

Delegation meeting - Minutes

- **Date:** 6 October 2020
- **Time:** 11am to 12:30pm
- **Meeting held:** via Teams
- **Attendees:** Chris Carter (CC), Cllr John Batchelor (JB), Dean Scrivener (DS), Paul Hunt (PH), Michael Sexton (MS)
- **Notes and actions:** Jemma Smith

Minutes approved by: Cllr John Batchelor (Consultant) on 09 October 2020, Chris Carter (Delivery Manager – Strategic Sites) on 09 October 2020

20/02527/HFUL 2 Butt Lane Great Wilbraham - Single storey rear extension replacing an existing conservatory, a single storey detached outbuilding and a new front entrance porch replacing an existing canopy (DS)

Reason for call-in request

Members unanimously agreed to maintain their objection to the planning application. Members want to reiterate their concerns over building work and request a robust traffic management be in place to avoid any problems.

As the rebuild of the proposed new conservatory goes well beyond the permitted development line, they cannot support this application as it stands, and recommend refusal. Note: if the new conservatory is kept within the development line (i.e. in line with the current brick-built lounge) then this may be acceptable.'

Key considerations

It was noted that the Parish Council, whilst objecting, had not requested that the application be referred to the planning committee for decision.

Notwithstanding, it was considered that the proposal did not present significant implications for adopted policy and was not of a nature scale or complexity to warrant a committee decision. The recent history of the site was noted, including the recent committee decision in respect of another matter, but this was not considered to trigger committee referral. Finally, the comments of the Parish Council were considered to be material planning considerations, but that they did not raise significant planning concerns in the context of this proposal.

Decision

Delegated Decision. See above.

20/03171/S73 8 Green Lane, Linton, CB21 4JZ - (Variation of condition 5 (surface water drainage), 6 (hard and soft landscape) and 8 (arboricultural method statement and tree protection strategy) and removal of condition 9 (traffic management plan) of planning permission S/3524/17/FL (erection of 1no dwelling).

and 20/03184/S73 (Variation of condition 4 (method statement) & 5 (materials) of listed building consent S/3525/17/LB (alterations to 2no curtilage listed walls for a vehicle access and a pedestrian access) (PH)

Reason for call-in request

[Please note that whilst the Parish objected to both applications in separate responses, and only requested 20/03171/S73 be referred to committee, their comments on 20/03184/S73 raised concerns about materials that are subject to 20/03184/S73 and so both need to be presented.]

20/03171/S73

Linton Parish Council Comments: 2 September 2020

The submission for condition 5 does not appear to meet the requirements for percolation testing, being only 2 test pits. The results were obtained after an unusually long dry spell and so are not typical of the area.

The comments for 20/03184/S73 apply to this submission, also.

Work has been done without meeting pre-commencement conditions, and materials are at the heart of recent planning appeals. This means bricks/flints/etc, not just mortar.

Already we see that the front wall has been reduced in height and the lowered wall has been built. The materials are not in keeping with the original, being of a different colour and texture, not appropriate for the Outstanding Conservation Area. This is particularly obvious against the historic fabric, in an area of historic value.

In particular the coping stones are soft and without longevity (we already see some wear and flaking). The colour is the cream/yellow of Cambridge Commons, not the russet of the original stones. Refer to the Tree Officers response, that trees were being lost only to meet the needs of development. The effect was that conditions, the needs of the area and protection of trees had not been met and deliberately and systematically ignored.

LPC Decision: Object and refer this to the District Council Full Planning Committee

20/03184/S73

Linton Parish Council Comments : 2 September 2020

(These should be considered in conjunction with the application on the adjacent listed property S/0668/18/FL and S/0669/18/LB).

The submissions refer only to the mortar between the materials and that there should be re-use of materials.

Work has been done without meeting pre-commencement conditions, and materials are at the heart of recent planning appeals. This means bricks/flints/etc, not just mortar.

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

Already we see that the front wall has been reduced in height and the lowered wall has been built.

The materials are not in keeping with the original, being of a different colour and texture, not appropriate for the Outstanding Conservation Area. This is particularly obvious against the historic fabric, in an area of historic value.

In particular the coping stones are soft and without longevity (we already see some wear and flaking). The colour is the cream/yellow of Cambridge Commons, not the russet of the original stones.

The materials used in the porch also do not appear to be in keeping with the area, the OL or conditions.

