

## **AGENDA REPORTS PACK**

### **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**18<sup>th</sup> November 2021**

## 21P/184. Minutes

### DRAFT Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

Meeting held in the Village Hall, Lambs Lane on Thursday 4<sup>th</sup> November 2021 at 7.30pm

**Present:** Cllrs Loveluck (Chair), Collinson, Graves, Henderson, Hutchison, Kidston, Jones and the Clerk

**In attendance:** 1 member of the public

**21P/172. Chairman's Introduction and Apologies** – Apologies accepted from Cllrs Bolitho (work) and Hewitt (work).

**21P/173. Any Questions from the Public or Press** – Standing Orders suspended 7.31pm. Resident attending re. application 21/0463/HFUL (applicant). Standing Orders reinstated. 7.32pm. Cllr Bailey arrived 7.32pm.

**21P/174. To accept Declarations of Interest and Dispensations** – Cllr Hutchison declared an Interest in 21/04549/FUL and will take no part in discussions or vote.

**21P/175. Minutes** – Resolution that the minutes of the Committee meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> October 2021 be signed as a correct record. Proposed Cllr Collinson and seconded by Cllr Hutchison. **RESOLVED.**

#### **21P/176. Planning Applications:**

- **21/0463/HFUL** - Rear Extensions, New Porch & Render of Existing External Walls, 271 High Street, Cottenham. Appropriate to plot size, subservient and can't see the extension from the road. Overall an improvement to the existing building. Concerns raised that the render might be too bright but it was confirmed that it will be off-white. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Loveluck and seconded by Cllr Hutchison. **APPROVED.**
- **21/04555/HFUL** – two story extension to the side, conversion of the garage, and extending the existing single storey extension to the rear - 5 Goldfinch Drive, Cottenham. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Hutchison and seconded by Cllr Kidston. **APPROVED.**
- **21/04451/FUL** - Installation of new fire escape staircase - 212 High Street, Cottenham. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Loveluck and seconded by Cllr Kidston. **APPROVED.**
- **21/04549/FUL** - Construction of a replacement dwelling - 85 Histon Road Cottenham. Site is outside the village framework and in the greenbelt; Neighbourhood Plan (no mention made in the application) will only support proposals outside the framework where they are designed to provide appropriate facilities for rural enterprise, agriculture, forestry, or leisure, or where they otherwise would accord with national or local planning policies. Proposal is on an entirely new footprint and materially different to the existing bungalow which constitutes inappropriate development in the greenbelt (contrary to LP policy S/4). Furthermore the SCDC Local Plan (2018) Policy H/14 (1) (d) only permits one-for-one replacement dwellings outside village framework boundaries in the Green Belt in accordance with the NPPF. Mention of the existing prior development consent is therefore a red herring since this is an entirely different building. IDB consent is required and there is no drainage scheme with the application; the existing pumping station is known to be unable to cope. Application is contrary to Neighbourhood Plan COH/1-5c (be responsive to village characteristics – plot widths/proportions); COH/2-1 (development framework); CPC recommends refusal.

Proposed Cllr Graves and seconded by Cllr Collinson. **REFUSED**. If officer minded to approve we would like the application to go to Committee.

**Tree orders**

- **21/1367/TTCA** - Tree 1: Wild Cherry - Prune to shape, so as branches do not touch house or obscure road sign and driveway - reduction from current height of 6 metres to height of 4.5 metres (25% =1.5 metre cut back) Tree 2: Walnut - Remove branches overhanging Shed/Pool House - reduce back by 1 metre Tree 3: Hazel - Reduce crown by 2.5 metres to allow light to rear neighbours garden Tree 4: Crab Apple - Reduce crown by 1.5 metres Tree 5: Eucalyptus - reduce crown by 6 metres - 259 High Street Cottenham. Noted.

**For information only:**

- **21/02520/19/CONDA** - Submission of details required by conditions 2 (External Materials) of planning permission 21/02520/REM, Bassenhally Farm, Broad Lane, Cottenham

**SCDC Decisions - Approved**

- **21/01023/OUT** - Outline planning permission for a single storey 'Self Build' dwelling with all matters reserved, Land north west of 15 Orchard Close, Cottenham

**21P/177. SCDC Planning Committee** – consider attendance at SCDC Planning Committee on 10<sup>th</sup> November re. Tilia Homes reserved matters application – Discussion regarding the state of the application and improvements that have been made since our original objections. Reasonably satisfied with progress and material considerations covered off. Noted that IDB consent has now been obtained. Long term SUDS management still a concern; any scheme is only as good as its maintenance. Resolution for Cllr Loveluck to provide written submission to raise the SUDS issue via SCDC Cllr Gough. Proposed Cllr Loveluck and seconded by Cllr Graves. **RESOLVED**. Resident left the meeting at 8.16pm.

**21P/178. Enforcement** – consider updates from Enforcement Officers and additional items – Report noted. Case 11/18B – works now expected Jan/Feb 2022. Case 8/20A – residents have left the site; Clerk to update SCDC. Noted that lights have been left on which is causing problems with light pollution to neighbouring properties; Clerk to contact environmental health. Case 5/19B – close.

