

## **AGENDA REPORTS PACK**

### **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**21<sup>st</sup> January 2021**

## 21P/015. Minutes

### DRAFT Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

Meeting held via Zoom on Thursday 7<sup>th</sup> January 2021 at 7.30pm

**Present:** Cllrs Morris (Chair), Bolitho, Graves, Jones, Loveluck, Ward, SCDC Cllrs Gough and Wilson and the Clerk

**In attendance:** 11 members of the public

**21P/001. Chairman's Introduction and Apologies** – Standing apologies for Cllr Collinson (illness).

**21P/002. Any Questions from the Public or Press** – no comments at this time.

**21P/003. To accept Declarations of Interest and Dispensations** – none given.

**21P/004. Minutes** – Resolution that the minutes of the Committee meeting held on 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2020 be signed as a correct record. Proposed Cllr Graves and seconded by Cllr Ward.

**RESOLVED.**

**21P/005. Planning Applications:**

- **20/04906/OUT** - Outline planning application for the erection of up to 34 new residential units as a Social Housing Rural Exception Site in the Greenbelt with all matters reserved except for access from Histon Road, Agricultural Building And Land To The Rear Of 38 Histon Road, Cottenham. Item brought forward for the benefits of residents attending. Cllr Morris clarified the definition of a rural exception site. This site is a bit big to be considered as one. Located partly in the greenbelt which has tighter restrictions. Noted that to qualify for a rural exception site it should all be affordable housing. The developer will have to submit detailed information to justify why the development is only viable with 3 market value homes. There also have to be special reasons for breaking greenbelt and development framework rules. Currently the need for affordable homes in Cottenham is a negative figure and we have an excess. There is however a deficit of locally affordable homes (@ 60% market value); as per the Neighbourhood Plan, only these locally affordable homes should be considered in the greenbelt. Resident 9 joined the meeting at 7.46pm. Discussion regarding flood risk on Histon Road, which is particularly high on that side of the road. Noted that there is a combined sewer. Cllr Graves commented on the excessive run off rate of 2.1l per second per hectare for that water to be permitted to drain into an IDB drain. The application hasn't approached the IDB and the applicant would need IDB consent to drain into one of their ditches; the run off would also need to be reduced to 1.1l per second per hectare. The IDB are at the limit of what they can pump in that area and Andrew Newton (IDB Engineer) will provide a response to the application on behalf of the IDB. Cllr Bolitho suggested that CPC consider getting expert input on the subject of drainage. As usual the SCDC Drainage Officer has said the application is acceptable subject to conditions. Why this response when the run off rates aren't acceptable? The application puts effort into explaining the sewers but not the surface water drainage. Noted that there is merit in the developer installing a 100m pipe which would alleviate the current sewer issues in the vicinity. Standing Orders suspended at 8.07pm for resident comments.

Residents 1 & 2 stated that the water table was the highest they'd seen in 37 years living at their property. Residents 3 & 4 said that their garden had flooded every year and the proposed site has flooded on several occasions. Residents 5 & 6 agreed with previous flood comments. The access road is directly adjacent to their property. There

is a slight bend on the road and they raised safety concerns. It is also precarious for pedestrians to cross (no pavement on that side of the road). Surprised that the traffic survey suggested average speeds were below 30mph. Cllr Morris suggested that in the event that the application is approved the verge should be upgraded to a full 2m wide pavement. Resident 7 was observing only. Residents 8 & 9 were concerned about traffic and drainage. In 30 years of living at their property this was the worst year for flooding. The indicative plan shows 4 properties directly behind their house. Disagree with the application when it states that there are good transport links. Local reports counter what has been stated in the ecology report and there is an abundance of wildlife on the site. Residents 10 & 11 mentioned the flooding; their garden adjoins the site and it is frequently under water. Concerned that the village facilities couldn't cope with the extra residents. Cllr Morris asked what facilities need improvement to make the development more acceptable. SCDC Cllr Gough encouraged residents to comment on the SCDC website. He has managed to agree an extension for responses until 29<sup>th</sup> January. Noted that under one Local Plan policy (H/11 1c): any proposed development in the Green Belt must not only prove that demand exists but also pass a sequential test demonstrating that no other sites exist that would have less impact on the greenbelt. He will be making a strong point that the Drainage Officer comments are misleading as written, especially in sensitive areas such as this. The pedestrian issue is a serious concern as currently seen on Oakington Road. Cllr Morris agreed that there was an over-reliance on conditions regarding drainage which can't always be enforced. SCDC Cllr Wilson reminded residents that they need to comment on material considerations. Standing Orders reinstated 8.36pm.