No sign of tree protection. Many of the trees, which had been shown in the OL (of this and the renovations of the adjacent property) to be retained, have already been removed. The TPO Pear Tree was still there, but the Robinias and others have been removed. The site is now left very open

LPC Decision: Object and do not refer this to the District Council Full Planning Committee

Key considerations

Consideration of this application was deferred to a future meeting.

Decision

Deferred for consideration of processes around Section 73 applications.

S/1963/15/COND13 Land North and South of Bartlow Road, Linton - Discharge of Condition - Waste Management (MS)

Reason for call-in request

S/1963/15/COND13 – Abbey Developments Limited – Land to North and South of and Immediate, Linton, Cambridgeshire – Condition 13: Waste Management Plan. Decision Required.

These DoC's mainly appear to be re-submitted reports upon which LPC has already commented. The deficiencies identified in our comments dated 23 January 2020 have not been addressed. Most of the reports are also out of date as they predate the RM scheme of 2019. The data and calculations used for these conditions are therefore inaccurate, incomplete and misleading. This includes noise, flood risk, surface water drainage and foul water drainage, identified in more detail in the full response to DoCs sent separately.

The submissions include further development that was not approved in the OL and RM schemes and would conflict with those approvals and their conditions. The conditions are therefore not fit to be discharged.

LPC Comment: The requirements have not been complied with:

- The information provided is incomplete. The submission includes the Recap "toolkit" and drainage layouts, but not other elements of the condition.

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



- The assessment and design does not take into account the slopes of the site and the deficiencies of the highway design, including sightlines, turning spaces and steep access design that resulted in Highways refusing to adopt the roads within the development. As Highways are not prepared to accept the entrances, nor to adopt the roads, the access conditions are likely to be substandard and the condition cannot be fulfilled.
- The submissions describe the roads and road drainage as if they are to be adopted, which is misleading, and it is likely that the waste consultees are therefore unaware of the real conditions on this site.
- The submission is generalised and does not provide clarity about the site-specific design and deal with the constraints of on-site provision on this cramped development. There are localised conflicts when accessing properties and storage areas close to the existing mature hedging, which would increase the vulnerability of the Protected hedges.
- The vehicle tracking scheme appears to be the same scheme that was previously objected to by Highways as it does not comply with the required standards, and in some cases requires reversing which is inappropriate and disruptive to residents.
- It is unlikely that SCDC will agree to collecting waste bins from such a steeply sloping site, bearing in mind that Highways will not adopt a road with this gradient.
- It is essential that waste bins are kept within properties. This is a sensitive, valued landscape and bins are generally highly visible in the landscape.
- Some of the accesses are very restricted, such as those cramped next to the Protected hedge, and the scheme should be redesigned to make access to screened garden storage viable without jeopardising the existing landscape features.
- The submitted scheme would be harmful as it would not 'ensure that waste is managed sustainably during the occupation of the development in accordance with objectives of Policy CS28 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy DPD 2011'. The condition should therefore not be discharged.

LPC Decision: Object and do refer this to the District Council Full Planning Committee

Please refer to the complete response to condition, sent by e-mail to the Planning Officer

Key considerations

The comments of the Parish Council were noted, insofar as they relate to the waste management plan.

The case officer advised that the technical consultees, including the Council's waste service had not objected to the details provided and were aware of the gradient of the site and the proposed bin placements, It was therefore considered that due to the technical nature of the issue, this matter should be resolved under delegated authority with the advice of specialist officers.

The proposed discharge of condition was not considered to present significant issues for adopted policy, to be of a nature, scale or complexity or have a history that would indicate that the matter should be referred to the planning committee for decision.

Decision

Delegated decision. See above

S/1963/15/COND21 Land North and South of Bartlow Road, Linton - Discharge of Condition - Energy Statement (MS)

Reason for call-in request

S/1963/15/COND21 – Abbey Developments Limited – Land to North and South of and Immediate, Linton, Cambridgeshire – Condition 21: Energy Statement. Decision Required.

These DoC's mainly appear to be re-submitted reports upon which LPC has already commented. The deficiencies identified in our comments dated 23 January 2020 have not been addressed. Most of the reports are also out of date as they predate the RM scheme of 2019. The data and calculations used for these conditions are therefore inaccurate, incomplete and misleading. This includes noise, flood risk, surface water drainage and foul water drainage, identified in more detail in the full response to DoCs sent separately.

The submissions include further development that was not approved in the OL and RM schemes and would conflict with those approvals and their conditions. The conditions are therefore not fit to be discharged.

