

AGENDA REPORTS PACK

PLANNING COMMITTEE

4th March 2021

21P/044. Minutes

DRAFT Planning Committee Meeting Minutes Meeting held on Thursday 18th February 2021 at 7.30pm

Present: Cllrs Morris (Chair), Bolitho, Graves, Loveluck, Ward and the Clerk

21P/032. Chairman's Introduction and Apologies – Apologies accepted from Cllr Collinson (sick).

21P/033. Any Questions from the Public or Press – None present.

21P/034. To accept Declarations of Interest and Dispensations – Cllr Ward declared an other interest in item 20/04296/OUT and will take no part in discussions or the vote.

21P/035. Minutes – Resolution that the minutes of the Committee meeting held on 4th February 2021 be signed as a correct record. Proposed Cllr Ward and seconded by Cllr Graves.

RESOLVED.

21P/036. Planning Applications:

- **20/04296/OUT** - Outline planning for the erection of an agricultural dwelling with all matters reserved, Bassenhally Farm Broad Lane Cottenham (**AMENDMENTS:** Relocated application site further to the west); Submission of amended red line site plan to include existing temporary dwelling. Cllr Ward took no part in the discussions or vote. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Graves and seconded by Cllr Loveluck. **APPROVED.**
- **21/00060/HFUL** - Single storey front extension, 286a High Street, Cottenham. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Morris and seconded by Cllr Ward. **APPROVED.**
- **21/00474/PRI01A** - Erection of an Orangery, 56 Lambs Lane, Cottenham. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Graves and seconded by Cllr Loveluck. **APPROVED.**

Tree Works

- **21/0093/TTCA** - Eucalyptus Tree 2) Removal of canopy overhang by cutting back to boundary line due to loss of light rendering my garden unusable. Overshadowing is killing my vegetation and grass. Mulberry Tree 1) Fell Mulberry tree due to being badly pruned by previous owners and irreversible imbalance of branches. It is also in a bad location for enjoyment of garden in obstructive central location as well as being a very poor specimen. There are enough trees around the site perimeter so views of these will be improved as well as giving better views across open fields and landscapes to distant trees - The Jolly Millers, 73 High Street, Cottenham. Noted that the application has already been approved.
- **21/0103/TTCA** - 1. Spruce - fell to ground level. A structural engineer has been to the house and confirmed the tree is causing the settlement cracking that we have experienced in the last year or so. In addition, we do know that the tree has damaged the foul drain which passes below – 35 High Street, Cottenham. Noted that the application has already been approved.
- **21/0131/TTCA** - Walnut (T1) - cut back the South to East quarter of the crown which overhangs the lawn by removing up to 2m from branch length. Crown raise to a height of 2.5m; Prunus (T2) - crown reduce by up to 1.5m – 28 High Street, Cottenham. Noted that the application has already been approved.

Clerk to check whether the system for tree applications has been changed yet.

For Information Only:

- **S/3334/19/CONDA** - Submission of details required by conditions 3 (Boundary Treatment) and 4 (Hard and Soft Landscaping) of planning permission S/3334/19/FL, Church Lane Farm, Church Lane, Cottenham
- **S/2702/18/CONDB** - Submission of details required by condition 6 (Car Park Management Plan) of planning permission S/2702/18/FL, King George V Playing Fields Lambs Lane Cottenham
- **S/2705/18/CONDA** - Submission of details required by conditions 7 (Car Park Mangement Plan) and 14 (Fire Hydrants) of planning permission S/2705/18/FL, King George V Playing Fields Lambs Lane Cottenham

21P/037. SCDC PAS report – consider SCDC Planning Committee response to Planning Advisory Service review of SCDC Planning Committee – Cllr Morris ran through the background. Report noted.

21P/038. Enforcement – consider updates from Enforcement Officers and additional items for enforcement – Case 11/18B needs an update. 6/16B – break in at the site during this week and police informed. 1/19 – remove. 4/19B – remove. 5/19B – add dates. 9/19B – Clerk to ask LHO to see whether there is a Highways issue and if the gravel is contained within the site. 3/20B – amend location to Church Lane. 8/20A – now a minimum of 3 tourers and large fence erected. IDB have reported the pipe to the Environment Agency but it appears there has been no action; follow up with Andrew Newton. 1/21B – need to add dates.

21P/039. Date of next meeting – 4th March 2021

21P/040. Close of meeting – 8.15pm.

Signed _____ (Chair) Date _____

21P/045. Planning Applications

- [21/00679/PRI01A](#) - Prior notification for a single storey rear extension, 18 Dunstal Field, Cottenham
- [21/00408/HFUL](#) - Single storey side extensions, 5 The Lakes, Twentypence Road, Cottenham
- [21/00172/HFUL](#) - Replacement of existing single glazed timber-stained windows with PVCu windows, 86 Rooks Street, Cottenham

SCDCC Approved:

- [20/04895/HFUL](#) - Conversion of existing rear conservatory to single storey rear extension, 1 Lacks Close, Cottenham

21P/046. Waterbeach Neighbourhood Plan

Waterbeach Parish Council submitted the Neighbourhood Plan for its parish to us (South Cambridgeshire District Council, SCDC) on 2 February 2021, along with its supporting documents. You have received this email because you are a consultee or have asked to be notified.

