

Delegation meeting - Minutes

- **Date:** 19 January 2021
- **Time:** 11am to 12:30pm
- **Meeting held:** via Teams
- **Attendees:** Chris Carter (CC), Cllr John Batchelor (JB), Cllr Pippa Heylings (PH), Alice Young (AY), Jane Rodens (JR), Michael Sexton (MS)
- **Notes and actions:** Jemma Smith

Minutes approved by: Cllr John Batchelor (Chair of Planning Committee – Consultee) on 22 January 2021, Chris Carter (Delivery Manager – Strategic Sites) on 22 January 2021

20/02929/OUT Land Between Haverhill Road And Hinton Way, Stapleford - Outline planning for the development of land for a retirement care village in Use Class C2 comprising housing with care, communal health, wellbeing and leisure facilities, public open space, landscaping, car parking, access and associated development and public access countryside park with all matters reserved except for access (MS)

Reason for call-in request

Objection

Introduction:

Stapleford Parish Council, in the spirit of openness and transparency, held an open meeting for members of the public to make comment on this application. Mr Phil Grant of Axis Partnership used this opportunity to address the meeting.

The Parish Council had, in 2015, made a statement supported by a local firm of solicitors regarding its position in regard to the Greenbelt:

The Parish Council is tasked with preserving Stapleford's Green Belt for the pleasure and benefit of its current residents and as a custodian for future residents. The Parish Council, as is its duty, will consider afresh any Planning applications and paragraphs 81 and 87 of the National Planning Policy Framework will be taken into account in its objective consideration of the application and its merits.

We consider that the application does not comply with these policy statements.

Six Parish Councillors and fourteen members of the public were present, with two members of Axis Partnership and a representative of Magog Trust.

Discussion:

Mr Grant of Axis Partnership reiterated the Axis position that this application was exceptional and should take place to release the 50 acres for the country park for general use, and that services provided in the retirement village would be open for general use. He further commented that only use within the C2 category would be built.

A member of the Bridleways Group supported the provision of the country park provided access was available for all including horse riders. Release of existing housing stock would be advantageous.

The representative of the Magog Trust commented that whilst the Trust had reservations regarding encroachment into the Greenbelt, the expansion of chalk grassland would bring benefit. The Magog Trust disclosed that it had been approached to manage the land in perpetuity, should permission be granted, which would ensure the land would be open for public use. Freehold transfer would be reliant on permission being granted for this development.

Reasons for Objection:

Six members of the public registered their objections on the basis that:

1. The proposed development is in the wrong place for connectivity, access to services and facilities, reliance on private cars, lack of parking for visitors to the retirement village and to the park.
2. Affordability: Members of the public had attended the public consultations held by Axis and were advised that NHS care would not be allowed on site for those in need. Further, a survey of other similar properties in nearby settlements had been carried out, and the average cost of a 2 bedroomed accommodation unit would likely be £500,000, leasehold, plus service charges plus ground rent. This was not considered affordable for local people and would not encourage downsizing in the village, thus not releasing any of the existing housing stock.
3. Intrusion into the Greenbelt: this development would set a precedent for development in the Greenbelt and would be the 'thin edge of the wedge' with the potential for further development to take place on the site in the future. Other landowners could use this as precedent to press for further expansion into the Greenbelt thus leading to further erosion of this important regulatory feature.
4. Height, bulk and scale of the proposed buildings: the height of the main building is some 12m, close to the existing built area in the village, and will block light and views of existing dwellings.
5. Covid-19: services would not be open to the general public due to the risk to the residents of the spread of Covid-19.
6. Country park: this was seen as a 'sweetener' to obtain development. Comments were made that if the landowner was being altruistic, the land could be donated to a suitable management body without the strings of development attached.
7. Local need: the need for this development to benefit the local community was not demonstrated by a local assessment. Rather, the development would be open to

anyone who could afford it. It was considered to be a private, exclusive development which would not want, for example, local children using the proposed swimming pool.

The Parish Council supported the comments made by members of the public, and made further comment:

1. The proposal is disproportionate in the context of Stapleford both in the height and mass of the buildings and also in the number of accommodation units being constructed. It will provide for better off people from all over South Cambridgeshire and could therefore be built anywhere in South Cambridgeshire without the need to compromise the Green Belt.
2. The development was in the wrong place and would be a carbuncle on the edge of the
3. The design was not conducive for older people to move to, as bungalows were in greater demand.
4. The impact on the street scene would be excessive and extensive. There are no similar sized developments as the main block within the village, and the bulk and scale was considered out of keeping with the vernacular.
5. The proposal appears to assume that the Cambridge South East Busway will proceed. In fact, it still faces several significant obstacles, for example, achieving an acceptable environmental survey and concerns expressed by the Mayor of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, who favours the old railway line option and says that the Busway proposal does not accord with the Local Transport Plan. The local MP also appears to have concerns and has walked the old railway line option.
6. Lack of public transport to the site: residents would be reliant on private transportation to access facilities increasing congestion and on street parking within the village and concentrating around the doctors.
7. There are several similar schemes in nearby villages which are struggling to fill vacancies. This development may become the same due to the costs involved in downsizing to 'exclusive, private developments'.
8. The provision does not match any perceived local need, which has not been established.
9. Of the 50 responses sent to South Cambs District Council, some 10% were in support with comment from people who do not live in the parish. Some 80% were against, with 10% neutral.
10. The proposed development has not demonstrated that it has any special reason which would require it to be built in the Greenbelt, outside the development envelope for Stapleford Parish.
11. There are no guarantees that the country park would be managed for the benefit and use of the whole community — there are 'promises' only.
12. In his comments, the Axis representative admitted that there are some negatives associated with the Retirement Village proposal. These negatives will be experienced by all residents of Stapleford but only better off people and those not requiring NHS treatment will be able to benefit from the Retirement Village. This is divisive and does not sit comfortably with the values and community spirit of Stapleford.
13. So far as Axis's reference to the philanthropic nature of the proposal is concerned, the aspirations of the Magog Down Trust and of the Bridleway Group could be met by philanthropic access permissions and gifting of land which is not conditional on receiving planning permission for a Retirement Village.

