

Delegation meeting - Minutes

- **Date:** 20 April 2021
- **Time:** 11am to 12:30pm
- **Meeting held:** via Teams
- **Attendees:** Chris Carter (CC), Cllr Pippa Heylings (PH), Cllr Henry Batchelor (HB), Charlotte Peet (CP) Michael Sexton (MS)
- **Notes and actions:** Jemma Smith

Minutes approved by: Cllr Pippa Heylings (Chair of Planning Committee – Consultee) on 26 April 2021, Chris Carter (Delivery Manager – Strategic Sites) on 26 April 2021

20/05214/FUL - 9 Back Lane, Barrington - Revised boundary of new dwellinghouse (CP)

Reason for call-in request

The Parish Council have called in the application for the following reasons:

The proposed boundary changes will have a detrimental and unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of Barrington Conservation Area (CA), and particularly upon the setting of the grade II listed building. There is no public benefit to this change. Loss of trees/ hedging would have a detrimental impact upon views from the footpath and the Conservation Area.

Key considerations

The case officer presented the application to the group and the group noted the comments of the Parish Council. It was further noted that the proposal related to a change of boundary position only and that issues regarding the felling of trees and removal of vegetation relate to details submitted as part of a previous planning application for the site.

It was considered that the Parish Council had raised material planning concerns in respect of impact on the conservation area and setting of listed buildings. However, in the context of the proposal itself, these were not considered to be of such significance that the application should be referred to planning committee and could be dealt with through delegated authority by planning officer.

The proposal did not raise significant issues for planning policy, was not of a nature, scale or complexity, or with a planning history which would justify referral to the planning committee.

Decision

Delegated decision. See above.

20/04341/FUL Meadow Farm, Sawston Road, Stapleford - Construction of conservation pond and associated earthworks (MS)

Reason for call-in request

As far as we can understand the applicant wishes to raise the land north of the river in order to submit (at some future time) an application to extend Aylsford Way with more housing. He can raise the land level by creating the conservation pond and back filling the flood plain to allow a future site for building once the land has settled. This will completely change the flow of the river which already floods regularly, and we are very concerned that this will impact the flood plain in the future. From the google earth picture it would seem that the river would actually divert into the pond! You have asked for planning objections, but we do not have the expertise for this. We would ask that a major flood assessment is required in order to understand the implications of this application and that it is called in to Committee for decision based on the findings of this report.

Key considerations

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

The group considered that the Parish Council had raised a material planning concern and technical issues in respect of flood risk. It was noted that comments raising no objection had been received from the LLFA, Environment Agency and Anglian Water, and that a detailed Flood Risk Assessment had been submitted. Therefore, the issues raised were not considered to be of such significance that the application should be referred to planning committee.

It was considered that the Parish Council had raised a material planning concern in respect of flood risk. However, this was not considered to be of such significance that the application should be referred to planning committee.

The proposal did not raise significant issues with, or conflict for, for planning policy, was not of a nature, scale or complexity, or with a planning history which would justify referral to the planning committee.

The suggestion of this application being a precursor to additional residential development was not material to the decision made.

Decision

Delegated decision. See above.