

Delegation meeting - Minutes

- **Date:** 29 June 2021
- **Time:** 11am to 12:30pm
- **Meeting held:** via Teams
- **Attendees:** Chris Carter (CC), Cllr Pippa Heylings (PH), Cllr Henry Batchelor (HB), Phoebe Carter (PC), Mary Collins (MC), Luke Waddington (LW) Charlotte Peet (CP)
- **Notes and actions:** Jemma Smith

Minutes approved by: Cllr Pippa Heylings (Chair of Planning Committee – Consultee) on 08 July 2021, Chris Carter (Delivery Manager – Strategic Sites) on 08 July 2021

21/02215/S73 - 130 Rampton Road, Willingham - S73 application to vary condition 2 (Approved Drawings) of permission 20/04309/S73 (relocation of dwelling) of S/0123/20/FL (Erection of 5 bedroom house and 1 bedroom ancillary annex with associated parking) for alterations to the fenestrations, doors and an increase of floorplan to the rear (PC)

Reason for call-in request

It has been called in by the parish for enlargement of the development and the negative impact on the open countryside.

Key considerations

As with the previous proposal to modify this scheme, considered in December 2020, the comments of the Parish Council were considered by the group. The case officer provided an update on the application and explained the proposed change from the previously approved scheme.

It was noted that the comments of the Parish Council did, in part, raise a material planning consideration regarding the appropriateness of the proposal in policy terms.

However, consistent with the previous view and given that the principle of this proposal has previously been considered, and approved, by the committee it was determined that this was not a significant concern in the context of this particular application. For the

The Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service is a strategic partnership between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council

same reason, the proposal was not considered to have significant implications for adopted policy, nor to be of a nature, scale or complexity to warrant committee referral.

The planning history of the site was noted as being relevant and of some complexity. However, it was considered that the minor nature of the proposed amendment to the approved scheme did not require committee referral on this occasion.

Decision

Delegated decision – see above.

20/03788/HFUL 6 Station Cottages, Six Mile Bottom - Two storey side extension. Removal of a false chimney stack (PC)

Reason for call-in request

Called into committee on the grounds of design/appearance and (b) previous planning decisions.

Key considerations

The comments of the Parish Council were considered by the group and the case officer provided an update on the application and the planning history of the site.

Whilst the comments of the Parish Council were found to raise material planning considerations in the form of design and appearance, and the planning history, these were not considered to be significant such as to justify referral of this particular application to the planning committee.

The proposal was not found to raise significant issues for adopted policy or to be of a nature, scale or complexity such as to warrant referral to the committee.

The planning history of the site was relevant, particularly the recent decisions in respect of extensions to the terrace but was not considered to indicate that a committee decision was required for this application.

Decision

Delegated decision. See above

21/00569/FUL 14 Church Lane, Elsworth CB23 4HU - Demolition of garage, construction of a new dwelling and the addition of a rear extension, render cladding, new windows and new porch to existing bungalow (MC)

Reason for call-in request

1. This is now the fifth planning application relating to the site at 14 Church Lane made since November 2017. The development of this whole site is proceeding in such a haphazard and piecemeal fashion, rather than as a coherent whole, that it is leading to a sub-optimal outcome in what is a central part of the village conservation area.
2. We would also draw attention, once again, to the link between this site and the proposals that have been made for an adjoining site in Brook Street (20/04791/FUL) and in particular to the foreshortening of the gardens on Church Lane in order to enlarge the Brook Street site. We would also ask that GCSPS gives consideration to SCDC Design Guide (March 2010) with respect to plot sizes and the elevated nature of the site and its relationship to proposed dwellings in Brook Street. The proposals for these two sites are separate but regard should be had to both when considering either one of them.

The current application

3. The current application is described as being for the “demolition of garage, construction of a new dwelling and the addition of a rear extension, render cladding, new windows and new porch to the existing bungalow”. At first sight this appears strange as the garage was demolished last year and the house is well on the way to being built under - as the Heritage Statement would have it - the approval previously given for S/1949/19/FL. However, the application form goes on to say that pre-application advice given to the developer in February 2021 was “to withdraw the application for alterations to the bungalow [that is, 20/04919/HFUL] and submit a new application to include the dwelling that is currently under construction as per approval S/1949/19/FL”. This would seem to suggest doubt about the approval claimed for the new dwelling as the size of the plot on which it stands has been significantly curtailed, as indicated in paragraph 1 above, and permission would have been given on the basis of the plot size and boundaries at the time the application was submitted.
4. Looking at the Heritage, Design and Access Statement this makes it clear that:

The Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service is a strategic partnership between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council

- the garage has already been demolished;
 - the groundworks for the new 4 bedroomed dwelling (adjacent to no. 18 Church Lane) have been completed and that the frame erection would shortly commence (in fact this has now been completed);
 - the present application seeks permission:
 - i. to retain, extend and alter the existing bungalow, rather than demolishing it (as sought in application S/1949/19/FL which proposed the demolition of both the garage and the bungalow and their replacement by two 4 bedroomed houses)
 - ii. to obtain retrospective planning permission for the driveway which has been created to the side of the bungalow (adjacent to no. 12 Church Lane).
5. The alterations to the bungalow were the subject of application 20/04919/HFUL made in November 2020. As will be seen from the Parish Council's response to that application (copy attached), it supported the alterations proposed to the bungalow, but drew attention to a number of issues with regard to the whole of the site including a reduction in plot sizes, removal of vegetation, work undertaken which was not part of the application or which seemed to exceed the proposed dimensions, and the construction, without permission, of the hardstanding for cars to the side of the bungalow. The Parish Council recommended that consideration should be given to requiring retrospective planning permission for the creation of the driveway and that, if approval were given for the other alterations, conditions should be attached in regard to site access and parking while the works to the bungalow are undertaken. However, that application has been withdrawn and replaced now by 21/00569/FUL.
6. This new application relates to the whole of the 14 Church Street site and not just the bungalow. Had this come to the Parish Council as the initial (rather than the fifth) application in respect of 14 Church Lane, the Parish Council would have objected to it in the strongest possible terms. As presented now, the application is incomplete (e.g. lacking proposed street scenes showing both the house and the bungalow) and misleading (e.g. the Site Location Plan only shows the existing bungalow and the now demolished garage whereas it should really show the existing bungalow and the footprint of Plot 2 the foundations for were in place prior to the revised application). Crucially it does not provide a sympathetic and balanced development of the site which sits in the middle of the village conservation area.

7. Even the Heritage Statement is less than fulsome and admits that, as a result of the changes now proposed, the gap between the house and the bungalow will be reduced (compared to the gap between the two houses proposed under S/1949/19/FL). As drawing 14CLE/2/003 shows, the reduction in this gap will make it extremely difficult to turn family sized vehicles (as depicted in the drawing) into the double garage, particularly as it has two doors. Moreover, the annotation on the drawing indicates “access out with clear 1.5m x 1.5m pedestrian visibility splays” which means that the requirement by the Highway Authority that there be two 2m x 2m visibility splays is not met.
8. As the construction of the dwelling and retention of the bungalow are being put to us as a new application for the development of the 14 Church Lane site, given the reasons set out above, our recommendation can only be object.
9. Should the new application be approved, we would draw attention again to the matters of concern and suggestions for conditions set out in our response to 20/04919/HFUL. In addition, it is suggested that because of the damage already caused to the verge outside the whole of the 14 Church Lane site (see photo below) that a further condition relating to the reinstatement of the verge also be attached.

Peter Deer, Chair, Elsworth Parish Council

E-mail received 25 June 2021

The PC does want this to be heard by the planning committee. This application and the one that is pertaining to the same area of land has become convoluted and the PC is concerned about the whole area involved

Key considerations

The comments and concerns of the Parish Council were noted by the group and the case officer gave an explanation of the current proposals, and the history on this site.

Whilst the Parish Council’s concerns with regard to the number of applications that have been made at this site were considered understandable, this was not considered a reason for referral to the planning committee. Those comments of the Parish Council related to impact on the conservation area, the spacing and design of buildings and visibility splays are material, but were not found to be significant in this case, such as to warrant referral to the planning committee.

The proposal was not found to raise significant issues for adopted policy or to be of a nature, scale or complexity such as to warrant referral to the committee.

The planning history of the site was clearly relevant but was not considered to indicate that a committee decision was required for this application.

Finally, the comment of the Parish Council in relation to a neighbouring site to the rear was noted but did not inform the decision on this occasion.

Decision

Delegated decision. See above

21/02032/HFUL 10 Shirley Close, Milton CB24 6BG - Garage conversion, first floor side extension, porch extension and installation of dropped kerb (LW)

Reason for call-in request

Parish Council and Local member (Cllr Bradnam) have called in to committee.

