

# Delegation meeting - Minutes

- **Date:** 21 June 2022
- **Time:** 11:00 – 12:30
- **Meeting held:** via Teams
- 

**Attendees:** Cllr Henry Batchelor (HB), Cllr Peter Fane (PF), Phil McIntosh (PM), Nick Yager (NY), Michael Sexton (MS), Michael Hammond (MH)

**Minutes approved by:** Phil McIntosh (Interim Delivery Manager and S106), Cllr Batchelor (Chair of Planning Committee - Consultee), Cllr Peter Fane (Vice Chair of Planning Committee – Consultee) on XXXXX

## 22/01556/S73 - Strawberry Farm 3 Pampisford Road

S73 to vary condition 1 of ref: S/3387/RM ((Approval of matters reserved for appearance landscaping layout & scale following outline planning permission S/1433/16/OL for residential development comprising 8 dwellings including affordable housing provision landscaping and associated infrastructure) to amend the design of Plot 6, alter the boundary layout of Plots 2, 3 and 4.

### Reason for call-in request

The Parish Council recommends the application is REFUSED and would like this planning application considered by the Planning Committee. Comments: When the original planning application was submitted for this development the council was concerned about the size of the houses and they were reduced in size, as this development sits at the top of a slope opposite bungalow on a much lower land. The council noted that this is the second application to increase the size of the houses on a piecemeal basis, despite the council's original request that the houses not be too large in relation to the neighbouring bungalows. The proposed piecemeal extensions to the unoccupied houses change the nature of the development and the outlook of the houses. The new extension is likely to overlook the existing house, Strawberry Farm.

### Key considerations

The case officer introduced the application explaining the site, local context (including adjacent bungalow), proposal and planning history. Photos of the adjacent bungalow were provided in the context of the site (plot 6). The case officer explained that the dwelling on plot 6 already has planning permission and that this application was for a single storey rear extension and minor alterations to the fenestration. The case officer explained the separation distances from the extension to the adjacent bungalow and that boundary treatments also formed part of the planning permission.

No significant planning concerns were raised in relation to the extension which is a modest addition in relation to the existing planning permission for a two storey dwelling. On this basis the Interim Delivery Manager did not consider the proposal warranted referral to the planning committee.

### Decision

Do not refer to Planning Committee

## **22/00886/FUL Clopton Farm, White Carpentry, Lower Road, Croydon**

Retrospective amendments to permission S/1127/17/VC consisting of: resurfacing of access onto highway; changes to Unit 1 external landscaping/ amenity area and internal layout of Live/Work Unit 1, including raising of ridge height and additional storey to accommodate 1no. bedroom to first-floor; merging of work space of unit 1 with Unit 2, addition of welfare facilities and addition of mezzanine floor; and changes to Unit 2 external landscaping/ amenity area, building clad in timber to match adjacent barn and alterations to internal layout, including removal of 1no. bedroom on ground-floor.

Retrospective amendments to permission S/3770/19/FL consisting of changes to Unit 3 including removal of green wall and green roof and replacement with timber cladding, enclosure of car port to form additional training space and installation of 3m high fence. Amendments to shared courtyard, external areas and parking areas, addition of DDA compliant steps and ramps and amendments to landscaping approved under permissions S/1127/17/VC & S/3770/19/FL.

Retrospective erection of 4no. buildings consisting of: an employee/ visitor space/ sensory suite building (Unit A); 2no. prototype houses/ visitor guest houses (Units B & C); and a window display building (Unit D). Retrospective creation of gravel parking area and orchard area. Retrospective single-storey infill extension between Units 2 & 3 for storage of maintenance materials, equipment and domestic storage for Units 1 & 2.

### **Reason for Call-in Request:**

Council objects to this application for the following material reasons:

Loss of privacy: Erection of a 3m high fence, intrusion of residential amenity.

Overshadowing: Building constructed by the applicant on a party wall. Scale and mass is impacting on the amenity of neighbours.

Highway Safety: The nature of the development implies increased traffic movements on the B1042.

Traffic: Increased traffic movements implies increased need for parking on the site. If permission were to be granted for the "bar/pub" building, then the Parish Council would request a traffic management scheme to be in place.

Noise: Increased traffic movements will create more noise.

Environment: The cumulative impact of the number of developments currently on the site leads to severe harm to the environment.

Overdevelopment of the site: The developments have changed the character and landscape, design and appearance of the area. Concern of neighbourhood disturbance as site appears to develop an entertainment and tourist venue as well as the original carpentry business.

Environmental Impact: Tarmac already laid should be replaced with gravel, to allow natural drainage. The land on which the lodges have been built had to be cleared, and given the amount of clearance, this would cause harm to the biodiversity of the area.

### **Key considerations**

The case officer explained the context of the site, in particular proximity of existing residential properties and the existing lawful uses that have been granted planning permission. The case officer also explained that some of the existing unauthorised

development on the site (2 visitor guest houses) has been removed from this application and is likely to be considered under a separate planning application. The case officer explained the planning history of the site including the existing lawful business use and live/work units. Changes to the scheme, including retrospective elements, were then explained in the context of the existing planning permissions. This included reference to provision of a bar in one of the buildings, although it was noted that this was not proposed as a commercial entity in its own right, separate to the existing lawful use. Should this become an issue through unauthorised use, it would be a matter for enforcement.

The incremental, unauthorised development, was noted in the context of what has already been granted planning permission. The relationship to neighbouring residential properties was also carefully considered in the context of impacts upon residential amenity, including the impact of additional built form and noise and disturbance, including vehicle movements.

Although the complexity of the planning history was noted and acknowledged, given the overall scale and scope of development, in the context of what is already existing, it was not considered there were significant planning concerns or implications for adopted policy. Therefore, based on the nature, scale and complexity of the application, on balance, the Interim Delivery Manager did not consider the proposal warranted referral to the planning committee.

### **Decision**

Do not refer to Planning Committee

## **S/2501/19/CONDB Land To The North And South Of Bartlow Road Linton**

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

### **Reason for Call-in Request:**

LPC acknowledge that the proposed brick may be more expensive than the original proposed, but it is a completely different colour to both that approved and the colour of the local Cambridge Buff brick. This change of colour would make the houses of the new development out of keeping with the surrounding area. The proposed brick is not acceptable to LPC.

### **Key considerations**

The case officer introduced the application which explained that changes to the approved bricks were being sought. The location of the properties were highlighted that would be altered and reference was made to the materials in the existing streetscene and materials agreed for relevant adjacent properties within the development.

Based on the details required to be considered by the condition there are no significant concerns with regard to material planning considerations. Based on the nature, scale and complexity of the application the Interim Delivery Manager did not consider the proposal warranted referral to the planning committee.

### **Decision**

Do not refer to Planning Committee