

Delegation meeting - Minutes

- **Date:** 18 June 2024
- **Time:** 11:00 – 12:30
- **Meeting held:** via Teams

Attendees: Cllr Anna Bradnam (Chair of Planning Committee), Cllr Peter Fane (Vice Chair of Planning Committee), Rebecca Smith (Delivery Manager (DM West & Compliance)), Dominic Bush (Senior Planning Officer), Nick Yager (Principal Planning Officer)

Apologies:

Minutes approved by:

24/01303/OUT – Land adj 110 Cinqes Road Gamlingay

Outline application for up to 3no self-build dwellings with all matters reserved except for access.

Reason for Call-in Request:

Parish objection - Reduction of number of properties from 5 to 3 does not address the objections previously raised or mitigate the impact of the proposal.

Application is contrary to NHP, would join hamlet of Cinqes to village, impacts on open countryside views, removal of hedgerow would be detrimental, outside the village envelope, outline for large, detached properties is not in keeping with housing needs of residents. Existing self-build plots are still available challenge need for more in Gamlingay. Should SCDC be minded to approve, GAM 8 contributions would be required. Should the application be recommended for approval we would request this be referred to Planning Committee

Key Considerations:

The Case Officer (DB) introduced the application outlining the details of the planning application, as well as the existing context of the site and surrounding area, together details of the site designations and planning history. The planning application is an outline application and relate to erection of up to 3 self build dwellings.

The case officer advised that the site is outside of the development boundary and represents a reduction in site area and amount of development since the previous refused (and dismissed at appeal) application. The Council's Ecology Officer has been consulted as part of the assessment of the application and that they have advised there is insufficient ecological information to determine the application. The Local Highways Authority and the Council's Environmental Health Team have also been consulted and have not raised any objections.

One representation has been received objecting to the proposal, on the grounds of loss of agricultural land, loss of trees and concerns over setting a precedent. The concerns raised by the Parish Council relating to the proposal, its assessment against the neighbourhood plan policies were also noted along with the call in request if the application were to be recommended for approval.

It was acknowledged that the nature, scale and complexity of the proposed development is not significant in context. There is limited public interest in the scheme, and it was not considered there were any policy implications. Consequently, in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee, the Delivery Manager considered, on balance, the proposal should not be referred to the planning committee.

Decision

Do not refer to Planning Committee

24/01190/S73 – Land between Haverhill Road and Hinton Way, Stapleford

S73 to vary conditions 1 (Approved plans) and 2 (Noise impact) of reserved matters application 22/04303/REM (Reserved matters application for additional access points, layout, scale, landscape and appearance following outline planning permission 20/02929/OUT (Outline planning for the development of land for a retirement care village in Use Class C2 comprising housing with care, communal health, wellbeing and leisure facilities, public open space, landscaping, car parking, access and associated development and public access countryside park with all matters reserved except for access)) Relocation of 6no. internal ASHP to the main roof of Block A, together with associated internal alternations and Removal of the balcony to the first floor southern elevation of Block A and replacement with full length windows with louvre above.

Reason for Call-in Request:

Parish Council objection - Great Shelford Parish Council commented on support of these proposal. However, Stapleford Parish Council commented in objection. The Stapleford Parish Council objection relates to the Air Sourced Heat Pumps effects on the rural landscape and lack consideration of the draft Stapleford and Great Shelford Local Plan. Although no objections from consultees.

Key Considerations:

The Case Officer (NY) introduced the application outlining the details of the planning application, as well as the existing context of the site and surrounding area, together details of the site designations and planning history. The planning application is a s73 application vary the approved plans to allow for the relocation of 6 Air Source Heat Pumps (ASHP) to the roof of Block A, together with some alterations to windows and balconies.

The case officer advised that the original permission was refused in 2020 but was allowed on appeal, the reserved matters application was approved at Planning Committee in May 2023. The Council's Landscape Officer has been consulted as part of the assessment of the application and that they have advised that a series of 3D rendered views have been included in the design and access statement addendum which show that, due to their location in the centre of the roof, the ASHP will not be visible from the selected viewpoints in the retirement village. The LVA addendum concludes that the addition of the ASHPs will not add any greater visual impacts than those already identified in the original LVA.

The Landscape Officer has advised that they have no objection to the addition of the ASHPs.

Five representations have been received objecting to the proposal, echoing the concerns raised by the Parish Council. The concerns raised by the Parish Council relating to the proposal and its assessment against the draft neighbourhood plan policies were also noted.

It was acknowledged that the nature, scale and complexity of the proposed development is not significant in context. There is limited public interest in the scheme, and it was not considered there were any policy implications. Consequently, in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee, the Delivery Manager considered, on balance, the proposal should not be referred to the planning committee.

Decision

Do not refer to Planning Committee