

AGENDA REPORTS PACK

PLANNING COMMITTEE

22nd April 2021

21P/073. Minutes

Draft Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

Meeting held via Zoom on Thursday 8th April 2021 at 7.30pm

Present: Cllr Morris (Chair), Bolitho, Collinson, Graves, Loveluck, Ward and the Assistant Clerk

21P/061. Chairman's Introduction and Apologies – Apologies received from the Clerk (personal).

21P/062. Any Questions from the Public or Press – None present.

21P/063. To accept Declarations of Interest and Dispensations – None given.

21P/064. Minutes – Resolution that the minutes of the Committee meeting held on 18th March 2021 be signed as a correct record. Proposed Cllr Loveluck and seconded by Cllr Graves.
RESOLVED.

21P/065. Planning Applications:

- **21/00619/S73** - Removal of condition 4 (agricultural occupation) of planning permission C/0439/69/O (Erection of a bungalow), The Fruit Farm, Bungalow, Ely Road, Chittering. Noted it is a small plot of land attached, not big enough for an agricultural holding. Discussion regarding whether affordable housing for agricultural workers is needed. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Ward and seconded by Cllr Collinson. **APPROVED.**
- **21/00901/HFUL & 21/00902/LBC** - Erection of timber driveway gates and pedestrian access gate, 28 High Street, Cottenham. Noted requires listed building consent and is within conservation area. Discussion regarding colour of gates. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Graves and seconded by Cllr Ward. **APPROVED.**

Tree Works

- **21/0298/TTCA** - Proposal: Oak (T1) Remove one lateral limb overhanging the crown of the adjacent walnut tree and crown thin 10%. removing the limb is to stop any interference between the oak and the walnut as the oak has grown larger and the walnut has compensated for this by growing very one sided. The crown thin is to reduce the crown density and allow more light and air through to the centre of the crown; Walnut (T2) Reduce lowest large over extended lateral stems by up to 2 Metre. Due to the oak shading the walnut it has grown very one sided and we are concerned about the limbs breaking due to being over extended and would like to reduce these back to reduce the risk of the limbs collapsing due to a hazard beam issue; Holly (T3) Fell to Ground level. The Holly is a poor specimen having previously been shaded by a neighbouring Hazel tree that was competing with the holly for resources. Now with ivy completely enveloping the trunk the owners would like it to be removed - 4 Eversley Close Cottenham CB24 8SG. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Morris and seconded by Cllr Loveluck. **APPROVED.** Applicant was commended for the level of detail provided in their application.

For information only:

- **S/3672/19/CONDB** - Submission of details required by condition 5 (Biodiversity enhancement scheme) of prior approval S/3672/19/PA, Lingwood Farm, Smithy Fen Cottenham
- **20/03460/CONDB** - Submission of details required by condition 2 (Biodiversity enhancement report) of prior approval 20/03460/PRI03Q, Lingwood Farm, Smithy Fen Cottenham

- **S/2549/19/NMA3** - Non Material amendment of planning permission S/2549/19/RM (Approval of matters reserved for access appearance landscaping layout and scale following outline planning permission S/2413/17/OL as varied by Section 73 application S/4116/18/VC for the erection of up to 200 residential dwellings (including 40% affordable housing) demolition of no. 117 Rampton Road introduction of structural planting and landscaping informal public open space and children's play area surface water flood mitigation and attenuation vehicular access points from Rampton Road and associated ancillary works) amend the road layout to include additional footpaths and parking layout for plots 52-53 amended from frontage to side parking bays, Land To The South West Rampton Road, Cottenham (Redrow). Noted that Redrow now have signed IDB consent for drainage at the site.

21P/066. Street Trading – consider application from Questione di Sapori to trade in Cottenham. Cllr Morris stated that the road was not adopted, and therefore may need permission from Cottenham Village College to trade there. The car park is frequently busy with events held at the College. CPC recommends refusal due to being on private grounds, risk of litter at site, and conflicts with parking needs of other activities at the College. Proposed Cllr Ward and seconded by Cllr Collinson. **REFUSED.**

21P/067. Enforcement – consider updates from Enforcement Officers and additional items for enforcement – Case 2/21 – Clerk has received an update: Enforcement checking whether activity is linked to pending planning application; following update from case officer may visit the site. Case 9/19B – Local Highways Officer now has evidence and will write to the homeowner accordingly.

21P/068. Date of next meeting – 22nd April 2021

21P/069. Close of meeting – 8.03pm.

Signed _____ (Chair) Date _____

21P/074. Planning Applications

- [21/00958/HFUL](#) & [21/00959/LBC](#) - Refurbishment and alterations to the existing house and erection of rear single storey extension, 318 High Street, Cottenham
- [21/01098/HFUL](#) - Proposed new single storey extension to the rear and new garage to the front, 20 Ivatt Street, Cottenham

Tree Works

- [21/0445/TTCA](#) – Yew: reduce height by 2.5 to 3ms and reduce lateral growth all round by up to 2ms to shape and balance, 87 Rooks Street, Cottenham
- [21/0447/TTCA](#) - Holly in rear garden - reduce height by 3-4m and prune by up to 1m laterally, 312 High Street, Cottenham
- [21/0465/TTCA](#) - 6. Mountain Ash - reduce ivy to 6ft and remove deadwood and crossing branches; 7. Hawthorn - prune to clear house, shed and remove crossing branches, 8 Margett Street, Cottenham

SCDC – Approved

- [21/00408/HFUL](#) – Single storey side extensions, 5 The Lakes, Twentypence Road, Cottenham

21P/075. Planning appeal

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

Reference: S/4207/19/RM
Proposal: 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.
Site address: Land North East Of Rampton Road Cottenham Cambs
Appellant: This Land Ltd
Inspectorate Ref: APP/W0530/W/21/3269815
Appeal Start Date: 9th April 2021

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 14th May 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/S/4207/19/RM> .

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 **14th May 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

Michael Sexton
Principal Planning Officer

21P/076. Bellway POS

Email received from Justin Gaggini (appointed by Bellway Homes to progress the Adoption of the POS areas):

“We have inspected the POS areas with Carol Newell (Great Cambridge Planning) and were pleased to note that there was only a minor amount of works to complete which we have instructed the contractor to complete without delay.

In the meantime we were asking if consideration could be given to waiving or reducing the 12 month maintenance period as the majority of the works had already effectively served that period.

Could you please confirm the Parish’s stance and advice?”

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.	Refusal decision imminent
S/4411/19/FL	35 Beach Rd	23/01/2020	Refusal		Occupancy condition on annexe	Refused
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.	Withdrawn
20/04906/OUT	Agricultural Building And Land To The Rear Of 38 Histon Road Cottenham CB24 8UD	7/1/21	Refusal		- 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	

				<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- 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 per other developments on Oakington and Rampton Roads.- 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	
--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>also pass a sequential test demonstrating that no other sites exist that would have less impact on the greenbelt.</p> <p>Local reports counter what has been stated in the ecology report and there is an abundance of wildlife on the site.</p> <p>- 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.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--