

## Delegation meeting - Minutes

- **Date:** 18 January 2022
- **Time:** 11:00 – 12:30
- **Meeting held:** via Teams
- **Attendees:** Cllr Henry Batchelor (HB), Nigel Blazeby (NB), Philippa Kelly (PK), Julie Ayre (JA), Lorraine Casey (LC), Mary Collins (MC), Nick Yager (NY), Michael Sexton (MS).

**Minutes approved by:** Cllr Henry Batchelor (Vice Chair of Planning Committee – Consultee) on 31 January 2022, Nigel Blazeby (Delivery Manager Development Management) on 31 January 2022

### **20/04791/FUL- Construction of 2 No. detached dwellings, including demolition and re-construction of existing former shop and replacement of demolished barn to form a garage.**

Land To The South Of 29 Brook Street Elsworth CB23 4HX

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

The revised application addresses a number of the issues of concern which led us to object to the previous application (S/0606/12/FL).

A couple of these concerns remain:

- The impact on the street scene in terms of the scale of two detached 'executive' style houses replacing the historic cottage(s) and outbuildings; as we noted previously, the two dwellings proposed are most definitely not cottages, while Drawing 006 continues to misrepresent the relative size of the bungalow to the rear of the site at 14 Church Lane.
- The slavish mimicking of two dilapidated heritage assets by their reconstruction in the same historic positions, regardless of impact. In the case of plot 1 this will reinstate a blank, black wall right on the roadside (Drawing 007) to the detriment of the street scene when the enlargement of the site by incorporating land previously part of 14 Church Lane could have allowed positioning further back into the plot to make space for a screen of vegetation to lessen its impact.

There are also a couple of matters of detail to mention:

- There appears to be (Drawing 006) only one parking space for Plot 1 contrary to what is said at para. 3.4 of the Design and Heritage statement.

- Given the nature of the highway along the Brook, presumably conditions will be set regarding works access and parking during the construction and a schedule of works will also be required."

## 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 scale of the proposed dwellings and their visual impact upon the street scene; parking provision; and potential disruptions during the construction phase of the development.

Whilst these issues were considered to be material to the assessment of the proposal, the group did not consider that they amounted to significant planning concerns that would 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

## **21/05008/FUL - Erection of 1no 5bed dwelling and Annex. Land Between 2 And 4 High Street Great Eversden CB23 1HN**

### Reason for call-in request

Following discussion, the Parish Council felt that upon reflection the size and scale juxtaposed to a Listed building had not been addressed.

It is substantially similar to the previous application and the Parish Council take issue with the reasoning for it being moved forward and losing trees.

## 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 impact of the proposal on the setting of the adjacent Listed Building and loss of trees. The Parish Council was also concerned that the proposal is similar to the previous refused application and it does not agree with the repositioning forward within the site.

The case officer explained that the revised position of the dwelling is on the same building line as an extant planning permission for a dwelling and that the Conservation Officer now states that the proposed dwelling will not harm the setting of the adjacent Listed Building. The case officer also explained that there were no objections from the Trees Officer subject to a condition to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the submitted arboricultural method statement that included new planting and some tree retention.

Whilst the issues raised by the Parish Council were considered to be material to the assessment of the proposal, the group did not consider that they amounted to significant planning concerns that would 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.

## 21/04456/FUL - Manor Farm, Fowlmere Aerodrome, High Street, Fowlmere

### Reason for call-in request

The primary concern of the Parish Council was that there is insufficient detail within the application to allow it to be properly judged against the appropriate policies or to assess the impact of the proposed change of use to the local community. The Parish Council considered that the required business case for the development had not been provided as part of the application and the resulting lack of detail meant that it was difficult to both understand the need for this scale of expansion of hanger space and properly assess the potential that this may have for impact on the local community.

## Key considerations

The case officer introduced the application to the group and explained the comments which had been received from the Parish Council.

The group acknowledged the concerns of the Parish Council, particularly with regard for the need for a business case, and concluded that the applicant should be required to submit this as further information to accompany the planning application.

## Decision

Deferred for further information – see above.

## 21/03822/FUL - Site 1, Granta Park, Great Abington

Erection of R&D building and associated decked car park, landscaping and associated infrastructure

### Reason for call-in request

(second submission – see Appendix B & C)

Recommendation: The Parish Council recommend REFUSAL of this planning application.

Comments: The Parish Council objects to the size and scale of the development which is overtly dominant in its size, height and location. Initial buildings on the site were limited to two storeys and the existing two storey buildings on the Granta Park site fit reasonably well into the rural landscape. However, the proposed speculative four storey building is over twice the height of the tree and therefore would not be shielded from local householders and would dominate the rural skyline.

