

## Delegation meeting - Minutes

- **Date:** 6 July 2021
- **Time:** 11am to 12:30pm
- **Meeting held:** via Teams
- **Attendees:** Chris Carter (CC), Cllr Pippa Heylings (PH), Cllr Henry Batchelor (HB), Charlotte Spencer (CS), Mike Huntingdon (MH), Sumaya Nakamya (SN), Phoebe Carter (PC)
- **Notes and actions:** Jemma Smith

**Minutes approved by:** Cllr Pippa Heylings (Chair of Planning Committee – Consultee) on 15 July 2021, Chris Carter (Delivery Manager – Strategic Sites) on 15 July 2021

### **21/01895/HFUL - 57 High Street, Dry Drayton, CB23 8BS: Two storey rear extension with first floor balcony, new entrance porch infills and new external finishes (CS)**

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

The Parish Council: Objects

Comments: It was agreed last night by a unanimous decision that Dry Drayton Parish Council object to this application. The reason for their objection is the proposal for a balcony which would result in 57 High Street completely overlooking the gardens of two neighbouring properties. Therefore, Dry Drayton Parish Council wish for the material consideration in relation to overlooking/loss of privacy to be considered and assessed in relation to this proposal.

The Parish Council does request that the application be referred to the District Council Planning Committee. Planning reasons: That a balcony would overlook neighbouring properties and create a loss of privacy.

#### **Key considerations**

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

The comments of the Parish Council were found to raise material planning considerations in the form of potential overlooking from the proposed balcony. However, it was not considered that this issue was of such significance in this case as to warrant referral to the planning committee. It was noted that the applicant had sought to address a previous reason for refusal in this area.

The proposal was not found to raise significant issues for adopted policy, nor to be of a nature, scale or complexity to warrant referral to the planning committee. The planning history was noted as being of relevance, but not found to justify a committee referral.

## Decision

Delegated decision – see above.

**21/01906/REM Waterbeach Barracks Denny End Road Waterbeach Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB25 9PA - Reserved matters application for the approval of details (outside of a key phase) of access, appearance, landscape, layout and scale in respect of a temporary construction haul road serving the Waterbeach Barracks and Airfield Development (S/0559/17/OL), including construction of engineered drainage works, drainage ditch, filter drains and temporary connection to drainage pond, earthworks and ground remodelling, areas for construction use and any necessary vegetation removal and demolitions (MH)**

## Reason for call-in request

Waterbeach Parish Council considered the amended application at its Planning Committee meeting last week and submits the following response.

WPC currently OBJECTS pending clarification on the following issues:

- a. reassurance that it is consistent with drainage strategy for KP1 and that appropriate consultees, such as the IDB and Lead Local Flood Authority, have been contacted since we understand that the filter drain solution will now be a piped system, and this is not referred to in Lead Flood's initial response, perhaps
- The Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service is a strategic partnership between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council

because it was a further amendment published on 26th May (after the PC's May planning meeting).

- b. reassurance that there is no additional impact on the environment (especially with respect to the drainage and biodiversity), and that appropriate consultees, such as the IDB and Lead Flood, have been contacted with the amended plans.
- c. assessment of impact on Denny Abbey.
- d. a specific time period for which this "temporary haul road" is approved.
- e. reassurance that Landbeach Parish Council will also be consulted on this application as well as 2021/2009/FUL.
- f. In its response to application S/2021/2009/FUL the Parish Council asked that businesses on the Research Park and in the vicinity of the estate behind the BP garage had been consulted and that their responses will be made known to the SCDC Planning Committee. It is not aware if this has been remedied but asks that the same provision applies to this application too. WPC requests that this application is called in for determination by the SCDC Planning Committee

## Key considerations

The case officer presented the proposal and provided an explanation of where this fits in with the wider development. The comments of the Parish Council were noted.

It was considered that the Parish Council had raised material planning considerations in the form of drainage and heritage impacts. However, noting that there were no objections to the proposal from statutory consultees in these areas and that the proposed haul road was contained centrally in the development, it was not considered that a referral to the planning committee was necessary in this case.

The proposal was not found to raise significant issues for adopted policy, nor to be of a nature, scale or complexity to warrant referral to the planning committee. The planning history was noted as being of relevance, but not found to justify a committee referral.

## Decision

Delegated decision. See above

## **21/01039/HFUL at Belvoir Cottage, The Avenue, Madingley - Construction of a home office in the front garden (SN)**

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

The opinion of the Parish Council is that the proposed office is too large in scale to locate in front of the house. (Its size and design would be better suited to the rear garden and we would support an application to have it there.)

### **Key considerations**

The case officer presented the application to the group and explained the local context. The comments of the Parish Council were considered and found to raise material planning considerations in the form of design and location. However, it was considered that, having regard to the surrounding context, this was not so significant as to justify referring the matter to the planning committee.

The proposal was not found to raise significant issues for adopted policy, nor to be of a nature, scale or complexity to warrant referral to the planning committee. The planning history was noted as being of relevance, but not found to require a committee referral.

### **Decision**

Delegated decision. See above

## **20/04706/FUL 60 Impington Lane, Impington - Demolition of existing garage and erection of a three-bedroom, single storey dwelling to rear with detached carport/store (PC)**

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

All agreed to recommend refusal on the grounds of drainage detail noting area has a tendency to flood and proposal for surface water to be discharged to main sewer. Positioning on plot would be difficult to avoid negative impact on neighbouring properties,

lack of private amenity space. Recommendation for SCDC officers to put this plan to committee.

### **Key considerations**

The case officer introduced the application to the group and the comments of the Parish Council were noted.

It was considered that the comments of the Parish Council did raise material planning considerations in the form of flood risk, design, form and relationship with neighbouring occupiers. It was also noted that a relatively large number of public representations, in the context of this application, had been received from local residents. As such, it was found that the material planning concerns of the Parish Council were of appropriate significance to refer the matter to the planning committee, particularly when combined with the nature and scale of the proposal in this backland location.

Notwithstanding the above considerations, with regard to the other criteria used to determine whether an application goes to planning committee, the proposal was not found to raise significant issues for adopted policy nor was the planning history noted as being of particular relevance.

### **Decision**

Referred to planning committee. See above.