

## Delegation meeting - Minutes

- **Date:** 25 May 2021
- **Time:** 11am to 12:30pm
- **Meeting held:** via Teams
- **Attendees:** Chris Carter (CC), Cllr Pippa Heylings (PH), Cllr Henry Batchelor (HB), Julie Ayre (JA), Michael Sexton (MS)
- **Notes and actions:** Jemma Smith

**Minutes approved by:** Cllr Pippa Heylings (Chair of Planning Committee – Consultee) on 27 May 2021, Chris Carter (Delivery Manager – Strategic Sites) on 27 May 2021

### **S/1963/15/CONDF Bartlow Road, Linton - Submission of details required by condition 5 (Hard and Soft Landscaping) of planning permission S/1963/15/OL (MS)**

#### **Reason for call-in request**

Linton Parish Council Comments: The responses to the submissions and amendments are not repeats but do raise the same issues which have not been addressed by the developer. We note that many documents are barely changed, and which would, of course, result in similar comments and objections. We note in the response to the Landscape officer that comments have the response that these are "a new criticism, raised by the landscape officer". However most have already been raised by Linton Parish Council (for example the use of Ash trees in planting schemes) several times. This confirms that the developer is paying little attention to our real and substantiated objections. The many objections raised should have been addressed; as a result we have been inundated, with amendments that could have been dealt with at an earlier stage and with less burden to statutory consultees.

There might have been a response to LPC comments as part of the appeal submission, but these are part of a separate issue and have not been submitted to the planning portal, nor has LPC been informed that such a response exists. It would

The Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service is a strategic partnership between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council

appear that the developer has sent responses to the wrong group, denying consultees, such as Linton Parish Council, the chance to respond. Planning process has not been followed as complete consultation has not been possible. Developers have an unfair advantage in being allowed to submit many amendments without proper consultations. This is the first response to our comments that we have seen; the developer is wrong in asserting that LPC comments are not up to date - comments refer to what was submitted to us at the time and remain relevant. The deadlines for submission of comments are as advised by SCDC; comments have been submitted by the deadline advised and in accord with the timing of LPC meetings where these were discussed. Any extensions were agreed with the developer and have not been exceeded. The objections and comments of LPC have not been addressed and stand. The effect of this development on the landscape was why a remarkably similar applications was dismissed at appeal. The terraces are still very visible across landscape Previous comments on this condition still stand including the terraces, the effect on adjacent houses (especially on western boundary where the terrace is shown as going right to edge of property, with no retaining wall, position of bike sheds within hedging, etc) We see that this another application which is at appeal, without LPC being able to comment on their submissions; we await their decision.

Additional Comments from Linton Parish Councils (LPC) Planning Consultant under instruction from LPC:

- The comments in previous LPC responses have not been dealt with:
- Hard landscaping is still not provided. The plans show this is likely to be intrusive and therefore cannot be signed off.
- The built-up platforms, staircases and railings previously objected to have returned.
- As a result, there is less ground able to drain and the surface water drainage calculations in Condition 10 are not representative.
- The plans are inconsistent with the approved Reserved Matters drawings and the plans used for other conditions (eg. Condition 17 plan). The landscaping of the two site plans provided for this condition are inconsistent with one another. Drawing 1552102 O appears be a flat site. The plans omit the 6M and 30M bufferzones

The Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service is a strategic partnership between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council

required under OL and under condition 18, and would impact on the landscape and ecologically sensitive areas, including the valley landscape, voles and Protected chalk stream..

- The buildings are nearly 200 ft<sup>3</sup> larger than the approved RM scheme. The RM scheme does not have a similar extent of retaining walls, built-up terraces and overlooking of the lower properties including the existing 78 Bartlow Road. The reintroduced elements include built-up terraces prominently stepping up along the views from the A1307. These elements were all omitted from the RM scheme because they were not supported by consultees, so their reintroduction in the DoC is not appropriate.
- A significant number of trees have been omitted, including trees in key visual buffer locations, such as the roadside, eastern and western boundaries of the Northern Site, and screening from the river views.
- The built-up terraces are proposed to be surrounded and supported by vertical Unilog retaining structures backfilled with concrete, which are not in accordance with the soft undulating profile of the land and the character of the locality, and would be highly visible in the Granta valley. They are topped with metal railings and only have a life expectancy of 25/30 years. This is not high quality design. • A document is included describing materials, which is predominately another condition. They are generally poor quality non-local materials such as cheap concrete and poorly matched lbstock wirecut bricks.
- The green rectangle in a neighbour's garden and green roadside depiction are still not clarified and explained in the key. The roadside green is likely to indicate the proposal is to lose the entire important mature roadside hedge and it is unclear whether any work in the neighbour's garden is lawful as it is not covered by the latest S106.
- The tree survey plan is submitted with a plan showing the development of the entire extent of both fields. This proposal was rejected back in 2015 and it is not compatible with the OL and RM approvals.
- The native hedging is still given insufficient thickness to thrive and to grow into a traditional hedge. The design does not provide the simple native local character of the area and the

The Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service is a strategic partnership between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council

- The tree buffers are not realistic buffers, and in places are only one tree wide. As a result, the buffers are not in accordance with the approved OL and RM plans, and the development would be substantially more prominent in the landscape than approved.
- The treatment of the frontage of the Northern Site is not compatible with the Drainage Plan.
- Sheet 4 shows a swale outside the developable area, and not in accordance with the OL and RM approved plans.
- The planting on sheet 4 is within the area where evidence shows flooding occurs, and the location and types of plants are inconsistent with the Ecology scheme. It will not provide the continuous defensive planting to preserve the protected species that is required and the plant species proposed are not suited to flooded areas. Refer to previous LPC responses for detailed examples of inappropriate planting being proposed.
- The plan does not acknowledge the recent destruction of trees on the riverbank and does not clarify how the damage is to be mitigated. It does not clarify the effect of proposed mounds and ditches on the river conditions and flood risk. The loss of trees and re-profiling of the riverbank is likely to have a detrimental effect on the flood plain and LPC/EAs natural flood protection scheme for the village. The raised banks are likely to trap floodwater on the site and this and the potential swale are likely to cause river surge in times of flood.
- It also not clarify the proposals for the spoil heap mounds.
- It does not clarify what the *link to adjacent development* would involve (Sheet 4 Soft Landscaping note). As drawn it provides no linkage to the village centre (see UD objection).
- The need for hedge removal would be to create access to the site. RM approval for the means of access was not applied for by 1 September 2019. The RM approval cannot be implemented without the OL permission, so it too has lapsed.

Until there is a viable hard landscaping scheme and inconsistencies are resolved (including the inconsistency between plans), the condition is not in a position where it should be reasonably discharged. The loss of ecology, likely flood risk, and impact on the wider landscape make this a harmful proposal.

The Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service is a strategic partnership between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council

Also, the lack of OL and RM approval for the accesses is likely to mean the approval has lapsed and the proposed works under this and the other conditions could not be delivered.

LPC Decision: Object and (unless minded to refuse under delegated powers), refer this to the District Council Full Planning Committee.

### **Key considerations**

The comments of the Parish Council, both those contained in the agenda and those appended in a pdf document, were considered by the group and it was noted that many of the comments set out did not relate to the details of the condition to be discharged.

The view of the Parish Council that some information was still inadequate was noted, as were the detailed points raised around terraces, however this was not found to justify referral of the application to the planning committee.

The proposal does not raise significant issues for adopted policy.

Whilst the nature, scale and complexity, as well as the planning history of the site itself are relevant, and of some local controversy, there were no reasons found to justify this application being presented to the planning committee

### **Decision**

Delegated decision. See above