

AGENDA REPORTS PACK

PLANNING COMMITTEE

23rd September 2021

21P/147. Minutes

DRAFT Planning Committee Meeting Agenda

Meeting to be held in the Village Hall, Lambs Lane on Thursday 9th September 2021 at 7.30pm

21P/136. Chairman's Introduction and Apologies – Cllr Kidston was welcomed to the Committee. Apologies accepted from Cllrs Graves (personal), Henderson (personal) and Hewitt (holiday).

21P/137. Any Questions from the Public or Press – No public present.

21P/138. To accept Declarations of Interest and Dispensations – None given.

21P/139. Minutes – Minor amends made. Resolution that the amended minutes of the Committee meeting held on 19th August 2021 be signed as a correct record. Proposed Cllr Bailey and seconded by Cllr Collinson. **RESOLVED.**

21P/140. Planning Applications:

- **21/03655/HFUL** – Single storey front extension, 20 Pelham Way, Cottenham. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Loveluck and seconded by Cllr Bailey. **APPROVED.**

Tree Orders

- **21/1055/TTCA** - 1. Holly left hand side of drive - prune to clear roof by appx 0.5m
2. Oak - crown lift over road to 5m, reduce crown over adjacent driveway by 2m, remove major dead wood, reduce Parthenocissus where it hangs lower than the crown over road or adjacent parking space, remove ivy and any other climber from top 30% of crown, trim foliage off footpath, 48 Corbett Street, Cottenham. Noted.
- **21/1062/TTCA** - Liquidamber (T1) - Crown reduction of up to 3m from height and 1.5m from sides. Copper Beech (T2) - Crown reduction of up to 3m from height and 1.5m from sides
Norway Maple (T3) - Crown reduction of up to 3m from height and 1.5m from sides
The reason for the above three crown reductions is to alleviate the shade they cast over the garden in the afternoon. Silver Birch (T4) - fell, the tree has a very uneven crown due to adjacent trees, 350 High Street, Cottenham. Noted.
- **21/1113/TTCA** - Proposal: 5 x Ash trees Complete removal. The trees are self-sets and through neglect have become too large for the location. They are overhanging Narrow Lane which is adjacent to my property and also pose a threat to my sewer pipes which run very close to the location of the trees, 271 High Street, Cottenham. Noted. Any replacement trees should be suitable for the location.
- **21/1094/TTCA** - G1 - Row of Ash and Hawthorn, cut back overhang growing towards the road and houses and clear away from telephone lines by a maximum of 5m, 7 Church Lane, Cottenham. Noted. Query whether the trees are owned by 7 Church Lane – the site is opposite and not part of the garden.

SCDC - For information only

- **S/2002/18/CONDA** - Submission of details required by condition 3(i) (Detailed Desk Study) and 5 (i-iv) (Traffic Management) of planning permission S/3003/18/FL, 144 Histon Road, Cottenham

21P/141. Enforcement – consider updates from Enforcement Officers and additional items – Report noted.

21P/142. Date of next meeting – 23rd September 2021

21P/143. Close of meeting – 8.10pm.

21P/148. Planning Applications

- [21/03737/FUL](#) – Change of use from a permanent mixed agricultural, B8 (storage and distribution) use, B2 (general industrial) use, and a vehicle panel beating use (sui generis) to a Class B2 (general industrial) use, Class B8 (storage and distribution) and vehicle/equipment storage use (sui generis), Land At Foxlands Long Drove, Cottenham
- [21/01881/REM](#) - Approval of matters reserved in respect of appearance, landscaping layout and scale following outline planning permission S/2876/16/OL for a residential development of 140 dwellings, Land North And East Of Ramphill Farm, Rampton Road, Cottenham
- [21/01882/REM](#) - Approval of matters reserved in respect of appearance, landscaping layout and scale following outline planning permission S/2876/16/OL for a residential development of 140 dwellings, Land North And East Of Ramphill Farm, Rampton Road, Cottenham
- [S/1617/19/VC](#) - Variation of conditions 31 (Rampton Road and Oakington Road roundabout improvements), 32 (Footway/Cycleway from site entrance to existing footway), 33 (Widening of footway/cycleway to junction with Rampton Road), 34 (Widening of Rampton Road footway) and 35 (Bus Stop Improvement) of planning permission S/1606/16/OL, Land At Oakington Road, Cottenham

