

Delegation meeting - Minutes

- **Date:** 14 September 2021
- **Time:** 11am to 12:30pm
- **Meeting held:** via Teams
- **Attendees:** Chris Carter (CC), Cllr Henry Batchelor (HB), Cllr Pippa Heylings (PH), Mike Huntingdon (MH), Karen Pell-Coggins (KPC), John McAteer (JM)
- **Notes and actions:** Jemma Smith

Minutes approved by: Cllr Pippa Heylings (Chair of Planning Committee – Consultee), Cllr Henry Batchelor (Vice Chair of Planning Committee – Consultee) on 17 September 2021, Chris Carter (Delivery Manager – Strategic Sites) on 17 September 2021

21/03564/REM - Waterbeach Barracks Key Phase 1 Lake Spur, Denny End Road, Waterbeach, Cambridgeshire

Reason for call-in request

Council comments:

- Members questioned the recent traffic monitoring in Station Road, Waterbeach and are keen to identify what was being done and by whom. Please can you confirm if this monitoring was by or on behalf of UC?
- Discrepancy between the haul routes shown on the Lake Spur REM application and what WPC currently understand to be the approved routes. It appears that the REM is based on the assumption that the current live applications will be approved.
- General disquiet and frustration at the short notice for and form of the online consultation meeting in respect to the Mere Way proposal- it appears that the solution suggested pleases none of the user groups or local communities.
- Within the update report there was a section on demolition and onsite crushing (page 5) concern was expressed by the committee in relation to the lack of detail in respect to dust suppression – I suspect that this is dealt with in more detail in the CMP or demolition consent however the council would welcome more detail /

assurances in respect to this activity- particularly if this will be ongoing when any of the homes / school will be occupied.

Key considerations

The comments of the Parish Council were noted by the group. It was considered that the first and third points that were raised are not material to the consideration of this particular proposal. It was noted that the second and fourth points did raise material planning considerations, however it was noted that the haul routes are not proposed for approval as part of this application and it was agreed that clarification on this point should be provided to the Parish Council in order to assist understanding. With regard to dust suppression during the works, it was noted that detail of the measures proposed to address this point is included in Chapter 6 of the Construction Method Statement. It was felt that referring the matter to committee was unlikely to add anything further on this specific technical point.

The proposal was not found to present significant issues for adopted policy, nor to be of a nature, scale or complexity to warrant a committee decision. Finally, whilst the planning history of the new town was considered to be detailed and complex, it was not considered that this justified this reserved matters application for a section of infrastructure being referred to the committee for decision.

Decision

Delegated decision – see above.

20/01564/FUL Land To The South East Of Burton End West Wickham (Parish of West Wratting) - Mixed use of agricultural and solar farm

Reason for call-in request

To determine whether the application falls under part 6 of the Scheme of Delegation - PC approval

Key considerations

This application has not been referred to planning committee by either the Parish Council or a local ward member. However, it was brought to the meeting by officers to be considered for referral to the planning committee in accordance with part 6 of the Scheme of Delegation, as set out in Part 3, Table 5 of the District Council's Constitution.

The group considered that the proposal, by virtue of its scale, proposed use, location on grade 2 agricultural land outside a settlement framework and potential sustainability benefits did raise special planning policy considerations, is complex and is of significant importance to the area. Therefore, it was agreed that the application should be referred to the planning committee.

Decision

Refer to planning committee. See above

21/02721/HFUL 7 High Street Dry Drayton – Single storey side extension

Reason for call-in request

- Overlooking / loss of privacy
- Loss of light/overshadowing
- Highway Safety
- Traffic
- Parking
- Noise
- Layout and density
- Design, appearance and materials
- Effect on listed Building and Conservation Areas
- Nature Conservation and or impact on protected trees or the landscape.
- Disabled Person's access
- Government Policy
- Compliance with the Local Plan.

- The following are not normally issues that can be taken into account:
- Loss of property value
- Issues of market competition
- Loss of a view
- The applicant's motive, character or personal circumstances Matters covered by other legislation including restrictive covenants Issues relating to landownership/property boundaries. Moral or religious Issue.

Key considerations

Notwithstanding what was included in the agenda, it was noted that the wording of the Parish Council call in request was as follows:

“Dry Drayton Parish Council met on Tuesday the 6th of July 2021 and made a unanimous decision to object to this application for the material consideration 'Design, Appearance and material' due to the appearance of the proposal not being in character with the location of the property. The Parish Council does request that the application be referred to the district council planning committee”.

These comments were considered by the group and the case officer presented the plans and some photographs to explain the proposal.

It was considered that the issues raised by the Parish Council of design, appearance and materials were material planning considerations. However, in the context of an application for a single storey extension to a property in a backland location, it was considered that these factors were not of such significance as to warrant referral to the planning committee.

The proposal was not found to raise significant implications for adopted policy and nor was it considered to be of a nature, scale or complexity to refer to the planning committee. Finally, there was nothing in the planning history of the site which indicated that a committee decision should be sought.

Decision

Delegated decision. See above