**21P/179. Date of next meeting** – 18<sup>th</sup> November 2021

**21P/180. Close of meeting** – 8.22pm.

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

## 21P/185. Planning Applications

- [21/04580/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) - resubmission of 21/03736/FUL, Foxlands, Long Drove, Cottenham
- [21/04663/FUL](#) - Change of use of Garden Studio from commercial to residential as part of the main house together with the insertion of 2 No. windows, 32 Histon Road, Cottenham
- [21/04651/FUL](#) - Demolition of remaining outbuildings and removal of slabs and walls of collapsed structures and occupied static caravan, and erection of 2 dwellings with parking, access and landscaping, Land to the west of Lost Acres, Twentypence Road, Cottenham
- [21/04652/HFUL](#) - Two storey side and ground floor rear infill extensions, 101 Rooks Street, Cottenham
- [21/04765/HFUL](#) - Single storey rear extension, 57 Victory Way, Cottenham
- [CCC/21/230/VAR](#) - Section 73 application to continue development without compliance with Condition 2: approved plans of S/002226/08/CW to allow development and operation of a new biofilter and exhaust fan and stack upgrade, IVC, Waterbeach Waste Management Park, Ely Road, Waterbeach

### Tree orders

- [21/1445/TTCA](#) - 1. Large Ash tree in rear garden - Dying back on right/ rear when viewed from house, also random throughout much of remaining crown - crown reduce by appx 4.5m all over crown including the height, 3 Cross Keys Court, Cottenham
- [21/1477/TTCA](#) - Tree no. 1 Alder Crown Lift - metres above ground level in car park - ornamental alder - proposed crown lifting, to remove one smaller branch that is growing out and across larger branches and to remove low hanging branches overhanging the car park next door. This is to prevent damage to the tree when, for example a Luton size van reverses up to the boundary wall. Also the removal of smaller dead and dying branches. Tree no. 2 Sycamore - Crown lift to 3.5 metres above ground level - this is self-seeded, we did not plant it and it's currently a "pyramid" shape. In addition proposed crown reduction to reduce the overall height from approximately 9 or 10 metres to achieve and maintain an approximate height of 6 or 7 metres to allow sunshine and daylight into our garden and neighbours' gardens. Also crown lifting of lower branch that is growing through our apple tree and lower branches that are over-hanging and shading our neighbour's garden, and to encourage an "umbrella" shape. Tree no. 3 - Walnut - Crown lift to a height of 2 metres above ground level - this is also self-seeded, we did not plant it. Proposed crown reduction to reduce the overall maximum height including new growth from approximately 6 or 7 metres to achieve, maintain and control at an approximate height of 4 or 5 metres to keep the tree (and roots?) away from our house and allow daylight into the house. Also crown lifting to allow sunshine and daylight to our plants under the tree, 232 High Street, Cottenham
- [21/1491/TTCA](#) - Prunus Briliana (T1-T7) - Reduce crowns by 2M; Prunus Briliana (T8) - Pollard at 2M; Prunus Briliana (T9,T10,T12,T14 - Pollard at 3M; Ash (T11) - Fell and poison; Elder (T13) - Fell and poison, 315 High Street, Cottenham

### SCDC Decisions - Approved

- [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

## **21P/186. SCDC Planning Committee**

We need to review the comments for the applications recommended to the SCDC Planning Committee to prepare for forthcoming Committee meetings. The two applications coming up are:

**21/02117/FUL** - Change of use of public house (SG) with flat to dwelling (C3), demolition of existing annex/outbuildings, erection of detached dwelling and creation of amenity space, bin storage and parking and manoeuvring for 2 dwellings, The Jolly Millers, 73 High Street, Cottenham

**Comments:** Design & Access statement is rather mendacious and there are a number of errors. Not true that the pub isn't needed by the community. The proposed development would change the linear pattern of the High Street. Concerns about the vehicle access arrangements. Incorrect to state that the Neighbourhood Plan hasn't been adopted. Noted that the amenity land **and parking** for the garden goes over the village framework boundary. Proposals are contrary to Cottenham Neighbourhood Plan policies COH/1-5 c, f, g and h (responsive to village characteristics – building lines; relationship between buildings and car parking; maintenance/creation of vistas between properties; and incorporation of native species trees within gardens).

Contrary to Village Design Guide SPD – S/1 (settlement patterns). Statement 4.3 of the D&A statement “there is in-principle support for any amount of new residential development within the framework” is incorrect and contrary to the NP.

NB: We may want to consider pointing out further issues as per latest correspondence re. 21/03073/FUL below.

**21/03073/FUL** - Demolition of existing studio and construction of 5 bedroom property with amenity space, parking, bin and cycle storage, Land rear of 129 High Street, Cottenham.

