

AGENDA REPORTS PACK

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9th September 2021

21P/139. Minutes

DRAFT Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

Meeting held in the Village Hall, Lambs Lane on Thursday 19th August 2021 at 7.30pm

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

21P/126. Chairman's Introduction and Apologies – Apologies received from Cllrs Bolitho (work), Graves (work) and Hewitt (personal).

21P/127. Any Questions from the Public or Press – None present.

21P/128. To accept Declarations of Interest and Dispensations – None given.

21P/129. Minutes – Minor amends made to item 21/02073/FUL. Resolution that the minutes of the Committee meeting held on 5th August 2021 be signed as a correct record. Proposed Cllr Collinson and seconded by Cllr Bailey. **RESOLVED.**

21P/130. Planning Applications:

- **21/03022/HFUL**- Installation of an Air Source Heat Pump - Resubmission of 21/01425/HFUL, 52 Histon Road, Cottenham. Providing that SCDC finds the noise assessment acceptable CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Loveluck and seconded by Cllr Bailey. **APPROVED.**
- **21/03445/HFUL** - Single storey rear extension, 12 Victory Way, Cottenham. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Henderson and seconded by Cllr Collinson. **APPROVED.**
- **21/03402/HFUL** - Two storey side extension and rear single storey extension. Re-submission 21/01634/HFUL, 11 Mill Field, Cottenham. Concerns raised about loss of parking and blocking access to the garage. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Loveluck and seconded by Cllr Henderson. **APPROVED.**
- **21/03495/HFUL & 21/03496/LBC** - Partial demolition of lean-to extension, extensions to existing garage block and conversion into domestic accommodation with link to main dwelling, 28 High Street, Cottenham. The Design & Access statement argues at great length that the historic nature of the building has been taken into account. The extensions won't be seen from the High Street but are very dominant and change the nature of the cottage considerably. Appreciate that the design has tried to make the link between the buildings disappear however would still be contrary to NP policy COH/1-4a. CPC recommends approval subject to condition that the extension not being subject to separate occupancy from the main dwelling. Proposed Cllr Loveluck and seconded by Cllr Henderson. **APPROVED.**

Tree Orders

- **21/0910/TTCA** - T1 - Yew tree, crown reduce by 2M, 185 High Street, Cottenham. Noted that the application form has been completed incorrectly. Owner is a Cllr however the applicant is a neighbour. No details regarding the original height of the tree or why the works are necessary – generally insufficient information.

SCDC - For information only

- **S/2549/19/NMA4** - Non-material amendment of reserved matters permission S/2549/19/RM for the addition of a medium Garden Pod to plot 9, Land to south west Rampton Road, Cottenham

- **21/03548/CL2PD** - Certificate of lawfulness under Section 192 for a proposed loft conversion with roof lights, 7 Sovereign Way, Cottenham
- **S/1225/17/CONDC** - Submission of details required by conditions 5 (Surface water drainage) and 6 (Foul water drainage) of planning permission S/1225/17/OL, Land between 117-123 Histon Road, Cottenham

21P/131. Greater Cambridge Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document – consider response to SPD by 17th September – Document isn't very accessible and disjointed. Noted that both the Cottenham or Histon Neighbourhood Plans are missing from the supplementary planning documents (page 18). May want to consider a village-focussed executive summary to aid use of the document. There is a lot of what they want to do but not how it will happen. City is very different from South Cambs and hard to combine policies for the two. Clerk to respond accordingly.

21P/132. Enforcement – consider updates from Enforcement Officers and additional items – 6/16B – Clerk to chase for an update. 6/20A – close. 1/21B – close. 5/17A – Clerk to chase for a timescale.

21P/134. Date of next meeting – 9th September 2021

21P/135. Close of meeting – 8.45pm.

Signed _____ (Chair) Date _____

21P/140. Planning Applications

- [21/03655/HFUL](#) – Single storey front extension, 20 Pelham Way, Cottenham

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
- [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
- [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
- [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

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

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
20/03846/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.	

				<p>- 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.</p> <p>- 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.</p> <p>- The site is outside the village framework (contrary to NP policy COH/2-1).</p> <p>- 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</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

					(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.	