Summary:

Stapleford Parish Council objects to this outline application for a retirement village on the grounds that it does not have the special requirements to make it necessary for it to be built within the Greenbelt — it could be built anywhere in South Cambs. The height, bulk and scale of the proposed development is incompatible with the high value landscape of the area.

No local need has been established, and it is unlikely to be affordable to the majority of local people wanting to downsize.

The country park could be delivered for local benefit without the encumbrance of the built development.

Stapleford Parish Council would ask that this application is called in for decision by the full Planning Committee.

Key considerations

The case officer presented the details of the application and the group considered the specific comments of the Parish Council.

It was noted that the Parish Council had raised material planning considerations and that there was a significant level of local objection to the proposal. It was found that in the case of this large-scale proposal, this would justify committee consideration.

The group also considered that there were significant implications for adopted policy, particularly in terms of the Green Belt, from this large proposal outside the settlement boundary and, again, this would warrant committee consideration.

The proposal was found to be of a nature, scale and complexity, particularly given the proposed country park provision, to warrant referral to the planning committee.

The planning history of this specific site was not determinative in this case.

Decision

Refer to planning committee. See above

20/03400/REM Land To The Rear Of, 30 Chiswick End, Meldreth, Royston, SG8 6LZ - Approval of matters reserved for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale following outline planning permission S/4058/17/OL for the erection of two dwellings with demolition of lean-to of existing building and alterations to existing highway access (JR)

Reason for call-in request

The Planning Committee recommended 'Object' with comments. There are three main areas of concern. 1. This is an over development of the plot in size and mass of the proposed dwellings and garages. 2. There would be a strong visual impact on the landscape. 3. The road is narrow with no footway and there is concern on the increase in traffic. The Parish Council would also like to reiterate their comments made at the meeting held on 7th December 2017 on the outline application for which refusal was also proposed.

Key considerations

The case officer introduced the application, provided details of the associated outline planning permission, advised on how the application had been negotiated and the group considered the comments of the Parish Council.

It was noted that material planning considerations had been raised in terms of over development, visual impact and the access road. However, having regard to the parameters of the outline planning permission, it was not considered that these issues required consideration by the planning committee.

The proposal was not considered to raise significant issues for adopted policy, as the principle of development had already been established. Nor was the proposal considered to be of a nature, scale or complexity to warrant committee referral. Finally, the site history was not of particular significance in this case.

Decision

Delegated decision. See above.

20/04951/HFUL 8 Pepys Terrace - Partial demolition of existing single storey extension. New part single, part two storey rear extension. Loft conversion with new dormer rear and internal alterations (AY)

Reason for call-in request

All agreed to recommend refusal on the grounds as the application does not meet policy as set out in the Histon and Impington Neighbourhood Plan.

- Pepys Terrace is listed as a restricted street in the neighbourhood plan (Table 2 HIM05) all parking must be provided off the road.
- Application does not meet parking standards for a 4-bedroom dwelling as outlined in table 3 HIM05
- Negative impact on no. 6 through shading.

Key considerations

The case officer introduced the proposal and the group reviewed the comments of the Parish Council, in particular the Neighbourhood Plan policies.

It was considered that the neighbourhood plan policy was clearly material to the consideration of the application but, given the nature of the proposal, it was not considered that the issues raised were of such significance as to refer the matter to the planning committee for decision. The proposal, given its domestic nature, was not considered to be of a nature, scale or complexity, nor to have a planning history such that would warrant a referral to the planning committee.

It was acknowledged that the case officer should undertake a detailed review of compliance with the neighbourhood plan policy in their officer report.

Decision

Delegated decision. See above.

20/04921/HFUL 18 Aingers Road - Single storey front extension and two-storey side extension (AY)

Reason for call-in request

Parish reason: All agreed to recommend refusal on the grounds of the south facing window of the neighbour will be shaded.

Key considerations

The case officer introduced the details of the application and the Parish Council comments were considered. Whilst the issue of shading to neighbouring occupiers is a material planning consideration, it was not considered to be so significant in this case as to warrant referral to the planning committee.



GREATER CAMBRIDGE
SHARED PLANNING

The proposal was not considered to have significant implications for adopted policy, nor to be of a nature, scale or complexity to refer to planning committee. Finally, there was nothing associated with the planning history of the site that indicated that committee consideration was required.

Decision

Delegated decision. See above.