Tree Orders

- [21/1174/TTCA](#) - The yew T1 should be removed within the next 2 years. The yew T1 is located in a confined space that will constrain future growth but significant further growth is quite possible should roots find favourable rooting conditions. The tree removal is for mortgage purposes, 58A High Street, Cottenham

For information only:

- [20/04408/CONDD](#) - Submission of details required by conditions 12 (Contamination) and 13 (Verification Report) of 20/04408/PRI03Q, Haelan Feld, Twentypence Road, Cottenham

Withdrawn

- [21/00417/FUL](#) - Siting of a semi-permanent seasonal sperry tent for weddings and events, erection of a timber pergoda, change of use of paddock land for wedding use, constuction of 2 no. service buildings, change of use of building to ceremony hall, siting of 2 no. shepherds huts, conversion of building to holiday let, car parking and soft landscaping - Resubmission of 20/04109/FUL, Willow Grange Farm, Ely Road, Chittering

21P/149. Consultation

Dear Parish Council,

I am sure that you are aware that the Government is currently running a consultation on the Oxford Cambridge Arc. South Cambridgeshire District Council will, of course, be responding to this and part of our focus is likely to be around the environmental impact of the Arc but also on the opportunities for doubling nature and for reducing carbon emissions.

I would like to encourage all of the parish councils in the district to also respond to the consultation on their own behalf so that government has some awareness of the impact of this proposal on rural areas and rural communities such as ours.

The link is <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/creating-a-vision-for-the-oxford-cambridge-arc> and the consultation runs until 12th October.

The Infrastructure Workshops we are running on 4th and 11th October will of course include information on E-W rail, and may be helpful for you in terms of finalising your individual responses.

Yours sincerely,

Cllr Bridget Smith The Leader, South Cambridgeshire District Council

21P/150. SCDC Street Trading policy

Dear Sir/Madam

I wish to advise you that at the Council's Cabinet Meeting on 6 September, Members approved the adoption of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982 ("The Act") for the whole of the South Cambridgeshire District, and designate all roads and streets within the District as Consent Streets (with the exception of the A11 and A14).

A public notice will be published in the Cambridge News on Wednesday 15 and 22 September, with representations invited by no later than 14 October 2021. I have attached a copy of the notice for your information. Should any representations be received, they will be considered by Cabinet on 19 October. If no representations are received, then the process of implementation will begin.

Subject to the final approval, the Council will be formulating a brand new street trading policy. The aims of the policy will be to ensure a fair and equitable approach to street trading District-wide, and to allow for a clear licensing scheme for ad-hoc vendors/food truck in for example pub car parks.

Ensuring we reflect the concerns of parish and town councils is essential in the policy, as key stakeholders you have a very important role to play, and we will ensure that your views are taken into account starting at the policy formulation stages, should you wish to be involved.

We recognise that in some areas, licensing of traders has been done locally and without issue for perhaps many years, we would seek to support those traders who have provided a valuable service to your community, and not imposing restrictions which would make trading for them unfeasible for financial or other reasons. I would be grateful to know if you do have any traders (if you licence them or not), and if so, if you could provide a contact name, number or email that would be extremely helpful. Equally helpful would be if you were able to provide me with any ideas as to how we could

support those traders, perhaps by offering “grandfather rights” to existing vendors who will fall into the new scheme.

There may be other suggestions relating to the licensing regime which would help shape the policy, and again, I would be very grateful to receive any such feedback. I do appreciate that your committee meetings may not happen too frequently, but if you could provide any feedback at your earliest opportunity, I would be very appreciative, as we will be commencing the drafting imminently, and intend to have a policy ready for consultation by November.