There are already problem with the existing volume of traffic using the site, at times queuing back along the A505. Therefore, the Parish Council is very concerned about the implications of a further 600 staff entering the single entrance site adding to the existing morning congestion, that delays local residents and can make the roads hazardous to negotiate. Mitigation of existing traffic movements is necessary, and the Parish Council's view is that there should be improved cycling access to and from Granta Park, not building more car parks, and that the Linton Greenway route should go along Newmarket Road to the Entrance to Granta Park and then continue along Pampisford Road until it meets the A1307.

The noise and light pollution (car park and some building lights are on all night) from the

site are an existing problem to local residents, which would increase with a further large and highly conspicuous building and car park on the site.

The Parish Council does request that the application be referred to the District Council 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, namely the size and scale of the development and its visual impact on the rural landscape; traffic; cycling access; and noise and light pollution.

The group considered that the scale and nature of the development were such that the application should be referred to the planning committee.

### **Decision**

Planning committee decision – see above.

## **S/2501/19/CONDA - Bartlow Road, Linton**

Submission of details required by condition 2 (External Materials) of reserved matters permission S/2501/19/RM

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

As mentioned in the appeal decision for previously refused Discharge of Condition 2 application, APP/W0530/W/21/3271548, the site is very prominently located at the entrance to the village and the general topography of the area is such that views of the development will be readily available.

The layout proposed for this site including the use of terracing which lifts the buildings well above the natural ground level emphasises the height of the buildings, making them more obtrusive in the landscape. It is therefore critical that the materials used for these buildings are of the highest quality and that they not only preserve but enhance this important entrance to the village.

Farmsteads in Linton only use black weatherboarding for barns, not dwelling houses.

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

There are areas at the edges of the village where such barns have been sympathetically converted to homes, but these are limited to a handful of dwellings, not a cluster of 55 homes with almost half including synthetic slate grey weatherboards. While this colour of weatherboard would be appropriate for garages/outbuildings, it is not appropriate for homes in this sensitive edge-of-village location.

Soldier/string courses in Linton are usually in a contrasting colour to the main brickwork typically a red contrast to cream facing brickwork. Soldier courses, windowsills and headers are all stated as to match facing brick. This does not reflect the local character of the village.

The Berwick multi brick looks very/too red in the documents provided. Are there examples of where this brick has been used in the area?

The clay pantiles chosen appear quite purple and have a spotty weathering effect. Google Maps images of the same pantiles used at Croft End in Orwell look brown from above, rather than the traditional clay colour seen in Linton.

The remaining materials have not been changed from the original submission and are still anywhere materials in standardised and intrusive urban combinations that fail to respect the context and local distinctiveness of this village and area.

Linton Parish Council Decision:  
Object and do refer this to the District Council Full 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, namely the appearance of the development through the use of appropriate high quality materials. The case officer explained that previously submitted materials details had been refused by officers and dismissed at appeal and that this new application seeks to overcome the concerns raised.

The group considered that the Parish Council's concerns were material planning considerations, but they did not amount to significant planning concerns that would warrant referral of the application to the planning committee. It was however agreed that the materials should be considered at a Case Management meeting (attended by Development Management managers, Urban Design officer and other officers).

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.

## 21/03039/FUL - Bancroft Farm, Church Lane, Little Abington

Demolition of existing dilapidated agricultural buildings and hardstandings. Erection of five dwellings and the conversion of two redundant barns to form a detached dwelling and an office

### Reason for call-in request

See Appendix D & E

Refused previously by the Planning Committee following PC referral. PC object again (summary below) but have not requested Committee, officer referral to Delegation Meeting

Little Abington Parish Council (LAPC) met to discuss this application on Wednesday 1 December 2021. Three members of the public summarised their objections. There was a unanimous objection to it from the four members of LAPC who were present for the following reasons:

- Rural character: While we agree that the Bancroft Farm site needs some development we still feel that this amended application does not do enough to fit in with the rural character of this corner of the village. The new visualisations in the Design and Access Statement are misleading. They show the view down Church Lane towards the church with trees in leaf on one side of the road and bare on the other, as well as a new large tree that must be planted in the middle of the service road. They therefore do not offer a realistic preview of the site after construction.

We still feel that an office is unnecessary, given that there are numerous empty offices on Granta Park and elsewhere in the vicinity.

- Road safety: We are still concerned that safety could be an issue on the tight bend near the church, especially as there could be extra parking and deliveries to the office.
- Drainage and flooding: Flooding is already an issue outside Bancroft Farm and we fear the creation of more hard standing will reduce the amount of land available for soakaway and increase the risk of flooding.
- PVAA: The boundary of the PVAA does not seem to be accurately drawn and so the site still encroaches on it.

## 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 not requested that the application be referred to the planning committee, however the case officer explained that it was understood that the Parish Council nevertheless had an expectation that it would be referred by officers.

It was noted that the Parish Council had raised material planning considerations, namely the impact on rural character; highway safety; drainage and flood risk; encroachment on to the Protected Village Amenity Area.

The group considered that the scale and nature of the development were such that the application should be referred to the planning committee.

## Decision

Committee decision – see above.