

Delegation meeting - Minutes

- **Date:** 29 September 2020
- **Time:** 11am to 12:30am
- **Meeting held:** via Teams
- **Attendees:** Chris Carter (CC), Cllr John Batchelor (JB), Cllr Pippa Heylings (PH), Alice Young (AY), David Norris (DN), Michael Sexton (MS)
- **Notes and actions:** Jemma Smith

Minutes approved by: Cllr John Batchelor (Consultant) on 30 September 2020, Chris Carter (Delivery Manager – Strategic Sites) on 30 September 2020

20/02488/FUL - Land To The East Of 43A To 53 High Street Landbeach - The change of use/conversion of a stable building to office use (B1a)

Reason for call-in request

Traffic on an already busy road. Car parking, cars already parked on High Street near a dangerous bend. Part of the Green Belt land. Noise unjustifiable Disturbance to livelihood of adjacent parishioners. They strongly recommend that this application goes to Planning Committee. One of the main objections should be the fact that to allow any additional planning on Green Belt land, the east side of an historical waterway would set a precedent for future development especially having turned down previous applications on paddock land that has the same land status as this application.

Key considerations

The comments of the Parish Council were noted. In particular the concerns regarding car parking, noise and impact on the Green Belt.

The case officer presented the proposal and noted that car parking was proposed to be provided on site and that there was no objection from the highways authority. With regard to noise, this was not considered to be a significant concerns as it could be managed by condition. Finally, it was noted that the proposed use of the building would comply with both local and national policy.

As such, whilst the Parish Council had raised material planning considerations, these were not considered to raise significant planning concerns. The proposal did not raise significant issues for adopted policy, was not of a nature, scale or complexity to warrant referral to the planning committee and did not have a planning history that suggested referral to committee either.

Decision

Delegated Decision. See above.



20/03248/HFUL - 9 Farmstead Close, Histon - Demolition of front porch, rear conservatory, and existing single storey side extension roof structure. Construction of front porch, rear single storey and first floor extension including internal and roof alterations.

Reason for call-in request

All agreed to make a recommendation of refusal, parking insufficient and contrary to both South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) Policies and Histon & Impington Neighbourhood Plan for a five-bedroom dwelling, materials out of keeping with streetscene. If SCDC are minded to approve, conditions covering deliveries and contractor parking requested noting proximity to cul-de-sac location

Key considerations

The comments of the Parish Council were noted.

The case officer presented the proposal and it was noted that there was no conflict with the Council's policy on car parking and that the use of materials could be controlled by condition. Having regard to this whilst the Parish Council had raised material planning considerations, these were not considered to raise significant planning concerns. The proposal did not raise significant issues for adopted policy, was not of a nature, scale or complexity to warrant referral to the planning committee and did not have a planning history that suggested referral to committee either.

Decision

Delegated Decision. See above.

**S/4252/19/FL Cherry Tree Field, Shepreth Road, Fowlmere SG8 6QU.
Conversion of cowsheds into a 3-bed home with internal annexe. (This is in lieu of a Class Q approval for 2 homes)**

Reason for call-in request

Fowlmere Parish Council Planning Committee discussed this new planning application at our meeting on 14 January.

We recognise that whilst prior approval was previously granted under S/2685/18/PA for a proposed permitted development scheme on this site, this application has now been made for larger planning permission as the proposed dwelling significantly exceeds the floorspace for a larger dwelling house permitted under Class Q.

As such, the reuse of the existing buildings is subject to Policy H/17 of the adopted Local Plan, which sets out the conditions for the “Reuse of Buildings in the Countryside for Residential Use”. This states that:

“The change of use and adaption of redundant or disused buildings in rural areas to residential use will only be permitted where:

- a. The buildings are unsuitable for employment use, or it being demonstrated through marketing the development opportunity for at least 12 months at a realistic price, that there is no demand for their development for employment use.
- b. The buildings are structurally sound, not makeshift in nature and are of permanent, substantial construction.
- c. There will be an enhancement to the immediate setting of the buildings.
- d. The form, bulk, design, landscaping and materials used in the change of use and adaption and any associated extensions are sensitive to the character and appearance of the building and locality.
- e. There is safe vehicular site access”

Fowlmere Parish Council therefore offer the benefit of their local knowledge to inform the assessment against these policy requirements.

