

Delegation meeting - Minutes

- **Date:** 12th July 2022
- **Time:** 11:00 – 12:30
- **Meeting held:** via Teams
-

Attendees: Cllr Henry Batchelor (HB), Cllr Peter Fane (PF), Phil McIntosh (PM), Michael Sexton (MS), Katie Christodoulides (KC), Jane Rodens (JR), Tom Chenery (TC)

Minutes approved by: Phil McIntosh (Interim Delivery Manager and S106), Cllr Batchelor (Chair of Planning Committee - Consultee) on 18 July 2022

22/01893/FUL Land Rear Of 129, High Street, Cottenham, CB24 8SD

Demolition of existing studio and construction of 5 bedroom property with amenity space, parking, bin and cycle storage

Reason for call-in request

“Concerns raised regarding the effect of removing the trees (act as noise suppression from neighbouring Les Ward site). Proposal would affect the linear pattern of the village, contrary to Neighbourhood Plan policy COH/1-2 and COH/1-5c (Village Character - proposals for new buildings will be supported where they would retain, or where practicable enrich, the character of the neighbourhood area as appropriate to their location and scale. In particular development proposals should address the following matters in a locally-distinctive fashion appropriate to their location and scale). The scheme neither adheres to the locally distinctive fashion appropriate to their location (by means of affecting the linear pattern - back land development in a conservation area) and the scale is out of keeping. There is no current housing need for 5 bedroom properties in the village - contrary to AECOM report conducted as part of the NP. Contrary LP policy HQ/1 - development must be of a high-quality design and make a positive contribution to the local and wider context. Part a) of the Policy states that development should preserve or enhance the character of the local urban and rural area and respond to its character. Part d) states that development should be compatible with the location and be appropriate in terms with scale, density, mass, form, sitting, design, proportion and the surrounding area. Furthermore the application would not be in conformity with the Cottenham Village Design Statement SPD (2007). This document it states "Within the village a variety of building types is mixed together, and yet its most distinguishing feature is the impression of unusual uniformity presented by the High Street. character of the Conservation Area specifically is of historic properties that front the High Street with long narrow plots to the rear, it is acknowledged that there are many with linear outbuildings to the rear of the dwellings, but there are no dwellings in this immediate area. There is a green rural backdrop to the plots that in many instances can be glimpsed between houses. located to the south-west are the grade II listed former Three Horseshoes Public House. Proposal is contrary to LP policy NH/14 which states that development will be permitted where it sustains and enhances the special character and distinctiveness of the districts historic environment, also they will

enhance the significance of heritage asserts. CPC recommends refusal. If Officer minded to approve then we request that the application to Committee.”

Key considerations

The case officer introduced the application explaining the Parish’s key concerns as set out above. Officer explained the planning history including principle of development having been established in 2016 with an outline planning permission and similar backland development had taken place on adjacent sites. Proposal for a dwelling on the site was refused on design grounds and this application sought to overcome those concerns. Reference was made to the Cottenham NP, which was “made” at the time of the previous refusal. Officer considered the design issues have been addressed.

The concerns of the Parish were noted however, the principle of development was not objected to in relation to the previous refusal. No significant planning concerns were raised and this is not a complex application with significant policy implications. On this basis the Interim Delivery Manager did not consider the proposal warranted referral to the planning committee.

Decision

Do not refer to Planning Committee

22/02356/OUT Land East of Long Lane, Fowlmere

Outline Application for up to 125 dwellings with all matters reserved except access

Reason for Call-in Request:

The application has a recommendation of refusal from the Parish and request it is taken to Committee if the officer supports the application. Taking to delegation panel given the public interest in the site.

Key considerations

The case officer explained that the application was for outline planning permission with all matters reserved except for access. Officers provided details of the application explaining the site context, being outside the village framework. Indicative masterplan was also presented. Officer noted that the site had been put forward in the HELAA and was not supported as a potential development site. Officer explained that the proposal conflicted with a number of Local Plan policies in terms of the principle of development. A number of objections have already been received.

The level of public interest was noted and the Parish recommendation. Whilst the proposal is a major development, officers note the significant conflict with the Local Plan in terms of the principle of development. Although there are a number of material planning considerations, the proposal was unlikely to be supported in principle in accordance with the recommendation from the Parish therefore, it was

considered by the Interim Delivery Manager that the application should not be referred to the planning committee.

Decision

Do not refer to Planning Committee

22/00209/S73 Cambridge City Football Club

S73 Variation of conditions 2 (Approved plans) and 8 (Cycle store) of planning permission S/2239/13/FL

Reason for Call-in Request:

Previous FUL application went to Committee

Key considerations

Case officer explained that planning permission had previously been granted for new football pitches and stands. The main alterations to the application were to make some of the stands smaller and revise the design. It was noted development has commenced on the site. It was explained that the original application was a major departure from the Development Plan being located in the Green Belt.

The Interim Delivery Manager explained that as the original application was a major departure from the development plan any associated s73 application was required to be determined by the planning committee in accordance with the Council's constitution.

Decision

Refer to Planning Committee