

Delegation meeting - Minutes

- **Date:** 8th March 2022
- **Time:** 11:00 – 12:30
- **Meeting held:** via Teams

Attendees: Cllr Henry Batchelor (HB), Cllr Fane (PF), Nigel Blazeby (NB) Lorraine Casey (LC), Alice Young (AY), Tom Chenery (TC), Michael Sexton (MS)

Minutes approved by: Cllr Henry Batchelor (Vice Chair of Planning Committee – Consultee) on 14/03/22 and Nigel Blazeby (Delivery Manager Development Management) on 14/03/22

Re: 22/00126/FUL 10 Shirley Close Milton

Reason for call-in request

Cllr Call In – Cllr Rippeth - I wish to call this in and agree with what Hazel has described. It is a cynical ploy to have applied for an extension but to have effectively built a separate dwelling and to then apply for planning permission retrospectively.

Key considerations

The case officer introduced the application to the group and noted both the Councillor call-in request and the comments that had been received from the Parish Council:

The Utility room on the previous planning application has been converted into a kitchen with the extractor fan facing out onto the neighbours back garden and patio area and will cause disruption to the neighbour's amenity. Can the extractor fan face out into the back garden of the property? 2. Location of bin store will cause an issue to neighbouring property entering and exiting their car. Deeds state that front gardens should be open plan. 3. Have the roof materials been approved as the slates are not in keeping with the street scene. 4. The division of the rear garden has already been carried out. 5. From GOV website:

Effective enforcement is important to:

tackle breaches of planning control which would otherwise have unacceptable impact on the amenity of the area; maintain the integrity of the decision-making process;

help ensure that public acceptance of the decision-making process is maintained.

Milton PC is concerned that the applicant has cynically applied for an extension knowing full well that they would build the new area with separate services and a new front door, and not put in the door connecting to the existing property. The amenity of the neighbour is impacted far more by this separate property, with kitchen extractor fan and a second bin store.

MPC supports the neighbours objections and would ask that this application goes to the Planning Committee for a decision.

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

It was noted that the Parish Council had raised material planning considerations.

The case officer explained that it was important to consider the planning merits of the proposal and not the applicant's motives. However, the case officer explained that in her opinion there were some aspects of the proposal that were not policy compliant, namely the size of the unit in relation to space standards and the inadequate provision and accessibility of cycle storage. The group felt that as such the proposal raised relevant material planning considerations that raised significant planning concerns.

Whilst such a conclusion may result in referral of the application to the planning committee, the group felt that in this instance, a delegated officer decision to refuse the application was the correct course of action, and it was therefore unnecessary to refer 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

Re: 22/00049/HFUL 65 Cambridge Road, Fulbourn

Reason for call-in request

Overdevelopment of the site as the wall proposed for the rear extension is on the shared boundary with 63 Cambridge Road

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 extent and proximity of the development in relation to the neighbouring property at 63 Cambridge Road.

Whilst these issues were considered to be material to the assessment of the application, the group considered that they did not amount to significant planning concerns that would warrant referral of the application to the planning committee. It was noted that in addition to the Parish Council objections there were objections from the neighbouring dwellings. The group felt that

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

these objections, alongside those of the Parish Council, could be adequately considered by officers through the delegated decision process.

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

Re: 21/05490/HFUL - 12 Chiswick End, Meldreth

Reason for call-in request

Demolition of a Curtilage Listed Building

Key considerations

It was noted by the group that the building is curtilage listed. As such the Council's constitution requires that the application be considered by the planning committee.

Decision

Committee decision

Re: 21/03955/FUL - Babraham Road, Sawston

Reason for call-in request

The Parish Council reiterates its earlier comments concerning the inadequacy of parking provision and notes that the comments of the Urban Design Team also raise concerns parking arrangements (Para.1.1, bullet point 2, Paras 2.8 & 2.9). It is noted that the inadequacy of the parking arrangements has been further exacerbated by the removal of on-street parking since the previous submission (21_03955_FUL-TECHNICAL_NOTE_02-5850634, p.3).

The Parish Council also supports the further comments of the Urban Design Team concerning the lack of distinctive character in design and finish of the standard house types proposed (Para. 1.1, bullet point 1, Paras. 2.13 & 2.14) and requests that design should reflect the criteria identified in the adopted Sawston Design Guide, 2019. It is particularly concerned about the massing of the 3

(2.5) storey buildings referred to in Para.2.14. Such buildings would be out of character and unduly obtrusive when viewed from the Green Belt.

The Council also has major concerns about the close proximity of dwellings on the plots referred to in Para 2.5 of the Urban Design report, which appear not to meet the recommended minimum separation of 25m between habitable rooms stipulated in the adopted District Design Guide SPD, 2010 (Para 6.68). This concern extends to the proposed separation between dwellings on the Western boundary of the proposed development and the existing dwellings in Stanley Webb Close and Plantation Road. The Parish Council understands that the existing planting on the North Eastern, Eastern and South Eastern boundaries of Stanley Webb Close is maintained by a charge on the existing residents of that estate. The Parish Council would like clarification of how responsibility for this boundary will be shared in future.

The Parish Council also reiterates the concerns expressed in the comments in the Landscape Consultation Response concerning the inadequacy of the proposed landscaping buffer on the Eastern boundary of the proposed development. The proposed development lies in a flat and open landscape and a significant depth and height of planting will be required to mitigate its impact on the adjacent green belt. The technical assessment which informed the release of this site from green belt and its inclusion in the adopted Local Plan referred to the potential to soften the hard edge of the existing development. This potential would not be realised by the current proposals.

The Parish Council notes that the applicant has now provided an adoption plan for the roads within the development. It is concerned, however, that substantial stretches of access road are not included within it (viz. the access roads to Plots 17 to 27; 79 to 92; 118 to 143; 144 to 157; Plots 177 to 193 and Plots 252 to 259) and that it is proposed that these should be maintained by a management company funded by a levy on residents. Experience on existing estates in Sawston suggests that significant deterioration of the road surface will occur over a 30-40 year period requiring extensive resurfacing. It is questionable whether a management company would survive as a functioning legal entity over such a long period and it would be unreasonable to burden future residents with the very considerable expense which resurfacing would involve either directly or through the medium of a management company. The Council therefore requests that all access roads within the development are completed to adoptable standards.

The applicants have still failed to produce a lighting plan and the Parish Council requests that permission is not granted until an acceptable scheme has been agreed. Such a scheme should clearly show the positioning and type of lighting columns and have regard to wildlife conservation and light leakage into the open countryside beyond the development. It should be completed to adoptable standards.

The Parish Council reiterates its previous concerns about highway safety on Babraham Road and requests that traffic calming measures be introduced at the entry to the built-up area and that the 30mph limit on Babraham Rd./Sawston Rd. be extended to the junction between Sawston Road and Babraham High Street.

The Parish Council requests confirmation from the statutory undertaker that there is sufficient existing capacity within the local foul water drainage system to cope with the additional flows arising from this development.

Key considerations

The group noted the comments of the Parish Council and that its further comments were awaited.

The group considered that the scale of the development warranted referral of the application to the planning committee regardless of the further comments of the Parish Council. It's comments, along with those of all third parties and consultees would appropriately be considered by the planning committee.

Decision

Committee decision