

## **AGENDA REPORTS PACK**

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**6<sup>th</sup> May 2021**

## 21P/083. Minutes

### DRAFT Planning Committee Meeting Agenda

Meeting held via Zoom on Thursday 22nd April 2021 at 7.30pm

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

**21P/070. Chairman's Introduction and Apologies** – Apologies accepted from Cllr Loveluck (personal).

**21P/071. Any Questions from the Public or Press** – None present.

**21P/072. To accept Declarations of Interest and Dispensations** – None given.

**21P/073. Minutes** – Resolution that the minutes of the Committee meeting held on 8th April 2021 be signed as a correct record. Proposed Cllr Graves and seconded by Cllr Ward. **RESOLVED.**

**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. No attempt to get the extension to fit and be appropriate to the existing house. NP policy COH 1/4b states that it should retain character similarity. Rest of the works are acceptable. We don't object in principle but due to the out of character extension CPC recommend refusal. Proposed Cllr Collinson and seconded by Cllr Bolitho.
- **21/01098/HFUL** - Proposed new single storey extension to the rear and new garage to the front, 20 Ivatt Street, Cottenham. Some concerns raised that the garage may interfere with the sight lines/visibility splays. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Ward and seconded by Cllr Graves. **APPROVED.**

#### 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. Cllr Bolitho raised concerns regarding how the tree could be shaped and balanced when one side doesn't exist. Need more specific information.
- **21/0447/TTCA** - Holly in rear garden - reduce height by 3-4m and prune by up to 1m laterally, 312 High Street, Cottenham. Not that there were no details regarding the existing tree height.
- **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. Mountain Ash is in poor condition. Hawthorn – no precise information regarding the clearance.

#### SCDC – Approved

- **21/00408/HFUL** – Single storey side extensions, 5 The Lakes, Twentypence Road, Cottenham. Clerk to check history of previous refusal.

**21P/075. Planning appeal** – consider written response to appeal relating to application S/4207/19/RM (This Land) – This Land are appealing to safeguard their position. SCDC have confirmed that they will robustly defend against the appeal. CPC to reiterate previous objections. Need to remind the Inspector about the Neighbourhood Plan. Defer to next

agenda and request that it isn't written representations. Clerk to flag to residents on social media.

**21P/076. Bellway POS** – consider waiving or reducing the 12 months maintenance period – Clerk

**21P/077. Enforcement** – consider updates from Enforcement Officers and additional items for enforcement – Case 2/21 – update received from Enforcement. Decision queried due to witnesses seeing material being dumped on the site. Clerk to speak to Deborah Jeakins at CCC and copy CCC Cllr Wotherspoon. Case 5/17 – may be premature to meeting; invite to next face to face meeting. Case 5/18 – padlock has been cut and flytipping taking place. Clerk to contact SCDC Cllr Gough. Case 11/18 – write to resident to ask what their plans are for reinstatement of the verge. Appendix – Clerk to chase Officer to ask for an estimated time when the case will be determined.

**21P/078. Date of next meeting** – 6th May 2021

**21P/079. Close of meeting** – 8.35pm.

## 21P/084. Planning Applications

- [21/00957/HFUL](#) - Erection of a double carriage style garage, Ash Barn, 71a High Street, Cottenham
- [21/01023/OUT](#) - Outline planning permission for a single storey 'Self Build' dwelling with all matters reserved, Land Adjacent To 15 Orchard Close, Cottenham
- [21/01068/FUL](#) - Installation of pumping station and security fencing, and construction of a layby to provide safe parking, Smithy Fen, Land Adjacent To Lockspit Hall Drove, Cottenham
- [21/01240/HFUL](#) - Single storey and two storey rear extensions, 4 Curringtons Close, Cottenham
- [21/01276/S73](#) - S73 variation of condition 2 (Approved plans) of planning permission S/2702/18/FL (To demolish existing single storey village hall and replace with a new two storey village hall in the same location. Extension to car park and ancillary development) the addition of a new fire access route from the car park to the fire hydrant, King George V Playing Fields, Lambs Lane, Cottenham
- [21/01277/S73](#) - S73 Variation of condition 2 (Approved plans) of planning permission S/2705/18/FL (Reconfiguration of the public play area to allow for the erection of a single storey standalone nursery building with additional car parking and access road modification) the addition of a new fire access route from the car park to the fire hydrant, King George V Playing Fields, Lambs Lane, Cottenham

### Tree Works

- [21/0506/TTCA](#) - 1. Elm - very minor pruning to small split branch. 2. Ivy and Hawthorn on left hand side (approx 12ft section up to large Hawthorn) - cut back hard to clear fence line for erection of new boundary close board fence (not inc in price). 3. Corkscrew Willow - remove 1 stem over adjacent garden boundary and crown reduce remaining by approx 3m. 4. Damson - on left hand boundary near to house - reduce upper crown by 2.5m - 3m, 2 Bramley Close Cottenham

## 21P/085. 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

**Notes:**

As mentioned at the previous meeting, we should say we stand by the SCDC reasons for refusal from the [decision notice](#).

And our own final input to that Planning Committee meeting: The letter quoting NP clauses to Michael Sexton

Anything else?



## 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.	<b>Refusal decision imminent</b>
S/4411/19/FL	35 Beach Rd	23/01/2020	Refusal		Occupancy condition on annexe	<b>Refused</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.	<b>Withdrawn</b>
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"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- The site is outside the village framework (contrary to NP policy COH/2-1).</li> <li>- 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</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

					<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>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--