

## **AGENDA REPORTS PACK**

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**22<sup>nd</sup> July 2021**

## 21P/111. Minutes

### DRAFT Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

Meeting held in the Village Hall, Lambs Lane on Thursday 8<sup>th</sup> July 2021 at 7.30pm

**Present:** Cllrs Loveluck (Chair), Bailey, Bolitho, Collinson, Graves, Henderson and the Clerk

**21P/100. Chairman's Introduction and Apologies** – Apologies accepted from Cllrs Hewitt (work) and Hutchison (personal).

**21P/101. Any Questions from the Public or Press** – None present.

**21P/102. To accept Declarations of Interest and Dispensations** – None given.

**21P/103. Minutes** – Resolution that the minutes of the Committee meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> June 2021 be signed as a correct record. Proposed Cllr Bailey and seconded by Cllr Graves.  
**RESOLVED.**

**21P/104. Planning Applications:**

- **21/02688/HFUL** - Two storey front extension, 28 Kingfisher Way, Cottenham. Concerns raised that 12 Tenison Manor might be affected by the windows and that they hadn't been consulted. Discussion regarding parking spaces. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Graves and seconded by Cllr Collinson. **APPROVED.**
- **21/02744/HFUL** - Replacement Boundary Garden Walls, New Garden Gates & Reduction of Existing Ash Tree, 250 High Street, Cottenham. Discussion regarding location of the gates and need to maintain visibility splays. Agree with Trees Officer that separate application regarding the ash tree should be submitted – needs to state height reduction. Removal of the hedge would benefit pedestrians (narrow pavement); query whether this would also require a separate application. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Henderson and seconded by Cllr Collinson. **APPROVED.**
- **21/02733/HFUL & 21/02734/LBC** - Refurbishment and alterations to the existing house and erection of rear single storey extension, 318 High Street Cottenham. Improvements seem sensitive however the extension doesn't fit in with the character of the building or location – contrary to NP policy COH/1-4 a and b. CPC recommends refusal. Proposed Cllr Collinson and seconded by Cllr Bolitho. **REFUSED.**

#### Tree Orders

- **21/0743/TTCA** - 1. Lime tree to East of cycle shed - CR by up to 2.5m to reduce weight on outlying branches, remove as much mistletoe as possible to lessen the risk of future branch failure. Thin crown by up to 15% to reduce sail area and remove major dead wood. Also remove basal suckers and inspect base of tree for cavities and fungal fruiting bodies. 2a. Laurel screen to rear of cycle shed against boundary wall - consider heavily reducing the crowns of the plants screening the rear of the cycle shed to leave trunks at around 5ft. These should then regrow and would produce a screen again. If regularly pruned they could be kept in check and not allowed to overhang the adjacent property to such a degree. The large Laurel to the west of the cycle shed included, All Saints Church High Street Cottenham. Item noted.
- **21/0762/TTCA** – T1 Magnolia Fell; T2 Maple Fell; T3: Maple Fell; T4 Silver Birch; T5 - T17 Leylandii Fell, 129 High Street, Cottenham. Noted that the application hasn't been signed by the owner; agent is working for the potential land purchaser and not the owner. Query whether trees have been correctly identified. Lack of detail and no

reason given for the works. CPC strongly object and recommend refusal. Proposed Cllr Bolitho and seconded by Cllr Collinson. Clerk to comment accordingly.

**SCDC – Withdrawn**

- **21/01425/HFUL** - Installation of an Air Source Heat Pump at the front of 52 Histon Road, 52 Histon Road, Cottenham

**SCDC – For information only**

- **S/3703/19/CONDA** - Submission of details required by condition 3 (Soft and Hard Landscape), 4 (Tree Protection), 5 (Archaeological Work), 6 (Contamination Land), 7 (Ecological Management Plan), 8 (Noise Assessment Report), 9 (Environmental Management Plan), 10 (Materials), 11 (Foul Water Drainage), 12 (Surface Water Drainage), 13 (Carbon Emissions), 14 (Remediation Method Statement), 15 (Footway Details), 16 (Bike Storage) and 23 (Lighting) of planning permission S/3703/19/FL, Broad Lane Industrial Estate, Unit F2 Broad Lane, Cottenham. Noted that not all of the documents are showing online. Cllr Graves to comment on conditions 11 and 12 and refer comments to the Clerk.
- **21/02241/CL2PD** - Certificate of lawfulness under S192 for single storey front, side and rear extensions, 85 Histon Road, Cottenham

**SCDC – Approvals**

- **21/1426/HFUL** - Two storey front extension to existing dwelling, Lake View 2 The Lakes, Twentypence Road, Cottenham
- **21/01956/HFUL** - Single storey side and rear extension, 94 Lambs Lane, Cottenham

**21P/105. Enforcement** – consider updates from Enforcement Officers and additional items – case 5/17A – Clerk to follow up with Bridget Smith regarding timescales. Case 5/18 – close. Case 6/16B – Clerk to follow up with Enforcement due to apparent lack of works.

**21P/106. Date of next meeting** – 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2021

**21P/107. Close of meeting** – 8.38pm.

## **21P/112. Planning Applications**

- [21/02878/HFUL](#)- Front Porch, Garage Conversion and link addition, 50 Lyles Road, Cottenham
- [21/0794/TTHR](#) - Removal of one section of hedgerow, 7m long, to facilitate the pipelaying of a new sewer, Land At The Junction Of Smithy Fen And Twentypence Road, Cottenham

### **Tree Orders**

- [21/0824/TTCA](#) - Cherry Blossom in rear garden – fell, 180 High Street, Cottenham

### **SCDC – For information only**

- [21/02252/PRI01A](#) - First floor extension, 85 Histon Road, Cottenham (prior approval not required)
- [21/02575/CONDB](#) - Submission of details required by condition 3 (Energy Statement) of planning permission 20/02575/FUL, Land To Rear Of 69 Rooks Street, Cottenham
- [21/04408/CONDA](#) - Submission of details required by condition 11 (Traffic Management Plan) of prior approval 20/04408/PRI03Q, Haelan Feld Twentypence Road, Cottenham
- [21/04408/CONDB](#) - Submission of details required by condition 7 (Biodiversity Enhancement) of prior approval 20/04408/PRI03Q, Haelan Feld Twentypence Road, Cottenham

### **SCDC – Approvals**

- [21/01641/HFUL](#) - Side extension over existing garage, two storey extension to rear side and demolition of existing conservatory, 108 High Street, Cottenham

## **21P/113. Gun Club**

The original application to build the bunds at Cambridge Gun Club is now 10 years old. CPC has previously engaged with SCDC and the owners regarding the extended build time which is causing noise, damage (vibrations to properties) and nuisance to residents due to the large number of lorry movements through the village. The site was last checked by SCDC in 2018 and works have gone on much longer than anyone might have expected. The bunds themselves have drastically altered the landscape of Twentypence Road.

Suggestion: that we request SCDC/County, via Neil Gough, to revisit the site to check whether the bunds are now as per the approved planning drawings. Is it also possible to seek alternative routing of the lorries if works are to continue?



**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 – Phoebe Carter (case officer) chased 6/7/21</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 rate quoted is excessive at 2.1l per second per	

				<p>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 also pass a sequential test demonstrating that no</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--	---	--



					<p>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>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--