

## Delegation meeting - Minutes

- **Date:** 22 September 2020
- **Time:** 10:30am – 11:30am
- **Meeting held:** via Teams
- **Attendees:** Chris Carter (CC), Cllr John Batchelor (JB), Julie Ayre (JA), Richard Fitzjohn (RF), Tom Gray (TG), Rebecca Claydon (RC)
- **Notes and actions:** Jemma Smith

**Minutes approved by:** Cllr John Batchelor (Consultant) on 23 September 2020, Chris Carter (Delivery Manager – Strategic Sites) on 23 September 2020

### 20/01964/HFUL 75 High Street Bassingbourn Cum Kneesworth - Two storey side extension (RF)

#### Reason for call-in request

Council wishes to object to this application for the following reasons: -

Overshadowing/loss of outlook of neighbouring property no.79 High Street due to the very close proximity of the proposed development.

Effect on listed buildings and conservation area notably the Bassingbourn Gas House (CHER MCB 16558 and the Smithy chimney (CHER MCB 16559) which are opposite the site, nearby listed buildings 65 High Street (UID 1128311), 81 High Street (UDI 1128312) and 83 High Street (UDI 1309291) and also the village green.

In the event that approval is being considered, the Parish Council would wish this application to go to Committee

#### Key considerations

The comments of the Parish Council were noted. The case officer advised the meeting on the location of the proposed extension in relation to nearby listed buildings and the village green, as well as the relationship with neighbouring properties. It was noted that the proposed extension would be largely screened from nearby listed buildings and the village green by other buildings. It was also noted that the neighbouring properties either didn't have any windows facing the proposed extension, or those that were there were already obscure glazed.

Turning to the four criteria it was considered that the proposal did not raise significant implications for adopted policy, was not of a nature scale or complexity or supported by a planning history that would require the application to be referred to the planning committee for a decision. It was agreed that the Parish Council had raised material planning considerations, but having regard to the discussion above, it was not considered that these raised significant planning concerns which would warrant a committee referral.

## Decision

Delegated Decision. See above

## 20/02128/HFUL 9 Halatte Gardens, Great Shelford - Part single, part two storey rear extension and associated works (TG)

### Reason for call-in request

We cannot support this proposal. The extension almost doubles the footprint of the property and overdevelops the site. The setting of the property is within a small and well architected site where there are some constraints to ensure the style is consistent whilst having unique properties. The proposed structure does not conform to the site constraints in window style and property style. The proposed extension makes the property out of proportion to its neighbours and overpowers their properties whilst removing light to their properties. The proposal is adjacent to the War Memorial and again impacts on the environment. This is a conservation area and the proposal will dramatically affect both the neighbours and the street scene. We request that you refuse this proposal.

We are very concerned that the Conservation Officer (Sue Smith) has deemed this proposal to 'preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area and to further enable it to assimilate into the street scene'. We cannot see how such a large two storey extension that overpowers the neighbouring properties can be acceptable in this situ. When Halatte Gardens was proposed great care was taken to ensure that the properties were appropriately spaced and diverse to make this development a very appealing place to live. This extension is disproportionate to its site and blights the neighbours' properties. Can we ask, as a Parish Council (PC), that this is called in to Committee to allow thorough transparency on your decision.

Comments on amended plans: Note was taken of the comments given at the public section of the meeting, correspondence received with respect to this application, previous comments made by South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) and the various report documents on the portal. The PC noted the reduction in ridge height but still felt that the proposal is overbearing and does not protect the aesthetics of the development in general. When Halatte Gardens was first proposed there were a lot of conditions imposed, including from 2 village meetings, such that there should be a cohesion within the whole development. We do not feel that allowing this extension would maintain the principles of such conditions. We were made aware that the new side wall will apparently constitute the boundary fence with the existing fence being removed. This makes the extension even more obtrusive to the neighbour. We are also concerned about whether there is a party wall agreement as this will obviously be needed as this is a 2-storey extension and is only around 1m from the neighbouring property. We also notice that the tree officer has required more information on 29 July 2020. In view of the fact that this is a GSPC Conservation Area we strongly recommend that this application is refused. We also ask that, if SCDC are minded to approve this application then we ask for it to be brought before Committee.

## Key considerations

The comments of the Parish Council were noted, including those in relation to the amended plans. The case officer advised the meeting on the context of the proposed extensions and the relationship with the conservation area and neighbouring properties.

It was noted that the application had drawn both strong comments from the Parish Council and some conflicting representations from third parties, both for and against the proposal. As well as this, the planning history of the site was considered relevant having regard to the attention that was paid to the original application and its context within the conservation area.

It was not considered that the proposal raised significant issues for adopted policy, or that it was of a nature, scale or complexity that would automatically warrant referral to the planning committee. However, the Parish Council had raised material planning considerations and the representations received from others indicated that these concerns were significant. This combined with the planning history of the site was considered sufficient to justify committee referral on this basis.

## Decision

Refer to Planning Committee. See above

## **20/02450/FUL Barnsbury House, Coxs Drove, Fulbourn, CB21 5HE - Change of use and conversion from C4 use to large House in Multiple Occupation (RC)**

### Reason for call-in request

Parish objection as follows -

Fulbourn Parish Council objects to this application for the following reasons:

1. A House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) with a potential of 16 residents was not the intended use for this particular house. Cross reference planning application S/2456/14/FL, point 3.
2. The property and surrounding locale cannot accommodate the potential extra car parking required and additional traffic flow. The property is situated at the end of a single-track lane.
3. Additional noise pollution.

## Key considerations

The comments of the Parish Council were noted. The case officer updated the group on the application as well as the planning history.

It was considered that the comments of the Parish Council did raise material planning concerns and that this, combined with the representations of the local district councillors did indicate that there may be significant planning concerns locally. As well as this, there is a detailed planning history for the site. Whilst the proposal was not considered to raise

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



**GREATER CAMBRIDGE**  
SHARED PLANNING

significant implications for adopted policy, it was noted to be of interest. The nature scale and complexity of the proposal was not considered determinative in this decision.

Having regard to all of this it was considered that there is sufficient justification to refer this application to planning committee for decision.

## **Decision**

Refer to Planning Committee. See above