

Delegation meeting - Minutes

- **Date:** 15 June 2021
- **Time:** 11am to 12:30pm
- **Meeting held:** via Teams
- **Attendees:** Chris Carter (CC), Cllr Pippa Heylings (PH), Cllr Henry Batchelor (HB), Julie Ayre (JA), Lorraine Casey (LC), Richard Fitzjohn (RF)
- **Notes and actions:** Jemma Smith

Minutes approved by: Cllr Henry Batchelor (Vice Chair of Planning Committee – Consultee) on 18 June 2021, Chris Carter (Delivery Manager – Strategic Sites) on 18 June 2021

20/04702/OUT Land At The Back Of 4 And 6 East Drive Highfields Caldecote CB23 7NZ - Outline planning for the erection of 2 No. dwellings with all matters reserved (LC)

Reason for call-in request

Call in from Caldecote Parish Council - The outline of the development (garden) is outside of the development envelope. The proposal compromises the 2 houses facing East Drive.

Key considerations

The comments of the Parish Council were noted by the group and the officer provided an explanation of the application and the planning history.

It was considered that the comments of the Parish Council do raise material planning considerations, particularly around the village settlement boundary and impact on neighbouring occupiers.

The application does raise issues for adopted policy as it includes a proposal for residential development which could be located out with the designated settlement boundary.

The application was not considered to be of a nature or scale that would require referral to the planning committee, although it was noted that there are complex issues to be considered.

The planning history was considered relevant, in particular the previous refusal of permission on this site, nearby appeal decisions and the recent Certificate of Lawful use for residential garden purposes of the wider application site.

Having regard to all of the above, it was considered that whilst no single criteria was of individual significance such that would justify a referral to the planning committee, the combination of material planning concerns, implications for adopted policy and the complex planning history did justify a referral to the planning committee.

Decision

Refer to planning committee. See above

S/4137/19/FL – 32 High Street Bassingbourn Cum Kneesworth Royston Cambridgeshire SG8 5NE - Demolition of all existing buildings and the erection of 2 shop units (Class A1) on the frontage with 1 flat above and three dwellings to the rear (RF)

Reason for call-in request

Bassingbourn Parish Council comments received 10.01.2020:

“On a majority vote it was agreed to object to the application and request that the application should go to SCDC Planning Committee.

Committee also agreed that the following comments be made:

- a) In principle the Parish Council supports the development of housing at the back of the site.
- b) In principle the Parish Council supports the development of retail at the front of the site.
- c) The High Street is a congested location which has significant transport implications. A Travel Plan is required (in accordance with Local Plan Policy T1/2)
- d) There is inadequate parking. The Transport Assessment indicates that one of the retail units is likely to be a bakers which is an A1 food use requiring 1 parking space per

14m² gross floor area in accordance with Local Plan policy T1/3 and the associated Figure 11.

Figure 11 indicates that single retail units will need parking space at the front.

- e) The adjacent property 34 High Street is a Grade II listed building (UID 1309294). The proposed retail units extend beyond the building line at the front of 34 High Street adversely affecting the setting of the listed building and street view. This will also result in compromising sight lines.
- f) The planning statement and flood risk assessment propose the use of Sustainable Drainage (SuDs). No consideration has been given to the impact of potential site contamination upon the ability to implement SuDs as required by the Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD.
- g) The Environmental report is considered inadequate in that it fails to identify likely ground contamination by lead from underground petrol storage tanks and possibly also by chlorinated hydrocarbons from degreasing of parts.”

Bassingbourn Parish Council comments received 09.11.2020:

“It was agreed to object to the application and request that the application should go to SCDC Planning Committee.

The following comments are also made:

- a) In principle the Parish Council supports the development of housing at the back of the site.
- b) In principle the Parish Council supports the development of retail at the front of the site.
- c) The High Street is a congested location which has significant transport implications. A Travel Plan is required (in accordance with Local Plan Policy T1/2)
- d) There is inadequate parking. The Transport Assessment indicates that one of the retail units is likely to be a bakers which is an A1 food use requiring 1 parking space per 14m² gross floor area in accordance with Local Plan policy T1/3 and the associated Figure 11.

Figure 11 indicates that single retail units will need parking space at the front.

- e) The adjacent property 34 High Street is a Grade II listed building (UID 1309294). The proposed retail units extend beyond the building line at the front of 34 High Street

adversely affecting the setting of the listed building and street view. This will also result in compromising sight lines. Councillors are extremely concerned regarding the adverse impact on the listed building.

- f) The planning statement and flood risk assessment propose the use of Sustainable Drainage (SuDs). No consideration has been given to the impact of potential site contamination upon the ability to implement SuDs as required by the Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD.
- g) The Environmental report is considered inadequate in that it fails to identify likely ground contamination by lead from underground petrol storage tanks and possibly also by chlorinated hydrocarbons from degreasing of parts.
- h) The application does not meet the energy requirements of the existing local Plan 2018
- i) Overshadowing of No. 22 High Street is not resolved

Key considerations

The comments of the Parish Council were carefully considered by the group and the case officer provided an update on the application. It was noted that the Parish Council does not object to the principle of development on either part of the site, but had concern regarding matters of detail.

The points raised by the Parish Council, as set out above, were considered to be material planning considerations but, having regard to the Parish Council's stated position on the principle of the proposals, they were not considered to be of such significance that would warrant referral to the planning committee. Indeed it was noted that many of these matters could be adequately controlled by planning condition, if permission were to be granted.

The application was not considered to present significant issues for adopted policy, nor to be of a nature, scale or complexity, or to present a planning history such that a committee referral was required.

Decision

Delegated decision. See above