

Delegation meeting - Minutes

- **Date:** 13 October 2020
- **Time:** 11am to 12:30pm
- **Meeting held:** via Teams
- **Attendees:** Chris Carter (CC), Cllr John Batchelor (JB), Karen Pell-Coggins (KPC), Dean Scrivener (DS)
- **Notes and actions:** Jemma Smith

Minutes approved by: Cllr John Batchelor (Chair of Planning Committee – Consultee) on 19 October 2020, Chris Carter (Delivery Manager – Strategic Sites) on 19 October 2020

20/03170/HFUL 5 Chalky Road, Great Abington - Workshop/Store (KPC)

Reason for call-in request

Recommendation: The Parish Council recommend refusal of this planning application.
Comments: The Parish Council objected to the application because the material to be used for the structure (black timber) is not typical of the local buildings and not in character with the local area. The Council would prefer the materials used to reflect the local area. The Council asks that a plan be made available to show how the proposed structure would be located on the newly reduced site of 5 Chalky Road, since part of the land has been sold off to build 5A Chalky Road. The Council recommends refusal as it does not have access to an accurate plan of the site showing the red line between the two plots and where the workshop would be located. The Parish Council does request that the application be referred to the District Council Planning Committee. The Chairman or Vice Chairman will attend the meeting to represent the Parish Council. If the Planning Officer is minded to refuse the application, the Council does not wish the application to be considered by the Planning Committee. **Comment about website:** Is SCDC Planning Dept. aware that planning documents seem to disappear from the website or are unavailable, which is unhelpful for Parish Councils trying to view full application.

Key considerations

The comments of the Parish Council were noted.

The case officer explained the planning history of the site and how this relates to the proposal for this outbuilding. It was agreed that the comments of the Parish Council did raise material planning considerations (materials and access) but that in the context of the proposal, these were not considered to be significant concerns which would warrant referral to the planning committee.

The proposal was not considered to raise significant issues for adopted policy, and neither the planning history, nor the nature, scale or complexity of the proposal was considered sufficient for committee referral.

Decision

Delegated decision. See above.

20/02234/REM 13 Ellis Close, Cottenham - Approval of matters reserved for access, appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale following outline planning permission S/0582/18/OL for two dwellings (Re-submission of S/4384/19/RM) (DS)

Reason for call-in request

Recommendation: The Parish Council object to the application on the following grounds. Comments: Flash floods are a concern and there have been recent flash floods on Ellis Close. A further 2 dwellings will cause further issues. Concerns also that the newly elongated window on dwelling B will overlook 15 Ellis Close. Previous objections still stand: Proximity to other buildings would seem to be closer than 25m to no.1 Cossington Close. Query regarding the 5m width as required under condition 5 of the outline permission - doesn't appear to comply. Inadequate parking provided for no.13 Ellis Close. Access is very close to no.11 Ellis Close, therefore impacting on residential amenity. Contrary to Neighbourhood Plan policy COH/1-5 c (be responsible to village characteristics, in particular plot widths and proportions, building lines and positions within plots, roof lines, height, scale, massing, boundary treatments and attention to detailing) and f (the sensitive relationship between the buildings themselves and the associated car parking provision). Contrary to Local Plan policy H/16 bii (Any direct and on-going impacts on the residential amenity of nearby properties), biii (The proposed siting, design, scale, and materials of construction of the buildings), biv (The existence of or ability to create a safe vehicular access), and bv (The provision of adequate on-site parking or the existence of safe, convenient and adequate existing on-street parking). CPC recommends refusal and recommends the scheme to be presented at Planning Committee.

Key considerations

The comments of the Parish Council were noted.

The case officer explained the history of the site and some of the details of the outline planning permission, in particular that drainage details were reserved by condition as part of the outline permission.

It was considered that the issues raised by the Parish Council (potential overlooking of neighbours, car parking, design) are all material planning considerations, as is the Cottenham Neighbourhood Plan, which is afforded significant weight in decision making. However, having regard to the size of the scheme it was not considered that these considerations were of such significance that they could not be considered by officers.

The proposal was not considered to raise significant issues for adopted policy, and neither the planning history, nor the nature, scale or complexity of the proposal was considered sufficient for committee referral.

Decision

Delegated decision. See above.