed. Committee satisfied with proposed timescales.

**20P/194. Enforcement** – consider updates from Enforcement Officers and additional items for enforcement. Brought forward. Case 8/20 Cllr Graves updated on current residency of site. Has already informed the Clerk.

**20P/192. Waste & Minerals Local Plan Consultation** - consider response to the main modifications. Cllr Graves left the meeting at 9.06pm CPC have commented previously on the consultation. Modifications have now been suggested based on initial consultation. Routes and extra traffic have been main concerns previously. Cllrs Jones and Morris to draft a response for discussion at next planning meeting.

**20P/195. Date of next meeting** – 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2020

**20P/196. Close of meeting** – 9.09pm.

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

## 20P/201. Planning Applications

- [20/04720/HFUL](#) - Porch extension, partial loft conversion, internal and external alterations, 105 Rampton Road, Cottenham
- [20/03806/HFUL](#) - Erection of a two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension, 5 Ellis Close, Cottenham

### Tree Orders

- [20/2337/TTCA](#) - 1. 2no Yews closest to road - crown reduce 1m. 2. Pleached hornbeams - prune to top of previous reduction points and remove side growth to maintain two dimensional screen. 3. 2no Pears - tidy smaller tree to shape and reduce larger to match as closely as possible (by up to 1.5m). 4. Privet - crown reduce to previous pruning points (by up to 1m). 5. Lime - fell and treat. 6. Beech - crown thin 25%. 7. Olive - crown reduce to shape (by up to 0.5m). 8. Copper Beech in adjacent garden - prune overhang to wall (by approx 2.5m). 343 High Street, Cottenham
- [20/2206/TTCA](#) - All trees to have crowns lifted to allow for hanging of Christmas Lights. Additional work required: 2 lime Remove suspended or broken branches; 3 & 7 common lime Remove major dead wood; 15, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 32 lime Remove major dead wood; 35 lime Crown clean and remove deadwood. Tree 35 lime has moderate deadwood overhanging the road in mid-crown, with multiple crossing and rubbing branches. An arboricultural report has recommended we remove dead and damaged branches. For the crown lift of the trees, this is to remove this years growth from lower branches, so as not to obstruct Christmas lights, and remove low branches growing over the path/road for health and safety reasons. This would be to a height of approximately 12-15ft. The Green, Cottenham. NB: CPC are the applicant

### For information only

- [S/0582/18/CONDA](#)- Submission of details required by condition 9 (arboricultural matters), condition 10 (biodiversity enhancements) of planning permission S/0582/18/OL, 13 Ellis Close, Cottenham
- [S/0582/18/CONDB](#) - Submission of details required by condition 4 (Traffic Management Plan) of planning permission S/0582/18/OL, 13 Ellis Close, Cottenham

### Withdrawn

- [20/03846/OUT](#) - Outline application for the Construction of 2 No. bungalows with all matters reserved, Land to the rear of 129 High Street, Cottenham

### SCDC – Approvals

- [20/03909/HFUL](#) - Garage and conservatory conversion and new link, 31 Harlestones Road, Cottenham
- [20/04035/HFUL](#) - New single storey entrance porch to existing property, 127 Rampton Road, Cottenham

## **20P/202. Tree works applications**

Further to the Clerk writing to SCDC regarding concerns about tree works, the following response has been received:

Dear Ms Brook

Further to your email and my initial response of 17<sup>th</sup> November, I have additional information to more fully answer your questions and concerns relating to works to trees in conservation areas.

Where works are carried out to trees in a conservation area, the legislation relating to this ( s211 of the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act) makes it clear that these are notifications (not applications) which must be responded to by the Planning Authority ( LPA) within 6 weeks. If there is no decision by that period, the works are allowed to go ahead, irrespective of how significant they are.

So, the 6 weeks period (referred to in your email) is not a consultation period for parties such as Parish Councils but the period by which the notification must 'determined'.

The Council is required to publish these notifications on its public register – which the Council does - and anything over above this is discretionary.

We recognise how important trees are to local communities and we do notify Parish Councils and look to take on board any comments that are made before determination (so long as they are material to proposal).

Given the large number of notifications we received every year (approx. 1000), the Tree Officer has a system of triage – looking at each one on receipt. Decisions on the more straight forward ones e.g. Crown lifting a tree over a footpath/ road are made as soon as possible, the more complex or controversial ones are the subject of a site visit. To date Parish Councils and their clerks have tended to contact Miriam Hill, our Tree Officer, if they have any concerns/ require clarification and that seemed to be working as a process.

We are aware however that the transfer of our tree works notifications onto our new IT system ( Uniform) does seem to have caused some issues, particularly with regards our communication with Parish Councils and clarity over timescales, and we are currently looking into this.

As you have highlighted, we recognise that the quality of the notifications we receive is very varied. Over the last year, the Tree Officer has been doing work to encourage tree contractors/ agents to improve the quality of their submissions to ensure they contain the necessary information. This has improved the quality and clarity, and invalid notifications are now down to approx. 15%.

In terms of the information that needs to be submitted in a notification, it is worth noting that what is required is fairly limited. The guidance (set out in the National Planning Policy Guidance) says:

***What information should be in a section 211 notice?***

*A section 211 notice must describe the work proposed and include sufficient particulars to identify the tree or trees. Where a number of trees or operations are involved, it should make clear what work is proposed to which tree. A notice must include the date it is submitted. A plan is not mandatory but can be helpful.*

*Sufficient information in a section 211 notice will help the local authority to verify that the proposed work, if undertaken, has not been exceeded and support enforcement action if appropriate. People should not submit a section 211 notice until they are in a position to present clear proposals. They should consider first discussing their ideas with an arboriculturist or the authority's tree officer.*

In respect of the specific examples you give where the species and height are given e.g. 'the application recently whereby it stated '1. Lawsons Cypress on right hand side - Reduce height by 12ft. 2. Spruce in group on left - Reduce height by 12ft'. – that would be sufficient in our opinion to make a judgement.

Some statements e.g. cutting back are too vague and, in those cases, the notification would be discussed with the contractor/ agent. In some cases, notifications will not be validated and simply be sent back until sufficient clarity or information is provided.

I hope this clarifies the situation.

I do want to assure you that the Council is keen to ensure that trees do have appropriate protection, but we must also allow for appropriate management of trees too.

The Tree Officer is doing the best possible work to preserve trees, and the resuscitation of the Tree Wardens programme last year and ongoing provision of training and information to Tree Wardens in the district is testament to the ambition to ensure we preserve our trees and increase our tree cover.

Yours sincerely



Cllr Bridget Smith





**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
20/01575/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	
20/02234/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	<b>Approve under delegated authority</b>

20/03846/OUT	Land to rear of 129 High St	15/10/20	Refusal	In the conservation area and within the setting of a listed building (garden adjoins). Materials not in keeping, no room around the buildings/too dense for the location. Contrary to the Local Plan H17 a and b. Poor access, no adequate safe road access shown.
--------------	-----------------------------	----------	---------	--