Noted that there is no mention of the Neighbourhood Plan in the design and access statement. Discussion about the need for CPC to employ a drainage expert. Roof pitches appear to be too steep in the indicative plans (one reason why the This Land application was refused) but the proposed housing mix is good. CPC recommends refusal. Proposed Cllr Morris and seconded by Cllr Bolitho. **REFUSED**. Specific issues are: contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan, drainage concerns, road safety/pedestrian safety issues, outside the village framework (contrary to NP policy COH/2-1), in the greenbelt. If Officer minded to approve we would like the application to go to Committee. Residents thanked for attending and left the meeting at 8.47pm. SCDC Cllr Gough said that it would be useful for Cllr Graves to speak to the planning team so that they have a realistic idea about how close we came to a flood disaster. SCDC Cllrs Gough and Wilson left the meeting at 8.49pm.

- **20/05172/P16** - Prior approval to swap 3 no. antennas on to the existing structure retaining the same height and bearings together with associated ancillary works, Communications Station 108, Clarkes Orchard, Beach Road, Cottenham. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Morris and seconded by Cllr Ward. **APPROVED**.
- **20/04822/FUL** - Demolition of existing bungalow, garage and outbuildings and erection of 2 bedroom bungalow, land rear of 160 Histon Road, Cottenham. Noted that a previous application had been looked at on this site last year. In the greenbelt and outside the village framework. This is a new application and not on the same footprint or location. Considered an improvement in building quality. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Morris and seconded by Cllr Jones. **APPROVED**.
- **20/04895/HFUL** - Conversion of existing rear conservatory to single storey rear extension, 1 Lacks Close, Cottenham. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Morris and seconded by Cllr Ward. **APPROVED**.

#### **For information only**

- **S/2702/18/CONDA** - Submission of details required by conditions 19 (Details of secure and covered cycle storage) and 20 (Provision and location of fire hydrants) of planning permission S/2702/18/FL, King George V Playing Fields, Lambs Lane Cottenham
- **S/0582/18/CONDC** - Submission of details required by condition 6 (Cycle shed), 12 (SuDS and Sewer report) of planning permission S/0582/18/OL, 13 Ellis Close, Cottenham

#### **SCDC – Approvals**

- **20/03806/HFUL** - Erection of a two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension, 5 Ellis Close, Cottenham
- **20/04039/HFUL** - Refurbishment of part of the existing ground floor and conversion of attic space to a bed-deck, 4 Bramley Close, Cottenham

- 21P/006. Tree works applications-** consider response from SCDC regarding issues with tree applications – Cllr Bolitho outlined the issues. He felt that if a Cllr was the applicant then there needs to be evidence that they have been visited by the Trees Officer. Need to know if the tree is of value to the village. Where a tree isn't accessible there needs to be more visibility in terms of information provided. It was noted that in most cases the trees are on private land. Our comments are asking SCDC to change their process; there is no guarantee that their process is in line with the law and this was challenged in the original correspondence. The Neighbourhood Plan quotes trees that may be suitable for protection. Clerk to respond with further queries.
- 21P/007. Planning appeal** – consider response regarding appeal for 8 Mill Field Cottenham (20/02217/FUL) by 22<sup>nd</sup> January – CPC stand by previous comments.
- 21P/008. Flooding** – Consider preliminary feedback and any necessary follow-up actions from flooding incidents over Christmas – Jetting seems largely to have worked. Counsellor Graves suggested that we are getting more water from Northstowe than we should; need to keep an eye on further extensions. Item is on the agenda for the Flood Risk Forum. Rampton PC have asked to join the meetings and it was agreed that this would be logical; Clerk to contact the Rampton Clerk accordingly. We need walkers to report any issues with the Lode etc. Extinction Rebellion have contacted Cllr Ward for more information on our flooding issues and arrangements; using the NP evidence paper for background. Article for village newsletter approved.
- 21P/009. Enforcement** – consider updates from Enforcement Officers and additional items for enforcement – Case 5/18 – Angling Club, IDB and land owners all require the access code. Case 8/20 - now has three touring caravans.
- 21P/010. Date of next meeting** – 21<sup>st</sup> January 2021
- 21P/011. Close of meeting** - 9:30 PM

