

Delegation meeting - Minutes

- **Date:** 1 June 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), Alice Young (AY), Sumaya Nakamya (SN), Rebecca Claydon (RC), Michael Sexton (MS)
- **Notes and actions:** Jemma Smith

Minutes approved by: Cllr Pippa Heylings (Chair of Planning Committee – Consultee) on 7 June 2021, Chris Carter (Delivery Manager – Strategic Sites) on 7 June 2021

21/01006/FUL 65 Park Lane . erection of new three bed dwelling, following demolition of the existing building and the erection of a new garden annex to the south of the site at the end of the garden (AY)

Reason for call-in request

This item was taken to vote. 4 Councillors voted to recommend refusal. Cllr Cahn voted to recommend approval and supported the application. Majority agree to recommend refusal. This is because application is contradictory to item 6.2 in the village design guide. If South Cambs are minded to approve Histon & Impington Planning Committee wishes to add conditions of use of annexe ancillary to the residential use of “65 Park Lane” only this includes employees of this address and no deliveries during peak times (10am-3pm). Histon & Impington Planning Committee request that this application is taken to committee and that a planning officer investigates for loss of biodiversity net gain.

Key considerations

The comments of the Parish Council were considered by the group and the case officer gave a brief explanation of the application. In particular the group considered item 6.2 of the village design guide.

The Parish Council was found to have raised relevant material planning considerations in the form of the design of the proposal. However, it was considered that in the context of

the application and surrounding area, this was not a significant planning concern which would justify referral to the planning committee.

The proposal was not found to have significant implications for adopted policy, nor to be of a nature scale or complexity which would warrant referral to the planning committee. Finally, the planning history of the site was not considered determinative in this case

Decision

Delegated decision. See above

21/00960/FUL at 106 High Street, Harston - extensions and alterations of existing detached 2 storey workshop, including the change of use from workshop (light industrial) to 5 bed dwelling with extensions to the North East and South to accommodate a single garage, hall and additional living accommodation (SN)

Reason for call-in request

I am writing on behalf of Harston Parish Council to confirm its objections to the following application. The Council consider that the proposal is an overdevelopment of the site, noting the layout, height and density of the application.

Key considerations

The comments of the Parish Council were considered by the group and the case officer gave a brief explanation of the proposal. This included advising the committee of an extant planning permission on this site for a similar, although not identical, scheme, granted under delegated authority in 2018.

The comments of the Parish Council were found to raise material planning considerations, specifically issues around potential overdevelopment as well as design issues. However, having regard to the nature of the extant permission, these were not found to be significant concerns in this particular case.

The proposal is located within the village framework boundary and so was not found to raise significant implications for adopted policy. Further, it was considered that the proposal was not of a nature, scale or complexity which would warrant a referral to the committee.

Finally, whilst the planning history was considered to be relevant, this would not found to require a committee decision.

Decision

Delegated decision. See above.

20/04706/FUL - 60 Impington Lane, Impington - Demolition of existing garage and erection of a three-bedroom, single storey dwelling to rear with detached carport/store (RC)

Reason for call-in request

Called in by Histon and Impington PC - All agreed to recommend refusal on the grounds of drainage detail noting area has a tendency to flood and proposal for surface water to be discharged to main sewer. Positioning on plot would be difficult to avoid negative impact on neighbouring properties, lack of private amenity space. Recommendation for SCDC officers to put this plan to committee. Noting proximity to neighbouring properties, request working hours for weekend to be considerate (9am – 1pm) with no Sunday working permitted.

Key considerations

This item was deferred to the following week pending the comments of the drainage officer.

Decision

Deferred. See above.

S/1963/15/CONDG Land to North and South of Bartlow Road, Linton - Submission of details required by condition 10 (Surface Water Drainage) of planning permission S/1963/15/OL (MS)

Reason for call-in request

The document showing overland surface water routes is VERY concerning. The land north of the development site slopes significantly between Horseheath Rd and Bartlow road (and continues sloping towards the river). The blue arrows show the water reaching the northern edge of the northern site and then turning eastwards along a contour to avoid entering the site. No drainage features have been proposed that would enable this to happen. The reality is that water will continue to flow downhill according to the laws of gravity into the gardens (and potentially homes) of the occupants as has occurred in adjacent sites. Similarly, no consideration has been given to the surface water flow witnessed from the roads to the north of Bartlow Road into the site itself (Ridgeway and Kenwood Gardens) and how this is likely to flow into the spine road on the southern site. Surface water flow along Bartlow road certainly does not simply flow to the east of the site entirely as is shown in this plan. The SUDS scheme would appear to be in the wrong position to deal with the surface water flow as shown by the blue arrows. The agreed planting barrier on the southern boundary, to keep pets and residents from the river, has again disappeared. As the developer has made “no material amendments” to the plans since the last submission, previous LPC comments still stand. The southern site layout still shows the foul water drain going to the Bartlow Road manhole, contrary to explicit conditioning. The main concern of LPC in relation to the drainage of this site is that the representations of the EA flood maps are categorically incorrect when compared with the real life experienced by the village. The EA flood maps from both river water and surface water are being challenged by LPC following discussions with the EA and LLFA.

Key considerations

The detailed comments of the Parish Council were noted by the group and the case officer explained the extensive dialogue which has taken place with both the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA).

It was also noted that the original planning condition, imposed by the planning committee, included a requirement for the Parish Council to be consulted on the application to discharge the condition, a requirement which has been met.

The comments of the Parish Council do raise material planning considerations related to the discharge of the condition. These concerns, whilst clearly of significance to the Parish Council, are not considered to be significant in the wider context of the district. Further, they relate to detailed technical matters on which the Council rely on the expert advice of the Environment Agency and LLFA.

The discharge of condition application is not considered to have significant implications for adopted policy, nor to be of a nature scale or complexity to warrant committee consideration.

Finally, whilst the planning history of the site is clearly of relevance, it does not justify the referral of the application to committee for decision.

Decision

Delegated decision. See above.