

Delegation meeting - Minutes

- **Date:** 25 January 2022
- **Time:** 11:00 – 12:30
- **Meeting held:** via Teams

Attendees: Cllr Henry Batchelor (HB), Nigel Blazeby (NB), Philippa Kelly (PK), Julie Ayre (JA), Lorraine Casey (LC), Phoebe Carter (PC), Amy McDonagh (AM), Charlotte Peet (CP), Charlotte Spencer (CS)

Minutes approved by: Cllr Henry Batchelor (Vice Chair of Planning Committee – Consultee) on 11 February 2022, Nigel Blazeby (Delivery Manager Development Management) on 11 February 2022

20/05219/FUL - 6 Thetford Terrace

Reason for call-in request

Overdevelopment - the units are overcrowded; 'layout and density' and also 'noise and disturbance' within a confined residential area.

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 layout and density of the development and neighbour amenity concerns.

Whilst these issues were considered to be material to the assessment of the application, the group noted that the proposal would not be readily visible from the public domain, all units complied with Local Plan policies including space standards and there had been no neighbour objections or any other objections from consultees. As such the group did not consider that the Parish Council's concerns amounted to 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

21/04549/FUL – 85 Histon Road, Cottenham - Construction of a replacement dwelling.

Reason for call-in request

The application has been objected to by the Parish Council on grounds that the proposal is contrary to Local Plan policy S/4 (inappropriate development in the green belt), policy H/14 (one for one residential development) and contrary to Neighbourhood Plan COH/1-5c (be responsive to village characteristics - plot widths/proportions); COH/2-1 (development framework).

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 conflict with Green Belt and other Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policies. The Parish Council had raised some very valid planning concerns and the case officer explained that there was a history of a previous refusal of planning permission and a dismissed appeal for a replacement dwelling on the site. However, the case officer explained that since the appeal was dismissed, a Lawful Development Certificate had been issued for proposed permitted development for a ground floor extension to the property and Prior Approval had been granted for a first floor extension. The group accepted that together these amounted to a 'fall back' position and the proposal would need to be considered within this context. The case officer explained that the proposed development was comparable, and in her view preferable, to this 'fall back' position and thus it complied with both Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policies. It was agreed that bricks should be buff and not grey to ensure the appearance of the dwelling accorded with the Neighbourhood Plan. As a result the group did not consider that the Parish Council's concerns amounted to 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.

21/04898/S73 - 65 Pettitts Lane, Dry Drayton, Cambridge

Reason for call-in request

Parish called application in, raising concerns regarding compliance with the outline consent and new rooflight.

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 potential conflict with the Outline planning permission, with resultant potential loss of affordable housing; and the impact of the insertion of a new rooflight.

The case officer explained that the development was almost complete but was not built in accordance with the approved plans. The application sought to regularise this. The case officer explained that she had not yet been able to measure the total floorspace to establish whether it was within the limit of 999m² as set out in the Outline planning permission. As such it was not known whether the application was in compliance with the Outline permission.

The group agreed that the principal issue was affordable housing and that provided the application was in accord with the Outline permission then the other concerns of the Parish Council, namely the introduction of the new rooflight did not amount to significant planning concerns that would warrant referral of the application to the planning committee. It was therefore resolved that if the revised floorspace was below the 999m² the decision should be delegated but otherwise the application should be referred to the planning committee.

Update: following the delegation meeting, the case officer has established that the floor area is below the 999m², however, significant further local concerns have emerged such that officers consider the proposal should be re-presented to the delegation meeting.

Decision

Deferred for consideration at a future delegation meeting

21/05355/FUL – 2 Barton Road Haslingfield

Reason for call-in request

The Parish Council stated: At a meeting of Haslingfield Parish Council on 10/1/2022, the councillors voted to object to the application on the basis that two of the three properties do not have solar panels or ground/air source heating.

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 renewable energy and low carbon technologies.

Whilst these issues were considered to be material to the assessment of the proposal, the group noted that the applicant had agreed to install further solar panels and the issues of the renewable energy and low carbon technologies could in any case be dealt with by a suitably worded planning condition. As such the group did not consider that the Parish Council's concerns amounted to 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.