## 21P/016. Planning Applications

- [20/05121/FUL](#) - Erection of a chalet style 2-3 bedroom dwelling and associated parking, Land at 9 Church Close, Cottenham

### Tree Orders

- [21/0015/TTCA](#) - T 1 - Norway Maple - Reduce the height by 1.5m and the spread in all directions by 1.5m; T 2 - Holly - Reduce the height by 2m; T 3 - Silver Birch - Reduce the height by 2m and the spread in all directions by 1.5m; T 4 - Conifer - Fell to ground level – 160 High Street, Cottenham
- [20/2423/TTCA](#) - 1. Lime - crown reduce 1-1.5m, crown thin 20% to contain size and liberate adjacent thorn; 2. Box Elder - remove low lateral over neighbours fence (to rear of garage) – 328 High Street, Cottenham

### For information only

- [20/05133/CLUED](#) - Certificate of Lawfulness under Section 191 for the continued use as a shop, Willow Grange, Willow Grange Farm Shop, Ely Road, Chittering

## **21P/017. Cycle stands**

As part of their planning conditions Redrow have to provide some cycle stands. The locations they have suggested are:

- 5 Sheffield stands by the village sign on the High St
- 8 Sheffield stands on the opposite side of the High St to the village sign
- 4 Sheffield stands near the inform crossing on the High St near the top of Telegraph St
- 12 Sheffield stands on the grass verge on the High St near the war memorial

NB: as part of the Zero Carbon Communities grant and County scheme to improve cycling provision during Covid, stands have already been agreed at WARG Field, Fen Reeves, the Pound, the 900 butchers and Co-op (who have subsequently installed their own).

The highway authority at CCC has advised these stands (and the proposed bus stop improvement on Lambs Lane) are subject to the Parish Council's review and agreement. Please note Redrow are still reviewing these locations via detailed design and some may prove to be unviable, however they would like our input.

## **21P/018. S211 tree works notices**

This is just a quick email to update you and your council/meeting, on behalf of the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Trees Team, of some changes as to how we process tree work cases and announce them to you. I am sure you have noticed that in recent weeks you have not received any tree work case announcements, even though cases have appeared on the weekly list of all planning applications in your area.

### **Background**

In the Autumn, several Parish Councils commented that they would like greater clarity about what to do when they receive letters from the Trees Team relating to a S211 conservation area tree work notice or TPO tree works application which have been submitted to South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC).

They asked about when/ if they should comment, how long they had to make any comments, and what comments could be made which would be material to the SCDC decision process.

By way of background, the Council has just 6 weeks to take a view on S211 tree work notices and if it does not do so, the works are deemed to be able to go ahead, no matter how substantial. The Council has 8 weeks to determine TPO tree work applications, after which applicants can appeal to the Planning Inspectorate for non-determination. Whilst there is no statutory requirement for any consultation for any tree work cases, to date we have always notified Parish Councils/Meetings of tree cases in their respective areas.

In response to this request, over the last month the Trees Team has reviewed our letters and our processes. This letter aims to provide you with clarity. We will trial this approach for 6 months and then seek to review it and will seek your comments on it.

### **Our Team**

We have two officers in the team: Miriam Hill – the Trees Officer, and Jay Patel - Assistant Trees Officer, who currently validate and consider over a thousand S211 tree work notices or TPO tree work applications per year. They also comment/advise, as required, on planning applications for development in the district (approx. 750 applications per year) and run our tree warden network.

**Changes to the process/new look letters:**

From this week (Mon11th January), to help provide clarity, SCDC Tree Teams will continue to notify parish council/meetings of ALL S211 tree work notices or TPO tree work applications in their parish but will divide them into two categories – minor and major and send out different letters.

**Letter One (major tree work cases)**

For all *major* tree work cases (either S211 tree work notices or TPO tree work applications), the Trees Team will send a letter to the Parish Council/meeting. The Parish (or any other person) will have an opportunity to comment - 10 days - on the case should it wish. Comments should be made via the website. All cases considered to be *major* contain one or more of the following:

- § crown reductions or pollarding for the first time,
- § crown reductions or pollarding beyond previous pruning points,
- § thinning or felling,
- § front garden, public land or churchyard tree works,
- § removal or topping outgrown hedgerows,
- § unusual species,
- § species/trees which may have historical or cultural meaning to the locality, and/or
- § other matters of interest.