With regards to point (a) we are not aware of any attempts to market the buildings on site for an alternative employment use for the required 12 months. We believe that the agricultural site was sold with scope for residential development under the approval notice that had been obtained for permitted development. To the best of our knowledge it has not been marketed as an employment development opportunity. If it is claimed that this has occurred, we would request that officers seek evidence of this to confirm that this requirement has been met.

Regarding point (b) we note that the buildings on site include open-sided framed barns, and do not believe that the current structure is likely to be capable of supporting the loads required for the two storey building proposed. In the absence of a structural engineering assessment we are unsure that the existing frames form the basis required for a conversion.

Regarding point (c) we note that the site is in the open countryside, which will be significantly altered by the change of use and development of these structures. Whilst relatively shielded from the road, the barns are visible from the higher ground on the public footpath between Fowlmere and Foxton and their conversion would change the nature of these open countryside views.

Regarding point (d) we note that the proposal includes significantly increasing the height of the current structures, increasing their bulk and creating a sizeable house which would not be sensitive to the open countryside nature of the locality.

We also note that the extent of the proposal to increase the height of the buildings suggests that this is in fact not a conversion of the existing barn structure, but rather a new build within the footprint of the current barns. If this is the case then Policy H/17 does not apply and the development should not be permitted outside of the village envelope.

Fowlmere PC therefore recommends refusal on the grounds that the application does not constitute the reuse of the existing buildings, and if it were to be judged to constitute a conversion then the tests required within Policy h/17 are not met.

If the planning officers are minded to approve this application, then Fowlmere Parish Council requests that it is called in to the SCDC Planning Committee for consideration.

Key considerations

The comments of the Parish Council were noted.

The case officer presented the proposal and explained the background and planning history. It was noted that a Prior Approval under Class Q had been granted on the site for two dwellings but that this proposal was for one dwelling. It was also noted that the proposal would, on its face, appear to conflict with local policy.

The comments of the Parish Council did raise material planning considerations which were considered to be of some concern. It was noted that the proposal could be considered to present significant issues for local policy and that the scheme featured some complexity in terms of the balance to be struck between adopted policy and a “fall back” position of the Class Q approval. This also bore relevance to the planning history of the site. As such, it was considered that the proposal should be presented to the planning committee for consideration.

Decision

Refer to planning committee. See above

S/3387/19/RM Land Rear Of Strawberry Farm, Pampisford Road, Great Abington, CB21 6AQ - Approval of matters reserved for appearance landscaping layout & scale following outline planning permission S/1433/16/OL for residential development comprising 8 dwellings including affordable housing provision landscaping and associated infrastructure

Reason for call-in request

Recommendation: The Parish Council recommend refusal of this planning application.
Comments: The Parish Council objected to the application on the basis that felt that it was inappropriate to have an access road between plots 2 & 3 to adjacent land that is outside of the village framework. 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.

Key considerations

The comments of the Parish Council were noted.

The case officer presented the proposal and explained the changes in the scheme since the previous refusal by the planning committee. It was noted that the sole objection from the Parish Council now related to an access track to an adjacent field. This was not considered to be a material issue of significant concern as the use of this track could be controlled by planning condition. However, it was noted that another scheme on this same site was recently refused planning permission by the committee and that, along with the outstanding concern of the Parish Council, this recent history suggested that this application would benefit from being referred back to the committee for decision.

Decision

Refer to Planning Committee. See above.

20/03221/FUL Land North Of Linton Road Great Abington Cambridgeshire - Increase of plots 3 and 8 garage roof pitch in order to convert roof space into habitable room with external side stairs access

Reason for call-in request

Recommendation: The Parish Council recommend REFUSAL of this planning application. Comments: The Parish Council objected to the application as the home offices have separate entrances so could be used as annexes because the floor area in the home offices is larger than that of the proposed flat. If the home offices were used as annexes this would increase the volume of traffic locally. Should permission be granted, the Council requests that robust conditions be put in place to compel households to seek planning permission if the home offices are to be used for any other purpose. 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.

Key considerations

The comments of the Parish Council were noted.

The case officer explained the minor change to the design of the garages on the scheme to offer flexibility for home working space in the roof space. Whilst the material concerns of the Parish Council with regard to the prospective use of the roof space as an annexe were noted, it was considered that this was not a significant issue that would warrant referral to the planning committee.



GREATER CAMBRIDGE
SHARED PLANNING

The proposal did not raise significant issues for adopted policy, was not of a nature, scale or complexity to warrant referral to the planning committee and did not have a planning history that suggested referral to committee either

Decision

Delegated decision. See above.