

Delegation meeting - Minutes

- **Date:** 23 February 2021
- **Time:** 11am to 12:30pm
- **Meeting held:** via Teams
- **Attendees:** Chris Carter (CC), Cllr John Batchelor (JB), Aaron Coe (AC), Charlotte Spencer (CS), Paul Hunt (PH)
- **Notes and actions:** Jemma Smith

Minutes approved by: Cllr John Batchelor (Chair of Planning Committee – Consultee) on 26 February 2021, Chris Carter (Delivery Manager – Strategic Sites) on 26 February 2021

20/03151/REM - Land South of Thompsons Meadow Guilden Morden - Reserved matters for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the proposed development of up to 16 dwellings (8 market and 8 affordable) following outline consent S/3077/16/OL (AC)

Reason for call-in request

Comment Reasons: The Parish Council objects to the application on the following grounds:

- 1) The Parish Council objects on the grounds of traffic and safety. It is concerned about the congestion which will occur at the exit onto Thompson's Meadow and at the junction of Thompson's Meadow with Trap Road. Problems will be caused by the increase in traffic onto Trap Road, adding to the traffic from the development across the road. This will be particularly bad and hazardous during morning and evening peak times and when the weekly refuse collection takes place. There should be a separate entrance or exit from the site onto Trap Road.
- 2) The Parish Council remains concerned about the future use of the paddock land. A condition should be placed to ensure that this is public open space in perpetuity.
- 3) The Council is also concerned about the safety of the pond. The pond should be fenced and lifesaving equipment provided.

Key considerations

The case officer presented the application to the group and updated as to the number of public representations (4) which had been received.

It was noted that the site had the benefit of an extant outline planning permission and that the position of the access had been fixed at the outline stage.

The comments of the Parish Council were considered by the group. It was noted that the Parish had raised material planning consideration in respect of the access, open space and safety around the drainage ponds. However, given that the access arrangements were already fixed, that planning permission would be required for any future development on the additional open space and that the fencing of the ponds could be controlled by condition, it was not considered that any of these points were so significant as to warrant referral to the planning committee.

It was noted that the site is located outside the settlement boundary and was granted permission at a time when the council was unable to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable sites. Notwithstanding, the proposal was not considered to raise significant issues for adopted policy.

Consideration was given to the nature, scale and complexity of the proposed development and it was considered that, in the context of Guilden Morden, this proposal is of a nature and scale which would justify referral to the committee.

Finally, the planning history of the site was not determinative in the decision.

Decision

Refer to planning committee. See above

20/05317/HFUL 32 Home Close, Histon - Single storey side and rear extension and outbuilding (CS)

Reason for call-in request

Insulation and smooth render to existing walls. Members inspected plans, noting blockage of at least 1 window to neighbouring property, overshadowing to neighbouring property, inadequate parking and overdevelopment of the site. All agreed to make recommendation of refusal. Members wish this application to go to committee.

Key considerations

The case officer presented the application to the group and the comments of the Parish Council were noted.

The comments of the Parish Council were found to raise relevant material planning considerations, principally around impact on neighbours, parking and overdevelopment. The group noted that this would be a particularly large single storey extension, as well as an outbuilding being constructed. However, the issues raised by the Parish Council were not considered to be significant planning concerns which would require referral to the planning committee. The reason for this was the

domestic scale of the proposal and the limited number of neighbouring properties concerned. It was considered that officers could assess the issues raised in this case.

The proposal does not raise any significant implications for adopted policy, was not found to be of a nature, scale or complexity, or to have a planning history, such that would warrant a committee referral.

Decision

Delegated decision. See above.

20/05197/HFUL 2 Chapmans Close, Melbourn - New porch at the front of house. Rear single-storey infill extension. Replacement garage with new first floor extension (Re-submission of 20/03602/HFUL) (PH)

Note - Previous application 20/03602/HFUL was refused against policy HQ/1: the scheme showed a token difference between the height of the proposed side extension and host dwelling that was insufficient to provide subservience. In addition, the proposed porch design was pitch-roofed, bulky and incongruous. The scheme was amended via a free pre-app in December 2020 and the submitted design was accepted by Team delegation pre-application.

Reason for call-in request

The Parish Council objects on grounds that the first-floor extension over the garage would constitute over development. The parish Council has no objection to the rear extension and front porch

Key considerations

The case officer presented the application to the group and the comments of the Parish Council were noted, in particular their objection to the proposed first floor extension only. The group also noted that a similar scheme had been refused under delegated authority in the recent past.

The Parish Council did raise a material planning consideration, overdevelopment, but having regard to the domestic scale of the proposal, the previous delegated decision, and the localised effects of the proposal, this was not considered to be an issue of such significance that it should be referred to the planning committee.

The proposal does not raise any significant implications for adopted policy, was not found to be of a nature, scale or complexity, or to have a planning history, such that would warrant a committee referral.



Decision

Delegated decision. See above.