

Delegation meeting - Minutes

- **Date:** 11 January 2022
- **Time:** 11:00 – 12:30
- **Meeting held:** via Teams
- **Attendees:** Cllr Henry Batchelor (HB), Cllr Pippa Heylings (PH), Nigel Blazeby (NB), Julie Ayre (JA), Aaron Coe (AC), Amy McDonagh (AM)

Minutes approved by: Cllr Pippa Heylings (Chair of Planning Committee – Consultee), Cllr Henry Batchelor (Vice Chair of Planning Committee – Consultee) on 31 January 2022, Nigel Blazeby (Delivery Manager Development Management) on 31 January 2022

20/04804/FUL 28 Wimpole Road Barton CB23 7AB

Change of use of ground floor and part of external area from residential (Class C3) to recreational (Class E(d)).

Reason for call-in request

The Parish Council has objected on the following grounds:

Concerned that the facility is an educational use rather than recreational

Concerned about OFSTED registration and are keen that Child and Youth Services in particular are further consulted given the sensitive needs of the individual pupils they are seeking to 'educate'.

The traffic issues remain a concern and do not feel Highways Dept has carried out sufficient due diligence in their appraisal.

Unjustified location for this form of development which would impact detrimentally on the residential uses close to where it would be sited near, which is not part of Barton house as it continues to state.

Key considerations

The case officer introduced the application to the group and explained the comments which had been received from the Parish Council.

It was noted that the Parish Council had raised material planning considerations. The key issues being the nature of the use, traffic, and residential amenity.

The case officer explained that the nature of the use would be limited by planning conditions, as would: the hours and days of operation; the number of visitors using the facility; the use by the owners of 28 Wimpole Road only; and controls would ensure that windows and doors would be closed when amplified music or other loud activities were taking place.

The case officer also explained that there had been no objections received from consultees, including the Local Highway Authority and that OFSTED registration was not a requirement.

The controls recommended by the case officer were considered to satisfy the objections of the Parish Council and as such the proposal did not raise any significant planning concerns.

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

Decision

Delegated decision– see above

21/04718/HFUL – 11 Home Close - Two storey side extension

Reason for call-in request

The Parish council has objected on grounds that the proposal would not maintain rural views and gaps, insufficient space to the rear garden gate will be provided as the extension looks to come out almost to the site boundary, Loss of a 2-bed 'starter' home, Loss of off street parking, visual impact.

Key considerations

The case officer introduced the application to the group and explained the comments which had been received from the Parish Council.

It was noted that the Parish Council had raised material planning considerations, namely the character and appearance of the street scene through loss of a visual gap, access to the rear garden, loss of a small affordable home, impact on parking and visual amenity. The case officer explained that an extant planning permission exists that was granted by the planning committee for a similar but smaller scheme that extends to the side by the same amount as in the revised proposal. In this regard the group felt that most of the concerns raised by the Parish Council had already been considered by the planning committee as part of the granting of the extant permission. The remaining concern regarding the visual amenity of the street scene due to the increased size was not

considered to raise significant planning concerns that would warrant referral of the application 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 to warrant referral to the committee. Finally, the history of the site was not determinative in this case.

Decision

Delegated decision – see above.