These cases require a SCDC Officer to visit the locality to assess the case. The time for comment is limited given the tight overall timeframe for considering these cases. Please note that in general, SCDC will not be able to give extended consultation periods due to the tight timelines involved and the resources available to the Trees Team.

In terms of what comments would be material to the decision, these should relate to the amenity of the tree, the impact of the works on the tree or locality, and with TPO tree work applications how the proposal is not justified or reasonable.

**Letter two (minor tree work cases)**

These relate to minor works (defined below) and will be for your information and to note.

For all *minor* tree work cases (either S211 tree work notices or TPO tree work applications), SCDC will look to determine the case immediately. Finalising minor cases will allow the time to focus on those cases which do need more time and consideration. The proposed tree works are considered to be *minor* as they include one or more of the following:

- felling dead/partially failed trees (with proof),
- crown lifting, epicormic or tipping back off lines or structures,
- repeat crown reductions or re-pollarding,
- trees not easily or clearly visible from public places,
- removal or topping evergreen (cypress) hedgerows,
- limited visibility trees such as rear garden trees, and/or
- pruning ornamental or fruit trees such as apples and pears.

This is a similar process which the team currently use but we hope the different letters will give greater clarity to those parishes which do not have many tree cases from year to year and/or who do not have a lead spokesperson for parish trees.

Many parish representatives attended the Tree Wardens event 'Pruning Protected Trees' in March 2019 and we hope to provide similar training again in February to those who are interested. More details will be released nearer to the time but as the sessions will be remote, we do hope you will be able to attend.

For any questions or queries you may have, please contact [planning.trees@scambs.gov.uk](mailto:planning.trees@scambs.gov.uk)

## **21P/019. Land off Broad Land**

### **Meeting with Claremont Planning re. land promotion on Broad Lane 13<sup>th</sup> January 2021**

**Present:** Cllrs Jones, Morris, Young, Katherine Else (Claremont Planning), Andrew Dutton (Landhold Capital) and the Clerk

**Outline** - KE started by saying that one of the key areas they've looked at is the high risk of flooding and this could be a reason the application wouldn't go forward. The current maps show the Jocelyn site in Flood Zone 3 even though other sites in the vicinity aren't. They have liaised with the EA and demonstrated that the online mapping is incorrect. Currently going through a process now to advise the EA and will provide info to show the mapping is incorrect and that certain areas of the site aren't in Flood Zone 3 and automatically excluded.

In the AECOM report there are a number of issues identified for this site. The flooding and the requirement to upgrade Broad Lane. They have looked at the capacity of Broad Lane and the ability to upgrade it, specifically to provide pedestrian footpaths. They believe that is possible. In terms of services, they aren't restrictions and can be accommodated within a residential development i.e the power lines would be put underground etc. In terms of the environmental credentials of the site, it has largely been used for grazing. They believe it does have some ecological value in terms of hedgerow etc. and that they could demonstrate an ecological enhancement and include an area on the edge of the site that residents that can enjoy.

The priority area of the plan is coloured buff. The space above it could be open space. The idea would be to maximise the housing in the buff area and provide open space around it. Want to create a setting to the village that will work well in that area. Still need to look at onsite drainage and ecology reviews.

Want to get an idea from CPC of what they were looking for to justify the site. The AECOM report refers to the agricultural quality of the land but likely to be 3B. If it was higher value the land would have been used for arable a long time ago. Claremont can investigate to confirm that if it would help in the assessment of the site. Willing to do a phase 1 eco assessment of the site if it would help.

**Housing need** – as far as CPC is concerned this isn't any need due to the other big sites in the village which are still being built. Following on from the AECOM analysis this demonstrated that Cottenham has exceeded the level for both market and affordable homes. The NP only argues there is a need for

'locally affordable' homes. The complication for the parish, is that there is a different calculation which shows there is a need for affordable homes in the District which could be 30 miles away from Cottenham.

KE asked if there was a need for self-build plots. CPC not aware of any need but SCDC would be the best place to ask. It may be that Claremont could look at making a number of plots available for locally affordable/self build.

FM mentioned the CLT which aspires to build the 91 locally affordable homes so this could be factored in. KE said they will take into account any land requirements in terms of the CLT as part of the wider land holdings that they are promoting.