**Comments:** 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.

NB: new case officer contacted the Clerk 16/11/21 to clarify points around NHP policy COH/1-5. The following response was sent: Policy COH/1-5 relates to Village character – new build. This states that:

Proposals for new buildings will be supported where they would retain, or where practicable enrich, the character of the neighbourhood area as appropriate to their location and scale. In particular development proposals should address the following matters in a locally-distinctive fashion appropriate to their location and scale.

Specific issues are:

1-5c: be responsive to village characteristics, in particular plot widths and proportions, building lines and positions within the plots, roof lines, height, scale, massing, boundary treatments, attention to detailing – see page 26 of the NP document.

By building behind the existing building this goes against the very linear pattern along that stretch of our High Street, against the building line. Given the proposals are in the curtilage of the Listed Three Horseshoes this change to the linear pattern coupled with the lack of attention to Cottenham detailing (as described in the Cottenham Village Design Guide SPD) is undesirable. Altering the linear

pattern of the village would have a huge impact for future applications. Whilst it is acknowledged that there are outbuildings to many properties, the proposals don't look anything like a barn or outbuilding. The application is therefore isn't considered responsive to village characteristics.

It is interesting to note that paragraph 3.5 of the planning and heritage statement says that "The proposal has been designed and positioned to avoid the need to remove any substantial level of vegetation." Why was there then a separate application for the removal of 17 trees? By any standard this is very substantial. Furthermore under para 5.7 the application acknowledges that it is smaller than the District Design Guide SPD. The fact that in para 6.3 the "existing property does not offer any important local architectural features of any note" is no reason for any proposed new building not to follow the Design Guide.

Lastly, according to our AECOM housing needs assessment undertaken as part of the Neighbourhood Plan, there is no requirement for 5 bedroom properties in Cottenham. Indeed the need for any new houses in Cottenham has already been exceeded by more than 100 by the 4 new developments on Oakington and Rampton Roads (see page 36 of the NP document).





**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 Outline planning application for the erection of up to 34 new residential units as a Social Housing Rural Exception Site in the Greenbelt with all matters reserved	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	

<p>except for access from Histon Road</p>					<p>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</li> </ul>	
---	--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>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>	
<p>21/02117/FUL Change of use of public house (SG) with flat to dwelling (C3), demolition of existing annex/outbuildings, erection of detached dwelling and creation of amenity space, bin storage and parking and manoeuvring for 2 dwellings</p>	<p>The Jolly Millers, 73 High Street, Cottenham</p>	<p>24/6/21</p>	<p>Refusal</p>		<p>Design &amp; Access statement is rather mendacious and there are a number of errors. Not true that the pub isn't needed by the community. The proposed development would change the linear pattern of the High Street. Concerns about the vehicle access arrangements. Incorrect to state that the Neighbourhood Plan hasn't been adopted. Noted that the amenity land <b>and parking</b> for the garden goes over the village framework boundary. Proposals are contrary to Cottenham Neighbourhood Plan policies COH/1-5 c, f, g and h (responsive to village characteristics – building lines; relationship between buildings and car parking; maintenance/creation of vistas between properties; and incorporation of native species trees within gardens).</p> <p><b>Contrary to Village Design Guide SPD – S/1 (settlement patterns). Statement 4.3 of the D&amp;A statement “there is in-principle support for any amount of new residential development</b></p>	

					<b>within the framework” is incorrect and contrary to the NP.</b>	
21/03073/FUL Demolition of existing studio and construction of 5 bedroom property with amenity space, parking, bin and cycle storage.	Land rear of 129 High Street, Cottenham.	5/8/21	Refusal		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 Prior approval for change of use of agricultural building to 1 No. Dwellinghouse (Class C3).	Land To The South-west Of Beach Road, Cottenham	5/8/21	Refusal		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.	
21/04129/HFUL Garage extension and conversion to form new Annexe	38 Histon Road, Cottenham.	7/10/21	Refusal		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. Condition that annexe use is tied to the main house.	

<p>21/04549/FUL Construction of a replacement dwelling</p>	<p>85 Histon Road Cottenham</p>	<p>4/11/21</p>	<p>Refusal</p>	<p>Site is outside the village framework and in the greenbelt; Neighbourhood Plan (no mention made in the application) will only support proposals outside the framework where they are designed to provide appropriate facilities for rural enterprise, agriculture, forestry, or leisure, or where they otherwise would accord with national or local planning policies. Proposal is on an entirely new footprint and materially different to the existing bungalow which constitutes inappropriate development in the greenbelt (contrary to LP policy S/4). Furthermore the SCDC Local Plan (2018) Policy H/14 (1) (d) only permits one-for-one replacement dwellings outside village framework boundaries in the Green Belt in accordance with the NPPF. Mention of the existing prior development consent is therefore a red herring since this is an entirely different building. IDB consent is required and there is no drainage scheme with the application; the existing pumping station is known to be unable to cope. Application is contrary to Neighbourhood Plan COH/1-5c (be responsive to village characteristics – plot widths/proportions); COH/2-1 (development framework).</p>	
--	-------------------------------------	----------------	----------------	--	--