

Delegation meeting - Minutes

- **Date:** 10 August 2021
- **Time:** 11am to 12:30pm
- **Meeting held:** via Teams
- **Attendees:** Nigel Blazeby (NB), Cllr Pippa Heylings (PH), Cllr Henry Batchelor (HB), Mary Collins (MC), Michael Sexton (MS)
- **Notes and actions:** Jemma Smith

Minutes approved by: Cllr Pippa Heylings (Chair of Planning Committee – Consultee) on 16 August 2021, Nigel Blazeby (Delivery Manager – Development Management) on 16 August 2021

20/05251/OUT Land North West Of 7 Primrose Walk, Little Gransden - Outline planning application for the erection of a single self-build dwelling with all matters reserved (MC)

Reason for call-in request

Comment: Little Gransden Parish Council considered this application at a meeting on 4 February 2021. The Parish Council was unanimous in its OBJECTION to this application for the following reasons:

- The Parish Council was concerned that residents at numbers 2, 4, 5, 6 and 8 Primrose Walk did not appear to have been notified - Primrose Walk is a small community abutting a public footpath, consisting of dwellings that were originally built by the District Council. Some of the dwellings are still owned by the District Council.
- The Parish Council was concerned that the proposed development would put more stress on the existing sewerage system.
- The Parish Council's principal concern was that the access to the proposed development is via a track that has the status of a public footpath: it is not of a suitable standard for vehicles and has not been maintained to highway standards for the existing dwellings, which were built by the District Council. If the Planning Office is minded to approve this application, Little Gransden Parish

Council very strongly urges that a condition of any approval should be that either the vendor or the purchaser of the land should make up Primrose Walk to public highway standards and that the County Council should adopt Primrose Walk. The Parish Council would like this application to be taken to the Planning Committee if the Planning Officers were minded to approve the application without the above condition.

Key considerations

Prior to consideration of the call-in request it was noted that the red edged location plan does not include land required for access to the site from a public highway. As such it will be necessary for the applicant to amend the proposal. The amendment would be subject to a further full consultation period of 21 days.

Should the Parish Council maintain its call-in request following this consultation, it would need to be considered at a later date. No decision is therefore made with regard to the current call-in request.

Notwithstanding this, it is worth noting that in relation to the request for Primrose Walk to be made up to adoptable standards, this may not be practicable and it would not be possible to attach any condition to any planning permission that would require the County Council to adopt Primrose Walk as this is not within the gift of the applicant and the Local Highway Authority has no powers to require adoption.

Decision

None at this time – see above.

20/05053/FUL Land At Damms Pastures, Highfields Caldecote, Caldecote - Erection of a 4 bed dwelling (MC)

Reason for call-in request

Caldecote Parish Council OBJECT to this application.

Reason: Over development of the site

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 group that planning permission had been granted on the site for a dwelling some time ago but not implemented and a more recent application had been refused for reasons of impact on the character of the area, inadequate amenity space for future occupiers, unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents and insufficient information on drainage. The case officer considered that the current proposal had adequately addressed all of these reasons for refusal.

The comments of the Parish Council were found to raise material planning considerations, albeit that 'over development' is a general term that can refer to many more detailed planning considerations. However, having regard to the historical consent and the applicants attempts to overcome the previous reasons of refusal, the proposal was not considered to raise *significant* planning concerns such that it would warrant referral to the planning committee.

The site lies within the village framework where the principle of residential development is acceptable. The proposal was not therefore found to raise significant implications for adopted policy.

The nature of the proposal was not found to be of a scale and complexity that warranted referral to the planning committee.

Having regard to the planning history of the site this was found to be relevant particularly with regard to the previous grant of planning permission for a dwelling and the more recent refusal, however this history was not considered to raise particular concerns that would warrant referral to the planning committee.

Decision

Delegated decision. See above

**S/4418/19/CONDE Land south of Wheatsheaf Barn, Horseheath Road,
Linton - Submission of details required by condition 3 (Management
and Maintenance of the Proposed Streets) of planning permission
S/4418/19/RM (MS)**

Reason for call-in request

Previous comments stand and support that the management plan submitted is inadequate. The plans submitted conflict with approved plans, OL and RM site plans including that the sewage tank is not included and the drainage plan sends surface water to the SE corner of the site towards Martins Lane, which is a private lane, not a water course. The management group is not named and there are concerns that this will fold leaving the site without management or an active Residents Association. We have experience of this in other areas of the village and are aware of the problems. This applies to street maintenance but also LEAP up-keep. This site has the added issue of maintenance of the SUDs and Sewage Tank, as if these fail there will be considerable Public and Environmental Health problems, not just on site but through the village. The maintenance plan does not take into account the time taken to recognise problems in the sewage tank, the repair time and supply of parts. As the tank should be emptied at least daily, any delay in repairs would have dire consequences for site and neighbours. The bin emptying is too infrequent. The weeding regime does not include removal of poisonous plants (e.g. Ragwort) and invasive non-native plants (e.g. Bamboo) both of which are in the proposed planting scheme, but which are inappropriate for a rural area. Linton Parish Council Decision: Object and do refer this to the District Council Full Planning Committee.

Key considerations

The application concerns only the management and maintenance of the proposed streets. The views of the Parish Council are noted, particularly in relation to concerns with regard to foul and surface water drainage. It was noted, however, that these matters are to be addressed through applications to discharge specific drainage conditions albeit it was recognised that there is a degree of overlap. The applications to discharge the drainage conditions are shortly to be determined by the planning committee and it was therefore felt that it would be preferable to suspend consideration of this application until



GREATER CAMBRIDGE
SHARED PLANNING

after the determination of these applications. Full consideration of the call-in request will therefore be made at that time.

Decision

Held in abeyance. See above.