

## Delegation meeting - Minutes

- **Date:** 18 May 2021
- **Time:** 11am to 12:30pm
- **Meeting held:** via Teams
- **Attendees:** Chris Carter (CC), Cllr Pippa Heylings (PH), Julie Ayre (JA), Jane Rodens (JR), Aaron Coe (AC), Charlotte Spencer (CS), Phoebe Carter (PC)
- **Notes and actions:** Jemma Smith

**Minutes approved by:** Cllr Pippa Heylings (Chair of Planning Committee – Consultee) on 20 May 2021, Chris Carter (Delivery Manager – Strategic Sites) on 20 May 2021

### **21/00447/REM Land To The Rear Of 1 Westfield Road, Fowlmere, Royston, SG8 7SN - Approval of matters reserved for access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale following outline planning permission S/4112/17/OL for development of 1 No. detached house as part of the SCDC Right to Build Vanguard (Resubmission of 20/04274/REM) (JR)**

#### **Reason for call-in request**

Fowlmere PC recommends refusal. Although some changes have been made to the proposed design following the previous refusal, the alterations are not adequate to mitigate the PC's previous concerns. The amount of fenestration is still excessive to the rear of the proposed property, and the issue of overlooking neighbouring properties has not been resolved. 1) Strict timing restrictions be set on deliveries and other vehicle movements in line with Fowlmere Primary School's comments dated 9th November 2020 on the original application (20/04274/REM). A precedent for this exists within planning application S/2023/17/DC. 2) A Banksman be present for all vehicle movements on and off site. While the delivery time restrictions should mitigate the risk to the school children, the access road to the front of the site is a designated public footpath and sees pedestrian traffic at all times of day. 3) Conditions be placed to restrict contractor parking to the curtilage of the site, and specifically state that using the parking area intended for Primary School staff (as clearly defined in planning application S/0653/93/F) must not take place.

## Key considerations

The comments of the Parish Council were noted by the group, and the case officer gave a brief explanation of the proposal.

It was considered that the Parish Council had raised material planning considerations, specifically the issues of design and fenestration and overlooking of neighbouring properties. However, these were not considered to be of such significance, having regard to the nature of the proposal, to warrant referral to planning committee for decision.

The proposal was not found to have significant implications for adopted policy, to be of a nature, scale or complexity or accompanied by a planning history to warrant a committee decision.

Finally, the suggested conditions put forward by the Parish Council were noted and it was suggested to the case officer that these be given careful consideration when the application comes to be determined.

## Decision

Delegated decision. See above

## **21/00789/HFUL 92 Ermine Street, Caxton - Single storey front porch and single storey side extension (CS)**

### Reason for call-in request

Caxton Parish Council recommend refusal of the planning application 921/00789/HFUL. Also that this application is taken to the Planning Committee - it recognises that the Committee usually only deals with larger developments but given the unhappy history of this site it seems appropriate.

Grounds for refusal: This extension will now give a footprint slightly larger than the plan (for a 4-bedroom house) which was rejected on the grounds that it was too big for the site. The plan is claimed to be for a Garage and store room but has unusual dimensions and has Patio Doors. This would appear to be 'development by stealth' turning it eventually into the 4 bedroomed house originally planned. This "extension" is of a height within centimetres of the existing property and will, seriously affect the outlook from No.

88 and will also affect the rural character of this Close which is within our conservation area. The proposed windows will overlook the Gardens of No. 88.

#### Comments:

It would expect Refusal by South Cambridgeshire District Council so as not to compound the many mistakes (already admitted by them) which have impacted on this site. It would ask that should approval unfortunately be given that all future 'Permitted Development Rights' be withdrawn. The inclusion (by default) of Permitted Development Rights being one of the admitted mistakes made by SCDC.

### Key considerations

The comments of the Parish Council were noted, as was that these had been supported by the local member, Councillor Wright.

The Parish Council comments were found to raise material planning considerations in the form of the planning history of the site, design and impact on neighbouring properties. However, dealing with this specific application for a single storey side extension and front porch, it was not found that these issues were of such significance as to warrant referral to the planning committee.

By its nature, the proposal was not found to present significant issues for adopted policy, or to be of a nature, scale or complexity to send to refer to the planning committee.

It was noted that there is a contentious planning history to this site, and that an error had been made in the issuing of a previous decision notice. Notwithstanding this, it was considered that this particular proposal was one that could be determined by officers, having regard to that planning history where appropriate.

Finally, the issues of “planning by stealth” and concerns as to the use of the extension were not considered to influence this judgement.

### Decision

Delegated decision. See above.

## **20/04627/FUL 12 Church Lane, Little Eversden - Erection of a live/work unit with associated parking and landscaping (AC)**

### **Reason for call-in request**

It was resolved in the majority to object to the application with the comments:

- The live/work unit has an undisclosed number of employees working at the unit travelling down a single track road.
- Design specification not in keeping with other properties;
- The Materials are now in keeping with surrounding properties
- Request Historic England be consulted due to curtilage to Church

Request that SCDC send to full Planning Committee.

### **Key considerations**

The comments of the Parish Council were noted by the group. The case officer gave a brief presentation of the proposal.

The comments of the Parish Council were found to raise material planning considerations in respect of the use of the building, design and materials and impacts on the historic church. However, it was considered that, in the light of the extant planning permission for a similar scheme, and the favourable consultation response from Historic England, that these were not of such significance to refer the application to planning committee.

The application was not found to have significant implications for adopted policy, nor to be of a nature scale or complexity to refer to committee. The planning history, whilst relevant, did not indicate that the proposal should be presented to the committee.

### **Decision**

Delegated decision. See above.

## **20/04685/HFUL 1 Loris Court, Teversham - Two storey side extension and erection of garden wall to the boundary (PC)**

### **Reason for call-in request**

1. The scheme will be overbearing through its appearance and size. There will be overdevelopment of the site and it will have a negative effect on the appearance of the street scene which was constructed with a sense of openness and space.
2. The effect on the area - it will alter the appearance of the area and is not in keeping with the surrounding area. It appears to be outside the building line.

### **Key considerations**

The case officer presented the proposal to the group and the comments of the Parish Council were considered.

Those comments were found to raise material planning considerations in terms of the design and appearance of the proposed extension, as well as its impact on the local area. However, given the nature of the proposal as a householder planning application, it was not considered that these issues are so significant as to warrant referral to the planning committee.

The application was not found to have significant implications for adopted policy, nor to be of a nature scale or complexity to refer to committee. The planning history was not found to indicate that the proposal should be presented to the committee.

### **Decision**

Delegated decision. See above.