LPC Comment: The proposals within the energy statement are inconsistent:

- It is a site outside the development boundary and so it is only considered suitable in principle for sustainable design. This sustainability should be reflected in the proposed energy scheme.
- This submission aims at a 10% CO2 reduction, which is a very low target not compatible with the UK target of net zero emissions by 2050.
- This is the minimum reduction required by building regulations, and very poor compared to other developments in the area. It barely complies, does so on the basis of the cheapest solution and uses poor quality materials such as upvc windows and doors. This is not high-quality sustainable design and does not comply with the quality and energy aims of NPPF and South Cambridgeshire DC.
- The document is a standard one which does not relate to the specifics of this site. The local site is only included in appendices at the end, and there is no clarity over which houses would be those selected for the proposed pv cells.
- There are no pv panels shown on the elevations in the RM scheme. The schemes are inconsistent and therefore the energy proposals are not demonstrated to be deliverable.
- PV panels have an impact on the appearance of the proposed development, and any changes to provide consistency with these energy proposals should be consulted on. The submission does not comply with the condition as it does not ensure an energy efficient and sustainable development in accordance with

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

Policies NE/3 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007. It therefore should not be approved. As this energy statement is inconsistent with the RM scheme and does not provide sufficient clarity about where it would affect the appearance of the buildings, it is premature and undeliverable. The poor quality of the proposals should also be reconsidered in order to comply with the Local Plan energy and design policies.

LPC Decision: Object and do refer this to the District Council Full Planning Committee

Please refer to the complete response to condition, sent by e-mail to the Planning Officer

Key considerations

The comments of the Parish Council were noted, and whilst detailed technical comments have been provided, it was considered that due to the technical nature of the issue, this matter should be resolved under delegated authority with the advice of specialist officers.

The proposed discharge of condition was not considered to present significant issues for adopted policy, to be of a nature, scale or complexity or have a history that would indicate that the matter should be referred to the planning committee for decision.

Decision

Delegated decision. See above

S/2501/19/COND8 Land North and South of Bartlow Road, Linton - Discharge of Condition - Pump Station (MS)

Reason for call-in request

S/2501/19/COND8 – Abbey Developments Ltd – Land to the North and South of Bartlow Road, Linton CB21 4LY – Condition 8: Pumping Station. Decision Required.

These DoC's mainly appear to be re-submitted reports upon which LPC has already commented. The deficiencies identified in our comments dated 23 January 2020 have not been addressed. Most of the reports are also out of date as they predate the RM scheme of 2019. The data and calculations used for these conditions are therefore inaccurate, incomplete and misleading. This includes noise, flood risk, surface water drainage and foul water drainage, identified in more detail in the full response to DoCs sent separately.

The submissions include further development that was not approved in the OL and RM schemes and would conflict with those approvals and their conditions. The conditions are therefore not fit to be discharged.

LPC Comment: The condition requires:

- details of the pumping station

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

- The reason is 'To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the adopted Local Plan 2018'.
- The condition is not complied with as the details of the pumping station have not been provided.
- Instead of showing the pumping station, the drawings show an extensive brick enclosure (with a footprint larger than the nearest house) that replaces the fenced enclosure around the proposed pumping station shown on the RM layout.
- The brick enclosure and metal gates are not high-quality design, appropriate to their rural context.
- The drawings indicate that, apart from the pump structure, there are other kiosks and structures within the same enclosure, and again details are not provided. The June 2020 scheme shows the number of 'kiosks' has increased since the RM scheme.
- The details of levels and excavations of the pumping station have still not been provided.
- The proposed development abuts the boundary with a neighbour, and therefore is likely to affect their boundary and amenity. The proximity is not assessed and there are no details of noise and other likely environmental effects on this and other nearby residents.
- There are indications on the plans submitted with these conditions that there is a circular zone of potential noise from this pumping station that extends over a neighbouring garden. The reproductions of the plans are so poor that the annotation cannot be read, and the information is not provided within this submission. Further noise information, details and remediation is required in order to minimise disturbance of neighbours.
- Details of the maintenance and management of the pumping station are missing and should also be provided to ensure the appearance, when acceptable, is maintained during the life of the development.