Parish Comments:

1. Overdevelopment of site boundary to boundary increasing a 4 bedroom house to a 6 bedroom house (4 of which are doubles).
2. There will be no access to the rear of the property as the extension will go right up to the boundary.
3. No bin store allocated.
4. Plans show potential of 2 properties (2 front doors and 2 staircases).
5. Concerns over parking. Only 4 spaces provided with the possibility of 6 cars for the property. Parking at the end of Shirley Close is not for this property.
6. Overlooking the side window will overlook number 9.
7. Fencing is not allowed beyond the building line as in the deeds to this property and will cause an issue to the neighbouring property entering and exiting their cars. Milton Parish Council supports the neighbours' objections. Please refer this application to the Planning Committee with a site visit request

Cllr Comments (summary, full comments are long and on website):

The Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service is a strategic partnership between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council

Milton Parish Council has asked me to request that this is referred to the planning committee and requested a site visit, which I support.

The plans show this is effectively creating a separate dwelling house, with a separate staircase in the garage section.

No 11 adjoining and in the same ownership has undergone a similar conversion and must accommodate five bedrooms. these two dwellings could accommodate some 11 individuals if living singly, with up to 11 cars.

Residents advise there is a covenant that restricts erection of fencing and that each plot should only contain one house.

This application represents over-development of the plot with insufficient parking, so it is inappropriate for the plot.

Parking - four cars are depicted parking on the frontage, requiring a dropped kerb all the way along. The application indicates 4 +2 cars in front of the property (which is impractical) and 4 cars using the spaces at the end of the cul de sac.

Additional cars and manoeuvring will make this more dangerous from children, cyclists and other drivers.

No outside access to the back garden, only through the house, which means that bins will have to be stored at the front of the property and no bin storage has been depicted.

No storage for bicycles has been included. The implication is that everyone who lives there will travel by car. Together with the bins this means there is less likely to be room to park 4 cars (as depicted) at the front of the property.

f) This proposal will have a negative impact on the street scene of Shirley Close. Parking four cars 'comb-wise' on the frontage would means cars dominate the street scene.

Key considerations

The comments of the Parish Council and the local Councillor were noted by the group. The case officer introduced the case and updated the group in respect of public representations.

It was noted that some of the comments raised related to local concerns as to what the effect of the proposal could be in terms of the creation of separate dwellings or possible an HMO and covenants. However the group noted that these concerns were not material to this current householder planning application and would be subject to other regulatory controls and potentially further planning permissions.

In terms of the other issues raised around potential overdevelopment, overlooking, parking provision and the amenities of the area, whilst these were acknowledged as material planning considerations, these were not found to be of such significance as to justify referral to the planning committee.

The proposal was not found to raise significant issues for adopted policy or, having regard to similar extensions in the street, to be of a nature, scale or complexity such as to warrant referral to the committee.

The planning history of the site was not considered to indicate that a committee decision was required for this application.

Decision

Delegated decision. See above

21/02099/FUL 9 Back Lane, Barrington - Revised boundary of new dwellinghouse (Resubmission of 20/05214/FUL) | Land Adjacent To 9 Back Lane Barrington CB22 7RF (CP)

Reason for call-in request

The Parish Council decided to request that this application is put before the planning committee for the following reasons:

The Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service is a strategic partnership between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council

1. This site is a prominent site within the Conservation Area and has attracted a great deal of adverse local comment.
2. As a matter of principle, BPC would like significant planning applications within the Conservation Area not to be decided under delegated powers given the recent history of inappropriate granting of permissions within the Conservation Area under delegated powers.
3. BPC disagrees with the advice of the Conservation Officer and cannot see how the current application, which subdivides the site such that the listed building is enclosed a significantly smaller plot to the advantage of the adjacent modern development
 - a. will not adversely affect the character of the Listed Building; or how it will
 - b. preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

For these reasons it objects to the application.

4. BPC requests that members of the Planning Committee undertake a site visit to see for themselves, and in particular what the effect of the current application will be upon the setting of the listed building.
5. BPC also requests that Parish Council's correspondence in relation to the previously withdrawn applications for this site are drawn to the attention of the Planning Committee for their consideration in determining this application.

Key considerations

Consistent with previous applications for this site, and this proposal, the case officer presented the application to the group and the latest comments from the Parish Council were considered.

It was considered that the comments of the Parish Council in relation to the conservation area are material planning considerations. However, in the context of this particular proposal to change the position of the site boundary, these were not considered to be of such significance as to justify the referral of the matter to the planning committee.

The proposal was not found to raise significant issues for adopted policy or to be of a nature, scale or complexity such as to warrant referral to the committee.



GREATER CAMBRIDGE
SHARED PLANNING

The planning history of the site was clearly relevant but was not considered to indicate that a committee decision was required for this application.

Decision

Delegated decision. See above