

Delegation meeting - Minutes

- **Date:** 26 January 2021
- **Time:** 11:00 – 12:30
- **Meeting held:** via Teams
- **Attendees:** Chris Carter (CC), Cllr John Batchelor (JB), Karen Pell-Coggins (KPC), Julie Ayre (JA)
- **Notes and actions:** Jemma Smith

Minutes approved by: Cllr John Batchelor (Chair of Planning Committee – Consultee) on 28 January 2021, Chris Carter (Delivery Manager – Strategic Sites) on 28 January 2021

20/04788/HFUL 22 Mingle Lane, Great Shelford - Twostorey rear extension (KPC)

Reason for call-in request

We object to this application with several reasons.

1. The proposal is to build a two-storey detached property to the rear of the existing house with its own front door access, linked by a covered walkway to the existing property. This is too imposing for the site, affects the rights of the neighbour and opens up the possibility of letting or resale of the new property.
2. We understand that they have been asked to include a lift so that elderly parents can access the upper floor. If this is the purpose for the extension, why do they need a two-storey extension or why not build a bungalow at the bottom of the garden?
3. Whilst we are sympathetic of people wishing to provide for elderly relatives, this cannot be a planning statement. The extension is not appropriate, detached and too large in that position on the site and we recommend refusal.

Additional comments from Cllr Peter Fane:

I think that this application raises issues of principle which merit its consideration by committee.

The first is that this is not in fact an extension but a separate two-storey house (although I gather a lift is now to be installed to justify it being treated as a 'granny annexe') or extension.

The second is how this can be treated as compatible with policy H13 a, b or possibly d. See extract below:

Policy H/13: Extensions to Dwellings in the Countryside

Extensions to dwellings outside the village framework boundaries shown on the Policies Map will be permitted where:

- a. The development would not create a separate dwelling or be capable of separation from the existing dwelling;
- b. The extension is in scale and character with the existing dwelling and would not materially change its impact on its surroundings;

d. If in the Green Belt that the extension would not result in a disproportionate addition to the original dwelling;

- a) the proposed 'extension' is separate from the house and so substantial that it is capable of separation from the existing dwelling;
- b) the proposed building, being substantial and two storey, does materially change the impact of the building as a whole on its surroundings and on the neighbouring properties;
- d) since the house would seem to me to be on the edge of the green belt (it is on the South side of Mingle Lane), it may be that policy H13 (d) does not apply. The [green belt map](#) was not quite clear to me on this.

I think there is a strong case for reserving this application to committee as requested by Stapleford parish council.

Key considerations

The case officer presented the proposal to the group and the group reviewed the comments of the Parish Council and ward member Councillor Fane. The group was reminded that the purpose of the meeting was not to determine the merits of the application, but solely whether there was good reason to refer the application to the planning committee for decision.

Firstly, the group noted that the application site is located within the settlement boundary and not in the countryside/Green Belt and therefore the majority of the comments of Councillor Fane were not of material relevance in this case. It was further noted that the proposal is for a two-storey extension to the existing house and not for the creation of a separate dwelling. The creation of separate dwelling would, at any point, require planning permission in its own right.

With regard to the comments of the Parish Council, it was considered that only the third point raised a material planning consideration, that being the view that the proposal was too large. It was considered that whilst this is a material consideration, it was not of such significance in the context of this proposal, that would warrant the referral of the application to the planning committee. That comments from concerned neighbours and nearby residents had been received was noted at this point.

Given the location of the proposal, within the settlement boundary, and the domestic nature of the proposed extension, no significant implications for adopted policy were found to exist.

In terms of the nature, scale and complexity of the proposal, the proposed use as an annexe was noted, but this kind of proposal is not unusual in the district and again was not found to warrant referral to planning committee for decision.

Finally, nothing was identified in the planning history of the site to indicate that the application should be presented to the planning committee.

Decision

Delegated decision. See above.