**Traffic** – Claremont believe the traffic capacity can be demonstrated to be acceptable.

FM mentioned the bridleway that runs alongside the north edge and through Les King Wood that cuts across to Broad Lane. Another nearer one is the thin strip around the southern edge of the field which was a drain. Still a reserved drain that runs around that edge of the TM estate and up to the ditch that Jocelyn has the riparian ownership for. CPC have a barrier strip around the edge and there is a gateway onto the Tenison Manor estate. Joining those together isn't anything that CPC have thought about. Site would need to go further in conceptual development before able to get a proper comment from residents.

AD asked if there be a comprehensive scheme in the area of bridleways, links, wooded areas etc. linking to Rampton Road for the northern area of the village? FM said that it could provide better connectivity/safer route to CPS.

Clerk raised issue of increased traffic joining traffic coming from TM already. Any development of the site would look at wider access to link back and avoid putting pressure on Broad Lane. May be s106 towards travel plan provisions and that the site is fit for cycling/walking. KE said they are getting a travel plan produced. May need to look at the changing dynamic of life/work at the moment.

**Scale and time** - In terms of scale the only party they are working with is Jocelyn. No masterplan as yet and Claremont are putting all the feedback in. That is because of the work done re. flood issues so that site should be remapped. Always look at a wider area to meet connectivity, eco, open space etc. All that work is still going on. The 300 homes for this site is as per the LP submission. AD said that SCDC uses 30 units per hectare as a calculation. Would never have that many per hectare. His job is find out what is commercially possible. Not looking at 2-3 years time, looking longer term. Dependent on ability to engage with the Local Plan and how quickly that moves forward. The next LP may steer away from Cottenham but don't know at this stage. Have looked at the possibility of linking up with This Land so see if possible to create a link road. Would be complicated but not commercially viable. Are still looking to see if there is any benefit.

KE confirmed that the Jocelyn site is the priority for promotion. In terms of the land requirements, that would be informed by the number of units and amount of open space they'd need to provide. If they provided the CLT homes alongside market homes then the buff area may be increased. The indicative number of homes on that plot is around 50 units.

CPC queried if there is any aspiration to develop the land south of the drain. AD has been engaging with the landowner so there is a possibility. Would want to resolve that area as well if the Jocelyn site was developed.

**Acceptability** - Two things may be acceptable; real affordable homes and then doing something substantial re. flood protection in that area which would have wider benefits for the village. AD can look at flood mitigation and sewage further which may benefit that side of the village. IY said need to do more than theoretical work because a lot of Jocelyn's site was underwater at Christmas.

**Flood** – FM said that the site does flood despite the information Claremont have, with the most recent incident at Christmas. The drainage is complicated. Ran through the details. CPC are pretty certain the sewage and surface water mingle but don't know how. Claremont may need to look at details of the improvement of the sewage system. KE asked if the improvements would be considered positively by CPC. Yes.

AD asked if we have anyone on the PC who has engaged with agencies re. the flood. FM ran through the flood risk group that was set up. We also have the benefit of the Chair of the local IDB on the PC. AD was concerned about the sewage mixing with surface water. The problem is the residual pumping station. Sewage from the north of the village comes down the High St, down Broad Lane into a combined drain etc. FM ran through the drainage system in that area and remedial works are required. There is also a maintenance issue. Any development would need to take this into account and provide a solution.

**Community Land Trust** - AD wanted to explore the CLT further. To what extent are we looking to cluster those together? FM said that Cambs ACRE had done a study to show the housing need. The CLT has used that elsewhere in Cottenham on a site which has since fallen through. AD has done a lot of work on exception sites and will explore but it's difficult commercially to take these forward. KE said that where Claremont has had success in this area is where they're supported by a market scheme alongside the exception/affordable site. FM said there is a rule of thumb that you can get away with around 20% market value on an exception site.

In terms of the southern area of the site, south of the drain, Claremont will engage with the CLT to see if that site is suitable so there could be a pedestrian link to Tenison Manor. Would look to work with CPC on that.

**Neighbourhood Plan** - Clerk asked about the vista from Rampton Road to the church and whether that would be obscured. FM confirmed there would be risks along the top of the site blocking the view.

**Next steps** - Claremont will now take stock and summarise and review the drainage arrangements. That will probably inform an early concept plan for the site once they have solutions to those aspects of the development. AD said they are on the way to a tech solution to altering the EA flood maps. Need to look at how they can look at improving the surface water. AD is doing some design work to pick up the visual vista protection etc. They will do that before they come back with a further update.

**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>Approved 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.
--------------	-----------------------------	----------	---------	--