

## **AGENDA REPORTS PACK**

### **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**7<sup>th</sup> January 2021**

## 21P/004. Minutes

### DRAFT Planning Committee Meeting Agenda

Meeting held via Zoom on Thursday 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2020 at 7.30pm

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

**20P/197. Chairman's Introduction and Apologies** – Apologies accepted from Cllr Loveluck (personal).

**20P/198. Any Questions from the Public or Press** – None present.

**20P/199. To accept Declarations of Interest and Dispensations** – None given.

**20P/200. Minutes** – Mind amend made. Resolution that the minutes of the Committee meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> November 2020 be signed as a correct record. Proposed Cllr Collinson and seconded by Cllr Graves. **RESOLVED.**

**20P/201. Planning Applications:**

- **20/04720/HFUL** - Porch extension, partial loft conversion, internal and external alterations, 105 Rampton Road, Cottenham. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Graves and seconded by Cllr Ward. **APPROVED.**
- **20/03806/HFUL** - Erection of a two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension, 5 Ellis Close, Cottenham. Amendment noted to window. Concerns regarding loss of privacy. CPC recommends approval subject to concerns regarding loss of amenity to no. 3 and possible overlooking. Proposed Cllr Jones and seconded by Cllr Graves. **APPROVED.**

#### 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. Noted that this was a re-application. Previous comments still stand. Request that the Trees Officer visits the site. Concerns regarding the loss of the lime tree. CPC recommend refusal until evidence received that the Trees Officer has visited. Proposed Cllr Bolitho and seconded by Cllr Graves. **RESOLVED.**
- **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/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/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**- consider response from SCDC regarding issues with tree applications – Defer to next meeting.

**20P/203. Enforcement** – consider updates from Enforcement Officers and additional items for enforcement – Case 11/18 – Clerk to chase for an update. Need quarterly review of actions.

**20P/204. Date of next meeting** – 15<sup>th</sup> December 2020

**20P/205. Close of meeting** – 8.03pm.

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

## 21P/005. Planning Applications

- [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
- [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
- [20/04822/FUL](#) - Demolition of existing bungalow, garage and outbuildings and erection of 2 bedroom bungalow, land rear of 160 Histon Road, Cottenham
- [20/04895/HFUL](#) - Conversion of existing rear conservatory to single storey rear extension, 1 Lacks Close, Cottenham

### 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**

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

## 21P/007. Planning appeal

### Notification of a Planning Appeal - Town and County Planning Act 1990

Reference: 20/02217/FUL  
Proposal: Change of use of land to form part of residential curtilage and the erection of a double garage.  
Site address: 8 Mill Field Cottenham CB24 8RA  
Appellant: Mr Toby Rickett  
Inspectorate Ref: APP/W0530/W/20/3262382  
Appeal Start Date: 18th December 2020

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

The appeal will be determined on the basis of **written representations**. The procedure to be followed is set out in Part 2 of The Town and Country Planning (Appeals) (Written Representations Procedure) (England) Regulations 2009, as amended. We have forwarded all the representations made to us on the application to the Planning Inspectorate and the appellant. These will be considered by the Inspector when determining the appeal.

If you wish to make comments, or modify/withdraw your previous representation, you can do so online at <https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk>. If you do not have access to the internet, you can send your comments to: The Planning Inspectorate, Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Bristol, BS1 6PN.

**All representations must be received by 22nd January 2021** . Any representations submitted after the deadline will not usually be considered and will be returned. The Planning Inspectorate does not acknowledge representations. **All representations must quote the appeal reference.**

Please note that any comments you submit to the Planning Inspectorate will be copied to the appellant and this local planning authority and will be considered by the Inspector when determining the appeal. The appeal documents are available for inspection online at <https://applications.greatercambridgeplanning.org/online-applications/PLAN/20/02217/FUL> .

Due to the impact of Covid-19 our normal arrangements to make appeal documents freely available to view in our offices is not possible to support at this time. The Council's Statement should be available by **22nd January 2021**.

You can get a copy of one of the Planning Inspectorate's "Guide to taking part in planning appeals" booklets free of charge from GOV.UK at <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/taking-part-in-a-planning-listed-building-or-enforcement-appeal> or from us.

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

Yours sincerely  
Rebecca Claydon

## **21P/008. Flooding**

Even when it rains and the odd puddle settles by the roadside most of us forget that we live in a shallow bath-tub from which almost all our rainwater has to escape into the River Ouse through a funnel in the north-east corner of the parish at Chear Fen. Even then “our water” has to compete with water already in the Ouse and coming from the west across the Bedford Levels or from the south-west in the Cottenham Lode. Fortunately most of the two rivers, managed by the Environment Agency, are embanked so the risk of flooding from them is quite low, despite their water level being much higher than that in the village and surrounding fields.

Cottenham’s rainwater disperses into the network of ditches and drains across our fields and, without assistance, would gradually fill up our bathtub, first cutting off our roads then – eventually - flood many of our houses. Our foul water (sewage) usually follows a different path with two pumps driving it down to the water treatment works at Milton.

Fortunately, a number of Drainage Boards were set up many years ago and given the task of keeping surface water levels in the fields at an acceptable level. They do this using a number of pumping stations along the main rivers; the pumps lower the water levels in the ditches and transfer the pumped water, in our case, up into the Ouse.

This Christmas the Environment Agency had to cope with extensive flooding across the Bedford Levels driving much more water than usual into the Great Ouse even when the Bedford Washes were used to hold back massive amounts of water in the low land at Earith, Sutton Gault and further north to Denver and Welney. Cottenham Lode itself was flowing with very high levels of water from the land around Dry Drayton, Northstowe and Oakington. The strong wind did not help.

Our local Drainage Board – the Old West Internal Drainage Board – is responsible for draining the land to the north of Cottenham. They and their colleagues throughout the Ely Group of IDBs had to work flat out for several days and nights to keep the pumps at Queenholme and Chear Fen in operation over the Christmas holiday in the face of several equipment failures and substitutions. Most missed their own Christmas lunch and a lot of time with their families. Staff from the Amey plant at Waterbeach and even Mick George himself (head of the haulier business) were there personally to lend a hand to the IDB and some local farmers when the going got really tough. Their work continued for several days, borrowing and deploying additional pipes and pumps, and repairing the damaged pumps.

We did not escape completely, of course. The level in the Lode prevented surface water around Broad Lane and Histon Road from escaping as fast as it should from low-lying areas, although the Balancing Ponds worked well, as did almost all the highway gullies following their jetting in recent weeks. The Cottenham fire crew answered several 999 calls to pump away water about to enter houses in the village. Unfortunately, they were not always successful.

Although this incident was the worst in living memory, the Parish Council is working on measures to reduce the future risk, as it could happen again. If you had a problem – or a near miss - this time or in the summer, please do what you can to protect yourself and your property. Sandbags and other flood protection equipment can be obtained from a variety of companies. Here are some companies you may wish to contact for further information:

Flood Sense – [info@floodsense.co.uk](mailto:info@floodsense.co.uk) or 08081 972 753

Multi-flood Solutions – [info@multifloodsolutions.co.uk](mailto:info@multifloodsolutions.co.uk) or 01584 819233

*For critical events contact: 999, 111, Highways Flood ..., Sewage issues ... Rivers ...*



**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.
--------------	-----------------------------	----------	---------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------