

Delegation meeting - Minutes

- **Date:** 16 November 2021
- **Time:** 11:00 – 12:30
- **Meeting Held:** via Teams
- **Attendees:** Cllr Henry Batchelor, Cllr Heylings, Nigel Blazeby, Julie Ayre, Charlotte Spencer, Michael Sexton, Mike Huntington, Jane Rodens
- **Notes and actions:** Nigel Blazeby

Minutes Approved By: Cllr Henry Batchelor (Vice Chair of Planning Committee – Consultee) on 12 December 2021, Nigel Blazeby (Delivery Manager Development Management) on 12 December 2021

21/03769/HFUL – 20 Acorn Avenue

Reason for call-in request

At their full council meeting of Thursday 21 October 2021, Bar Hill Parish Council resolved to Object to planning application 21/03769/HFUL on the grounds of the material planning considerations of increased traffic and parking regarding the timber shed, and scale and massing regarding the front and rear extensions.

Key considerations

The case officer introduced the application to the group and explained the comments which had been received from the Parish Council. It was noted that the Parish Council had raised material planning considerations, namely the increased traffic and parking associated with the timber shed, and the scale and massing of the proposed front and rear extensions.

The case officer explained that the timber shed was in use for activities reasonably connected to a domestic use only and no proposal has been put forward for any commercial use of the building that extended beyond this domestic use. The traffic associated with it was therefore domestic only in connection with the residential use of the dwelling and therefore not significant. The other concerns of the Parish Council in relation to the scale and massing of the extensions were also noted.

The concerns were not considered to be of such significance as to warrant referral of the application to the planning committee.

The proposal was not found to have significant implications for adopted policy, nor to be of a nature, scale or complexity to warrant referral to the committee. Finally, the history of the site was not determinative in this case

Decision

Delegated decision - See above

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

S/2501/19/COND8 - Bartlow Road, Linton - Land to The North and South of Bartlow Road Linton

Reason for call-in request

Please see Appendix A and B

Key considerations

The case officer introduced the application to the group and explained the comments which had been received from the Parish Council. It was noted that the Parish Council had raised material planning considerations, notably that the data and calculations used in the application were inaccurate, incomplete and misleading and this included noise, flood risk, surface water drainage and foul water drainage and that the details of the proposed pumping station were inadequate for a number of reasons.

The case officer explained that the application was seeking to discharge a condition that requires details of the pumping station to be submitted and approved. He explained that the reason for the condition is to ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the adopted Local Plan 2018. As such the relevant matters to consider are the appearance of the pumping station only as other details, in particular in relation to other drainage matters, are controlled by other conditions. As a result, some of the comments of the Parish Council, though relevant in the broader sense, were considered to go beyond the matters that could be considered in relation specifically to the application.

Having regard to the limited nature of the relevant issue of the appearance of the pumping station only, the Parish Council's concerns were not considered to be of such significance as to warrant referral of the application to the planning committee.

The proposal was not found to have significant implications for adopted policy, nor to be of a nature, scale or complexity to warrant referral to the committee. Finally, the history of the site was not determinative in this case

Decision

Delegated decision - See above

Land Rear Of 129, High Street, Cottenham, Cambridgeshire.

Demolition of existing studio and construction of 5 bedroom property with amenity space, parking, bin and cycle storage

Reason for call-in request

Drive to side of 129 narrows to the side, not adequate access. Contrary to Local Plan H17 a and b. Infill of back land in conservation area. No reference to NHP. Contrary to NHP policy COH/1-5. Large size relative to plot. Concerns withdrawn application to remove 17 trees shows intent. Tree removal would open up plot. CPC recommends refusal. CPC would like the application to be referred to the SCDC Planning Committee.

Key considerations

The case officer introduced the application to the group and explained the comments which had been received from the Parish Council. It was noted that the Parish Council had raised material planning considerations, most notably that the proposal was contrary to the Cottenham Neighbourhood Plan with regard to the proposals, responsiveness to village characteristics and that AECOM housing needs assessment, undertaken as part of the Neighbourhood Plan, concluded that there is no requirement for 5-bedroom properties in Cottenham. Concern was also raised in relation to significant removal of trees.

Due to the potential conflict with the neighbourhood plan, the proposal was considered to raise significant implications for adopted policy.

Decision

Committee decision - See above

S/0559/17/cond29 – Waterbeach new town east - cycleway / footway

Reason for call-in request

The case officer presented the amended application to the group and the comments of the ward councillor were noted.

After assessing the amended drawings, the ward councillor no longer objected to the proposals and particularly made reference to seeking to bring forward the Waterbeach greenway. Milton Cycling Campaign, whilst welcoming the new suggested changes, still could not support the scheme.

Key considerations

The application was considered in accordance with the principles set out in the Council's constitution by my officer Nigel Blazeby in consultation with the Chair of the planning committee having regard to the Notes appended to Table 5 of the Councils recently revised constitution.

It was considered that the amendments to the scheme does provide an improved cyclepath along the A10 and significantly improves the Car Dyke junction with the A10 by including widening the cycleway and narrowing the A10 carriageway in this general location.

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 discharge of condition application being referred to the committee for decision.

Decision

Delegated decision – See above

21_02009_FUL New haul road access; Waterbeach new town planning

Reason for call-in request

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

It was considered that the issue of highway safety was material to the consideration of this planning application.

Key considerations

It was noted however that the issue of highway safety had been addressed by the applicant through the amendments to the application to take into account the conclusions of the Road Safety Audit undertaken by the County Council as Highway Authority. In their response to the planning application, the County Council concluded that the proposal creates a junction that is within the normal range of risks and hazards that users of the adopted public highway would expect to meet within the context of a principal route such as the A10, and is therefore considered to be acceptable.

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 full application for a haul road access being referred to the committee for decision.

Decision

Delegated decision – See above