

Delegation meeting - Minutes

- **Date:** 27 April 2021
- **Time:** 11am to 12:30pm
- **Meeting held:** via Teams
- **Attendees:** Chris Carter (CC), Cllr Henry Batchelor (HB), Alice Young (AY), Rebecca Claydon (RC), Andy White (AW)
- **Notes and actions:** Jemma Smith

Minutes approved by: Cllr Henry Batchelor (Vice Chair of Planning Committee – Consultee) on 30 April 2021, Chris Carter (Delivery Manager – Strategic Sites) on 30 April 2021

20/03245/CLUED – Alwyn Tourist Park, Willingham - Certificate of lawful development for an existing use of land as a single residential mobile home pitch for two caravans and ancillary domestic buildings (RC)

Reason for call-in request

Parish objection:

- Concerns about principle of having additional travellers pitches within the parish - Site has been hidden from view
- Consistent refusals for previous applications for mobile home sites, none of which make reference to the caravans which are subject of this application and they are not shown on these plans

Key considerations

The comments of the Parish Council were noted by the group, and the case officer gave a short explanation of the application.

It was noted that the Parish Council had raised a material planning consideration in terms of the planning history of the site. However, having regard to the nature of the proposal, as an application for a certificate of lawfulness, it was considered that this was not of such significant concern that it should be referred to the planning committee.

The proposal was not considered to have significant implications for adopted policy, given that it is a matter of lawfulness rather than policy compliance, nor was it of a nature, scale or complexity such that it should be referred to the committee for a decision.

Decision

Delegated decision. See above.

20/04688/FUL – 40 pierce lane, Fulbourn – demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 2no. replacement dwellings (resubmission of planning application 20/03314/FUL) (RC)

Reason for call-in request

Parish Objection: Concerns in respect of the boundary with 38 Pierce Lane – the garage will dominate the rear of 38 Pierce Lane as it appears to be in very close proximity and the height has not been indicated on the drawings (no measurements shown). Previous planning applications for tree removal have been granted on the basis of letting more light into the existing property which has totally changed the character of the conservation area. The drop-down kerb is not sufficient for 2 houses – only for pedestrian purposes at present. Concerns regarding contractors traffic on the narrowest part of Pierce Lane which is also a bus route. The nature of the size of the houses does not potentially provide affordable houses in the village. Recommendation objects. This is confirming Fulbourn Parish Council would like to refer Planning Application 20/04688/FUL to the Planning Committee.

Key considerations

The comments of the Parish Council were noted and the case officer provided an explanation of the application.

It was considered that the Parish Council did raise a material planning consideration in terms of amenity impacts on neighbours. The point regarding a previous tree decision was not considered to be of relevance to this matter. Given the small scale of the proposal, it was considered that the impact on the amenity of neighbours was not a significant planning concern, such that would justify referral to the planning committee for decision. The issue of contractors traffic was considered to be one which could be dealt with by planning condition, were the application to be approved.

The proposal was not considered to have significant implications for adopted policy, given the location within the settlement boundary, nor was it of a nature, scale or complexity, or with a planning history, such that it should be referred to the committee for a decision.

Finally, whilst some objections had been received to the proposal, these were not considered to be of a quantity which would justify a committee referral in the wider public interest.

Decision

Delegated decision. See above.

20/03899/HFUL 24 Stevensons Road, Longstanton - Proposed first floor extension over existing garage area, proposed two storey front extension with single storey entrance porch. (AW)

Reason for call-in request

Call in by Cllr Cheung Johnson - We would recommend this application for objection based on the following concerns:

- loss of light for neighbouring properties due to the proposed extension at the front and overshadowing into neighbouring gardens.
- Potential overlooking with the second-floor extension overlooking into neighbouring gardens and loss of privacy

Parish Objection

Having considered this application at their meeting on Monday 8th March 2021, Longstanton Parish Council have recommended this application for refusal. Cllrs remain opposed to the planning application due to the concerns raised previously including overlooking/loss of privacy with the extension over the garage looking into the neighbour's garden.

Loss of light experienced to the front of the neighbour's property with front extension extending past the front of the neighbour's dwelling and the effect this proposed development would have on the area in that it is not in keeping with the rest of the street scene. This includes the materials not being consistent with the remainder of the development, the building is not in character with the rest of the street scene and would be a negative impact on the neighbours immediate view with this property becoming too big for how it was designed with it being subservient to the rest of the terrace. It was also requested that should officers look to recommend this application for approval that the application be taken to planning committee and Cllr Burns will attend on the Councils behalf.

Key considerations

The comments of the ward councillor and the parish council were considered by the group. The case officer gave an explanation of the proposals, as well as updating on representations received.

It was noted that both the ward councillor and the parish council had raised a number of material planning considerations related to design, appearance and residential amenity. However, it was considered that these did not raise significant planning concerns, having regard to the nature of the application as a householder proposal, such that would warrant referral to the planning committee.

Further, the proposal was not considered to raise significant implications for adopted policy, nor to be of a nature, scale or complexity to justify referral to the committee. Finally, the planning history of the site was not considered to be determinative.

Decision

Delegated decision. See above.

21/00339/FUL Histon Sweet Spreads - Installation of a combined heat and power plant, flue stack, transformer, pipework, ancillary infrastructure and equipment | Histon Sweet Spreads Ltd Chivers Way Histon Cambridge CB24 9NR (AY)

Reason for call-in request

Parish objects and refers to Committee. Main issues raised by Parish: airflow issues, pollution and noise and disturbance.

Key considerations

The concerns of the Parish Council were noted by the group. The case officer updated on the application, including the technical consultee responses which had been received.

The issues raised by the Parish Council were material planning considerations concerned with environmental health matters. However, having regard to the consultee evidence, it was considered that these were not of such significance as to warrant referral of the application to the planning committee.

The proposal did not raise significant issues for adopted policy, nor was it considered to be of a nature, scale or complexity to justify committee referral. The planning history of the site was relevant, but did not contain anything to suggest that the application should be determined by the planning committee.

The representations from neighbours were noted but, again having regard to the technical nature of the concerns of the parish, were not found to justify a committee decision.

Decision

Delegated decision. See above.