

AGENDA REPORTS PACK

PLANNING COMMITTEE

16th December 2021

21P/193. Minutes

DRAFT Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

Meeting held in the Village Hall, Lambs Lane on Thursday 18th November 2021 at 7.30pm

In attendance: Cllrs Loveluck (Chair), Bailey, Graves, Henderson, Hutchison, Jones, Kidston and the Clerk

Present: 1 member of the public

21P/181. Chairman's Introduction and Apologies – Apologies accepted from Cllrs Bolitho (work), Collinson (sick) and Hewitt (personal).

21P/182. Any Questions from the Public or Press – Standing orders suspended 7.33pm. Resident spoke regarding application 21/04663/FUL. Wants to retire and the studio isn't paying its way. Have a large family so the building would be used as an annexe/additional rooms for people staying.

21P/183. To accept Declarations of Interest and Dispensations – Cllr Henderson declared an interest in items 21/04663/FUL and 21P/186 and will take no part in the discussion or vote.

21P/184. Minutes – Resolution that the minutes of the Committee meeting held on 4th November 2021 be signed as a correct record. Proposed Cllr Hutchison and seconded by Cllr Kidston. **RESOLVED.**

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. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Loveluck and seconded by Cllr Kidston. **APPROVED.**
- **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. Item brought forward for the benefit of resident. No significant changes but need to ensure that it is properly insulated. Recommend condition that it is used for family only and not as a separate dwelling. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Kidston and seconded by Cllr Graves. **APPROVED.** Resident left the building at 7.40pm.
- **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. Noted that location stated in the application is incorrect; it is Haelan Feld and is mendacious by attributing itself to the neighbouring Lost Acres. Furthermore the village is Cottenham and not Cottingham as described in the design and access statement. Development is outside of the village framework and not supported by our Neighbourhood Plan. Not greenbelt or brownfield as stated in the application, neither has it been occupied for a number of years as claimed. The proposed designs show no Cottenham characteristics. Application is contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan COH/1-5 (village character – new build: proposals for new buildings will be supported where they would retain, or where practicable enrich, the character of the neighbourhood area as appropriate to the location and scale) a (incorporate measures to conserve the

'fen edge' landscape character of Cottenham), c (be responsive to village characteristics, in particular plot widths and proportions, building lines and positions within plots, roof lines, height, scale, massing, boundary treatments, attention to detailing) and j (be within easy walking distance of the village centre); COH/2-3 (use of brownfield sites for housing) and COH/2-1 (development framework) – development proposals outside the development framework will be supported where they are designed to provide appropriate facilities for rural enterprise, agriculture, forestry, or leisure, or where they otherwise accord with national local planning policies. Furthermore the AECOM housing needs assessment undertaken as part of the Neighbourhood Plan (see section 5.20 of the Plan) states that all needs for additional housing in Cottenham has been exceeded and no further housing is needed. CPC recommends refusal. Proposed Cllr Loveluck and seconded by Cllr Graves. **REFUSED**. If Officer minded to approve then we would like this application to go to Committee.

- **21/04652/HFUL** - Two storey side and ground floor rear infill extensions, 101 Rooks Street, Cottenham. Concern raised regarding lack of parking; should be parking for 2 vehicles on site; the carport isn't big enough to fit 2 cars whereas the current driveway can fit 2 vehicles. No design and access statement submitted despite being in a conservation area and double the size of the building. Concerns about boundary treatment and removal of hedge (no separate planning application submitted as yet). Extensions aren't subservient to the original dwelling. Contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan policies COH/1-4 (village character – alterations and extensions) a (being responsive to village characteristics, in particular plot proportions, building lines and positions within plots, roof lines, height, scale, massing, boundary treatments, attention to detailing and architectural individuality) and c (retaining or increasing on-site parking to reduce the need for roadside parking). CPC recommends refusal. Proposed Cllr Hutchison and seconded by Cllr Kidston. **REFUSED**.
- **21/04765/HFUL** - Single storey rear extension, 57 Victory Way, Cottenham. CPC recommends approval. Proposed Cllr Loveluck and seconded by Cllr Graves. **APPROVED**.
- **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. General concerns raised that they aren't adhering to environmental conditions and are in breach. No comments on the application.

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. Application noted.
- **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 overhanging 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. Application noted.

- **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. Application noted – sensible maintenance.

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 – review applications submitted to SCDC Planning Committee (appendix 1) – 21/02117/FUL – concerns that the parking and garden are outside of the village framework. The AECOM housing needs assessment undertaken as part of the Neighbourhood Plan (see section 5.20 of the Plan) states that all needs for additional housing in Cottenham has been exceeded and no further housing is needed. Resolution for Cllr Loveluck to attend SCDC Planning Committee meeting when scheduled. Proposed Cllr Graves and seconded by Cllr Kidston. **RESOLVED.** A village of this size should be able to sustain the pub. Cllr Bailey to look into viability and report back. 21/03073/FUL – additional comments (in reports pack) to Officer noted.

21P/187. Enforcement – consider updates from Enforcement Officers and additional items – Report noted.

21P/188. Date of next meeting – 16th December 2021 (apologies from Cllr Loveluck)

21P/189. Close of meeting - 8.26pm.

Signed _____ (Chair) Date _____

21P/194. Planning Applications

- [21/04959/CTY](#) - 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
- [21/05028/HFUL](#) - Single storey side extension, 1 The Lakes, Twentypence Road, Cottenham
- [21/05029/HFUL](#) - Erection of single storey rear extension, following demolition of existing conservatory; new windows to rear elevations and internal renovations, 4 Dunstal Field, Cottenham
- [21/05246/PRIOR](#) - Change of Use of Agricultural Building to 1 No. Dwellinghouses (Class C3), and for building operations reasonably necessary for the conversion, Land To The South-west Of Beach Road, Cottenham

Tree orders

- [21/1654/TTPO](#) - T1 large oak with wide spreading crown ~ tip end reduce South East crown by up to 2ms back to natural growth points and up to 5ms to lessen overhang to property and raise low branches over communal parking area on North West side of tree to 2.5ms to ensure pedestrian and vehicle clearance, 9 Lee Court, Cottenham
- [21/1684/TTCA](#) - Rowan (T1) - reduce main limbs back to previous pollard points at approx 4m height, 6 Cross Keys Court, Cottenham

For information only:

- [21/04408/CONDG](#) - Submission of details required by condition 4 (Surface water and foul water) of prior approval application 20/04408/PRI03Q, Haelan Feld, Twentypence Road, Cottenham
- [S/2876/CONDA](#) - Submission of details required by condition 15 (Written scheme of Investigation (WSI)) of outline planning permission S/2876/16/OL, Land North East Rampton Road, Cottenham
- [21/04923/TELNOT](#) - Removal of the existing 3 No. antennas and the installation of 3 No. replacement antennas, installation of 1 No. equipment cabinet and ancillary development thereto including the installation of 1 No. GPS module, Land At Unit 14, Watsons Yard, High Street, Cottenham

SCDC – Withdrawn

- [21/01313/FUL](#) - Erection of a new dwelling to the rear, 35 High Street, Cottenham

SCDC Decisions - Approved

- [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
- [21/02349/HFUL](#) - First floor rear extension and additional windows to first floor side elevations, 18 Lambs Lane, 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
20/04906/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"> - 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 	
---	--	--	--	--	---	--

					<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 & 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).</p> <p>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</p>	

					within the framework” is incorrect and contrary to the NP.	
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	YES	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>	
--	-------------------------------------	----------------	----------------	--	--