

## **AGENDA REPORTS PACK**

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**21<sup>st</sup> October 2021**

## 21P/167. Minutes

### Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

Meeting held in the Village Hall, Lambs Lane on Thursday 7<sup>th</sup> October 2021 at 7.30pm

**Present:** Cllrs Loveluck (Chair), Bolitho, Collinson, Hutchison, Jones and the Clerk

**In attendance:** 2 members of the public

**21P/155. Chairman's Introduction and Apologies** – Apologies accepted from Cllrs Bailey (personal), Graves (personal) and Kidston (holiday). Cllr Henderson arrived at 7.31pm.

**21P/156. Any Questions from the Public or Press** – Standing Orders suspended 7.31pm. Residents attending re. item 21/03788/OUT. Standing Orders reinstated 7.32pm.

**21P/157. To accept Declarations of Interest and Dispensations** – None given.

**21P/158. Minutes** – Resolution that the minutes of the Committee meeting held on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2021 be signed as a correct record. Proposed Cllr Henderson and seconded by Cllr Collinson. **RESOLVED.**

#### **21P/159. Planning Applications:**

- **21/03788/OUT** - Outline planning for the erection of an agricultural dwelling with all matters reserved, Merton Hall, Smithy Fen, Cottenham. Item moved forward for the benefit of residents. Standing Orders suspended 7.33pm. Resident 1 outlined the need for the additional property – primarily so extended family can be on site to assist with running the farm. Access is off the main access and they have tried to make the dwelling as unobtrusive as possible. House has an agricultural tie. Standing Orders reinstated 7.37pm. Acknowledged that additional family are needed on site. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Collinson and seconded by Cllr Bolitho. **APPROVED.**
- **21/04142/HFUL** – Two storey side extension and single storey rear extension, 47 Victory Way, Cottenham. Extension considered large for the size of house. Roof pitch steep but acknowledged that might be so that the windows aren't obscured to neighbouring property. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Loveluck and seconded by Cllr Hutchison. **APPROVED.**
- **21/04129/HFUL** - Garage extension and conversion to form new Annexe, 38 Histon Road, Cottenham. Doesn't adhere to NP policy COH/1-4. Concerns that the annexe would block light to the main house. No information provided regarding the need for the annexe and no design and access statement provided. Very poorly positioned in relation to the main house and overlooking within the plot. CPC recommends refusal. Proposed Cllr Collinson and seconded by Cllr Jones. **REFUSED.** If Officer minded to approve we would like the application to go to Committee. Needs to be a condition that the annexe is not used as a separate dwelling to the main house.
- **21/04208/S73** - Variation of condition 1 (approved plans) of planning permission 21/02520/REM (Reserved matters for access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale following outline planning permission 20/04296/OUT (erection of an agricultural dwelling)) to include a porch, bay French door and covered plant area for the ground source heat pump, Bassenhally Farm, Broad Lane, Cottenham. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Loveluck and seconded by Cllr Hutchison. **APPROVED.**

#### **Tree Orders**

- **21/1094/TTCA** - G1 Row of Hawthorn and Ash. The roadside trees in the field opposite the whole row of houses are to be reduced back to the field boundary by 2m and reduce branches from the phone line to give a clearance of 1m. (Amended), Land at Church Lane, Cottenham. Cllr Bolitho queried whether the applicant owned the trees; if not do they have permission by the owner to do the works. Standing Orders suspended 7.59pm. Resident 1 queried the location. They previously lived on Church Lane and believe that the applicant isn't the owner. Standing Orders reinstated 8pm. Clerk to request that ownership is confirmed. Acknowledged that the works require doing.

**SCDC Decisions - Approved**

- **21/01421/FUL** - Installation of an Air Source Heat Pump, 52 Histon Road, Cottenham

**21P/160. Consultation** – consider response to consultation on the Oxford Cambridge Arc (by 12<sup>th</sup> October) – Cllr Henderson outlined as suggested response: “Cottenham Parish Council strongly supports the recommendation of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority that the complete route of East West Rail between Oxford and Cambridge should be electrified from day one. Given the widespread public concern over climate change and the detrimental impact from continuing use of fossil fuels, it would in our view be irresponsible and demonstrate poor leadership for the line to open using diesel locomotives.”

Resolution to submit response on the Ox/Cam Arc. Proposed Cllr Loveluck and seconded by Cllr Henderson. **RESOLVED.**

**21P/161. Enforcement** – consider updates from Enforcement Officers and additional items – Case 5/17a – Cllr Collinson expressed surprise at the lack of information held by SCDC. 2/21 – further information to be available for the next meeting.

**21P/162. Date of next meeting** – 21<sup>st</sup> October 2021

**21P/163. Close of meeting** – 8.19pm.

Signed \_\_\_\_\_ (Chair) Date \_\_\_\_\_

## 21P/168. Planning Applications

- [21/04465/HFUL](#) - First floor rear extension, 11 Histon Road, Cottenham
- [21/04449/HFUL](#) – New open carport with workshop/shed behind, 11 Histon Road, Cottenham

### For information only:

- [S/2549/19/NMA6](#) - Non-material amendment of reserved matters permission S/2549/19/RM for alterations to approved Garden Pod to plot 9, Land To The South West Rampton Road 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/2549/19/NMA7](#) - 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.) to amend brick types from Buff brick to Marlborough Stock Red brick on plots 54-57, Land Off Rampton Road, Cottenham
- [20/04408/CONDE](#) - Submission of details required by condition 4 (Surface Water and Foul Water) of planning permission 20/04408/PRI03Q, Haelan Feld, Twentypence Road, Cottenham
- [20/04408/CONDF](#) - Submission of details required by condition 11 (Traffic Management Plan) of planning permission 20/04408/PRI03Q, Haelan Feld, Twentypence Road, Cottenham

### Tree Orders

- [21/1332/TTCA](#) 1. Field Maple - crown thin 30% to allow greater light penetration into garden. 2. Walnut - crown thin 20% to allow greater light penetration into garden. 3. Bay - crown reduce height by half and sides by up to 0.5m to contain crown and tidy. 6 Lambs Lane, Cottenham

### Withdrawn

- [20/04408/CONDA](#) - Submission of details required by condition 11 (Traffic Management Plan) of prior approval 20/04408/PRI03Q, Haelan Feld, Twentypence Road, Cottenham

### SCDC Decisions - Approved

- [21/01260/FUL](#) - Creation of a 7m x 5m pond at the T-junction of the corner of the reedy ditch that runs north of Willow Grange Farm and parallel to Chear Lode, Farmhouse Willow Grange, Ely 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

<b>Planning Ref</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Mtg date</b>	<b>CPC recom'd</b>	<b>Referral allowed</b>	<b>Reason for refusal</b>	<b>SCDC Decision</b>
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"> <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 other sites exist that would have less impact on the greenbelt. Local reports counter what has been stated in</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

					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.	