There are additional inconsistencies and elements of harm, raising objection as follows:

- The connection of drainage to the pumping station is inconsistent. The D+A statement says the drainage is proposed to go to manhole 7501. It does not do this. Drawing E17-084-141 P7 The drawings show the sewer pipe heading uphill to the old village drain heading west from Bartlow Road. Connecting drainage onto the Victorian 6" main was specifically not approved due to the environmental damage likely to be caused to the village and Conservation Area. Manhole 7501, required to be the connection under Condition 11, is on the newer 375mm pipe is further away and requires landowner consent to access this. This is where the sewer pipe must lead - south west of the site.
- It is critical that the submission details demonstrate that the proposed pumping station protects the rural landscape and key riverside views.
- It is also critical that the details demonstrate protection of the integrity of the aquifer and water supply. The submission does not show the structure itself and the excavation into the ground, which is critical to assess likely impact.
- Being located within the previously flooded area, the scheme should also demonstrate it will not cause flooding and/or contamination elsewhere.
- The elevation drawings instead shows a brick boundary enclosure wall some 13 metres long by 9 metres by 1.8 metres high, with a weldmesh pair of gates. This replaces the fence in the RM scheme. It is larger than the footprint of a house and its additional bulk within the key river view would impact on the appearance of the site, and its solidity is likely to impact on the flood performance of the site. It is on

the site boundary so also likely to affect the amenity of neighbours and the retention and maintenance of the site boundary. The changes to the RM scheme therefore 'go to the heart of the permission' and have not been publicly consulted on.

- The brick enclosure and its metal gates has an industrial character at odds with its domestic and rural context, exacerbated by the use of cheap detailing such as concrete cappings.
- Inside this boundary wall is another structure, and no details are provided of this. This is likely to be the pumping station.
- Behind and next to that structure are two 'kiosks'. Again, there are no details provided of these structures.
- There are other structures described as slabs, but an attached drawing shows these slabs are actually parts of structures that are at least 1.8 metres high, so would also have a material impact on the appearance of the development.
- There is a new tarmac road which overlaps the access to the parking spaces for Plot 13. When the pumping station is in use, it is likely that the residents of Plot 13 will not be able to park. This change to the RM scheme is also not consulted on. The road is proposed in tarmac so will not be permeable, contrary to the flood calculations, and its appearance is poorly integrated with the finishes around it.
- The outer brick boundary wall is less than 1 metre away from the boundary with adjacent housing, so fails to provide sufficient space to retain and maintain the existing boundary/Protected hedge.
- There is insufficient space to maintain the wall, boundaries and hedging.
- The pumping station plan shows a drainage route which conflicts with the drainage condition which requires the connection to be in the new section of main (i.e. downhill of this site) See below.
- This pumping station is sited outside of the developable area, in the previously flooded area of the floodplain (Flood Zone 2)
- The developer asserted in the covering letter to s/2501/19/RM that consultees were content with the scheme, although Highways, Lead Local Flood Authority and others recommended refusal. Anglian Water objected to the proposed sewer connection. LPC was definitely not content. The consultees this time should be provided with full consistent details in order to make their decisions,
- As relevant consultees are not content, the foul water handling station would likely not be adopted, leaving its maintenance uncertain and likely to be a burden on the public purse.
- The scheme does not comply with the LPC specialist drainage report. The reason Anglia Water's objection to the wrong manhole being used for foul water, appears to have been dropped, was that the developer stated they will not now connect to Anglian Water's drainage at all. However, there is no deliverable alternative scheme provided and the drawings still show the drainage being directed towards the old Victorian 6" main, where it is likely to increase flooding of the village. That the drains terminate on the plans without any viable connection is of considerable concern.
- The planning application fails to provide any viable solution to the flooding and drainage issue, and instead leaves the development with a much higher risk of contamination and discharge of flood water into the Protected Chalk Stream and Cambridge Aquifer.
- The siting of the pumping station in a flood zone, into our drinking water aquifer and outside of the developable area, should be given due concern. This proposed design and failure to demonstrate a viable drainage scheme is of considerable



GREATER CAMBRIDGE
SHARED PLANNING

concern to the parish. The details of the proposed pumping station have not been provided and therefore the condition is not complied with.

In addition, the proposal includes new structures and roadway not publicly consulted on. The proposed route of the sewer pipe directly contravenes s/1963/15/OL condition 11. The submission and latest changes do not clarify the impact and viability of the pumping station and its drainage route, and are likely to result in harm to the appearance, landscape, the environment and amenity, contrary to HQ/1, CC/9 and NPPF 43 and 155 etc.

LPC Decision: Object and do this to the District Council Full Planning Committee

Please refer to the complete response to condition, sent by e-mail to the Planning Officer

Key considerations

This item was deferred to be considered at a future meeting along with other drainage conditions.

Decision

Deferred. See above