Due to the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic we have had to consider how we could adapt our public consultations on neighbourhood plans to ensure everyone's safety whilst still complying with current national regulations. To ensure this we have decided that anyone wishing to inspect a hard copy of neighbourhood plan documents out for consultation will be able to request a copy by contacting the Planning Policy Team (See Contact details below). Our Statement of Community Involvement has been updated to reflect this change in how we make documents available to the public for inspection.

We are now seeking your views on the Waterbeach Neighbourhood Plan before it is considered by an examiner and can proceed towards a referendum.

Comments can be submitted to SCDC between 9am on Tuesday 16 February and 5pm on Tuesday 20 April 2021.

How can I make comments?

There are a number of ways that you can comment:

- By using the online consultation system: <https://scambs.oc2.uk/>
- By emailing us at neighbourhood.planning@greatercambridgeplanning.org
- By writing to us at Planning Policy Team, SCDC, Cambourne Business Park, Cambourne, Cambridge, CB23 6EA

Please include your name, and both your postal and email addresses with any comments so we can keep you informed on the progress of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Where can I view the Neighbourhood Plan and its supporting documents?

To view the Neighbourhood Plan and its supporting documents, visit: www.scambs.gov.uk/WaterbeachNP

You can request a hard copy of these documents by

- Telephoning us at 01954 713183
- emailing us at neighbourhood.planning@greatercambridgeplanning.org

What is the Waterbeach Neighbourhood Plan?

A Neighbourhood Plan is a way for communities to take a proactive approach to deciding the future of the places where they live and work. Once 'made' (adopted) a Neighbourhood Plan has the same legal status as the district wide Local Plan, and alongside the Local Plan will be used in deciding planning applications that fall within its area. Further information is available on our website: www.scambs.gov.uk/neighbourhood-planning

The Waterbeach Neighbourhood Plan sets out a range of planning policies which cover many issues that are considered important to the local community.

We look forward to receiving your comments on the Waterbeach Neighbourhood Plan.

21P/047. Consultation

Both South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council are Planning Authorities with the former mostly concerned with housing development and the latter more interested in exploitation of minerals and processing of waste.

Both organisations have to publish a list of required documentation and the necessary level of detail to be provided with any development application, so that the application can be properly assessed by the Planning Officers or Committee, after the information has been made available to the public for the requisite number of days.

Whenever an application is submitted, and the necessary fee paid, the documentation set will be checked for compliance with the requirements and, if compliant, validated so the statutory response time clocks can be initiated.

From time to time, usually in response to changes in national legislation or local policy, the validation checklist is updated and various bodies, including Parish Councils are consulted for the views on the changes.

1. Planning statement
2. Local authority development letter
3. Statement of Community Involvement
4. Biodiversity survey and report
5. Statement of Sustainable Design and Construction
6. Tree survey/arboricultural report
7. Flood risk assessment
- 7A.Surface water drainage strategy
8. Heritage statement
9. Landscape impact assessment 2
10. Landscaping Proposals
11. Landscaping and biodiversity enhancement management scheme
12. Transport assessment or statement
13. Parking and access arrangements
- 13AConstruction ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT AND traffic management plan
14. Travel Plan
15. Noise AND/OR VIBRATION impact assessment
16. Lighting assessment
17. Air quality assessment
18. Contaminated land assessment
19. Waste audit and management strategy
20. Open space/ playing field assessment
21. Information in support of applications for the storage, treatment or disposal of waste
22. Plans and drawings (including cross-sections where necessary)

Although CCC has little responsibility for housing-related development, this consultation could be an opportunity for CPC to comment on:

- flood risk assessment – inadequate attention to effects of marginal developments
- surface water drainage strategy – long-term maintenance issue with SUDS
- transport assessment – inadequate support of small car-dependent communities

- storage, treatment and disposal of waste – relative benefits of landfill / incineration

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 | Approved under delegated authority |

| | | | | | | |
|--------------|---|----------|---------|--|---|--|
| 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. | |
| 20/04906/OUT | Agricultural Building And Land To The Rear Of 38 Histon Road Cottenham CB24 8UD | 7/1/21 | Refusal | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Application is contrary to the referendum ready Cottenham Neighbourhood Plan. NB: there is no mention of the Neighbourhood Plan in the design and access statement or rest of the application. - Strong concerns regarding drainage. The run off rate quoted is excessive at 2.1l per second per hectare for water to be permitted to drain into an IDB drain. The applicant hasn't approached the IDB and they 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. NB: The IDB are at the limit of what they can pump in that area. Query why the SCDC Drainage Officer has said the application is acceptable subject to conditions when the run off rates aren't acceptable. The application puts effort into explaining the sewers but not the surface water drainage. There has been severe flooding in the vicinity of the site recently and local knowledge states that the site regularly floods. - Road safety/pedestrian safety issues - no pavement provided on the site side of the road. The proposed access could also impede highway visibility for existing adjacent residents. In the event that the application is approved the verge should be upgraded to a full 2m wide pavement as | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | <p>per other developments on Oakington and Rampton Roads.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The site is outside the village framework (contrary to NP policy COH/2-1). - Site is partially in the greenbelt and considered a bit too big to be considered a rural exception site. Currently the need for affordable homes in Cottenham is a negative figure since we have an excess. 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. <p>Local reports counter what has been stated in the ecology report and there is an abundance of wildlife on the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|