The intention would be that any policy would take effect in March, so currently there will be no changes during this review period.

Best wishes

Rachel Jackson | Principal Licensing Officer

Street trading - Proposed Resolution to Re-Designate Streets Within South Cambridgeshire District as Consent Streets

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN South Cambridgeshire District Council (“the Council”) in accordance with Paragraph 2 of Schedule 4 to the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982 intends to pass a resolution with regard to street trading.

Notice is hereby given that South Cambridgeshire District Council intends a resolution be passed rescinding the current prohibited streets designation prior to the passing of a further resolution designating all streets within the district as consent streets for the purpose of street trading. A draft of the proposed resolution is set out below:

“RESOLVED that pursuant to Schedule 4 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982, that the current prohibited streets designation with the Council area be rescinded and that with effect from 1 March 2022, all streets within the district shall be designated as consent streets for the purposes of street trading.”

There shall be excluded from the designation in the resolution above any area of land which is from time to time in the ownership and control of a Public Authority or a registered charity other than any highway which is included from time to time on the list of streets maintainable at public expense pursuant to section 36(6) of the Highways Act 1980, currently A11 and A14.

For the purposes of this resolution above “ownership and control” means having a sufficient estate or legal interest in the area of land to enable the relevant Public Authority or registered charity to restrict and regulate the use of that area in the public interest and “Public Authority” means Cambridgeshire County Council or South Cambridgeshire District Council or any Parish or Town Council the whole or part of whose area falls within the boundary of the district of South Cambridgeshire.

It is proposed the resolution will take effect on 1 March 2022.

Persons wishing to make representations about the proposed resolution must be received no later than 14 October 2021, either in writing to The Licensing Section, South Cambridgeshire District Council, South Cambridgeshire Hall, 6010 Cambourne Business Park, Cambourne, Cambridge, CB23 6EA or by email to licensing@scambs.gov.uk. All such representations received by this date will be considered before it is decided whether or not to pass the resolution.

A copy of this notice will be displayed for public inspection on the Council's website www.scambs.gov.

Dated: 15 September 2021

21P/151. Tree Preservation Orders

Resident has contacted the Council regarding trees which overhang his boundary. There are 3 sycamore trees close to the boundary with the house. All trees on The Pond (top of Broad Lane/High Street) have a TPO on them.

a) we need to decide what to do in circumstances like this: they are our trees but do we have a responsibility to cut back when overhanging a neighbour's garden/ should we do so as a good will gesture? b) trimming back can take place now if need be and c) an application would need to be submitted to SCDC for the works (quotes will be required for the works).

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 – Phoebe Carter (case officer) chased 6/7/21
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 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	

				<p>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 also pass a sequential test demonstrating that no other sites exist that would have less impact on the greenbelt. Local reports counter what has been stated in 	
--	--	--	--	---	--

					the ecology report and there is an abundance of wildlife on the site. - 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.	
21/03073/FUL	Land rear of 129 High Street, Cottenham.	5/8/21	Refusal		Demolition of existing studio and construction of 5 bedroom property with amenity space, parking, bin and cycle storage. Drive to side of 129 narrows to the side, not adequate access. Contrary to Local Plan H17 a and b. Infill of back land in conservation area. No reference to NHP. Contrary to NHP policy COH/1-5. Large size relative to plot. Concerns withdrawn application to remove 17 trees shows intent. Tree removal would open up plot	
21/03406/PRI03Q	Land To The South-west Of Beach Road, Cottenham	5/8/21	Refusal		Prior approval for change of use of agricultural building to 1 No. Dwellinghouse (Class C3). Was never an agricultural building. Appears to be on same footprint, but not enough detail. Situated in open countryside, not linked to agricultural business. Away from amenities, no footpath contrary to COH/1-5 j of the NHP.	