

Delegation meeting - Minutes

- **Date:** 9th August 2022
- **Time:** 11:00 – 12:30
- **Meeting held:** via Teams

Attendees: Cllr Henry Batchelor (HB), Cllr Fane (PF), Phil McIntosh (PM), Toby Williams (TW), Sumaya Nakamya (SN), Paul Hunt (PH), Mike Allen (MA), Charlotte Spencer (CS), Karen Pell-Coggins (KPC)

Minutes approved by: Cllr Batchelor (Chair of Planning Committee - Consultee) on 12th August 2022

[22/01272/FUL 33 South Road Great Abington](#)

Demolition of existing haystore and erection of a single detached dwelling including all associated external works and re-instatement of granny annexe to stables/ancillary buildings servicing 33 South Road.

Reason for call-in request

The Neighbourhood Plan Design and Access Statement says any new dwelling should be on or adjacent to the old piggery site, NOT a hay store as this applications states. Therefore, the proposed location of new dwelling does not conform to the requirements of the Neighbourhood Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan (NP) also states that the new dwelling should be subservient in height to the original dwelling and the applications states that they are the same height, which does not comply with the NP. Any new dwelling as well as being on or adjacent to the site of the old piggery is required to be at least as far from the road as the original dwelling to maintain the openness of the neighbourhood; this dwelling is closer to the road than the original dwelling so does not meet the requirements of the NP. Having two dwellings so close together could be seen as possible over-development of a small area of the plot. Should the district Council be minded to pass this application, can there be conditions included in the approval that all vehicles associated with the development of the site must park on the site and not on the single-track road or in the neighbouring pass bay.

Key considerations

Possible multiple conflicts with the Neighbourhood Plan

The scheme requires careful consideration against potential specific conflicts set out by the Parish Council regarding Neighbourhood Plan policies. These include use of the land, height and siting. As such, there are potential significant implications for the implementation of the Neighbourhood Plan and its policies that require the Planning Committee's specific deliberation.

Decision

Refer to Planning Committee

22/02682/HFUL 10 Flaxfields Linton

Single storey front, rear and side extensions, rear dormer extension and associated landscaping works

Reason for Call-in Request:

[In summary] Overlooking of neighbour to the south-west; design; excessive hard landscaping uncharacteristic and affecting flood risk to neighbour downhill to the Southwest; setting in Conservation Area and of Listed Buildings to the rear.

Key considerations

Heritage, privacy, design.

The size and nature of the scheme is such that it does not present any significantly controversial or sensitive planning issues. There are no objections from the heritage officer. Little weight can be given to the emerging conservation area. The privacy issues are noted but the orientation and distance between the proposed and existing dwellings is such that there does not appear to be a significant breach of guidance on intervisibility and that notwithstanding there may be permitted development considerations that offer a very similar fall-back in terms of the proposed rear facing dormer window.

Decision

Delegated decision

22/02337/FUL Land at rear of 64 Barton Road

Single storey 3 bedroom dwellinghouse and associated works.

Reason for Call-in Request

Impact on the historic public footpath, impacts the PVAA, impact on badgers, concerns about splays onto the busy road

Key Considerations

Protected Village Amenity Area, character, impacts on public footpath

The site has a complex site history, including an appeal. Proposals for the site have been to planning committee before. There are not an insignificant number of interested third parties. The impact of the scheme on the PVAA needs careful consideration in terms of the application of planning policy.

Decision

Referred to Planning Committee

22/02859/PRIOR Land Adj Ermine Street

Installation of H3G street pole and additional equipment cabinets

Reason for Call-in Request:

Excessive height impact on adj CA and PVAA. Conflicts with village design guide, highway safety, aircraft operations

Key Considerations:

Heritage, PVAA, highway safety and aircraft.

Reasons for decision: The size and nature of the scheme is such that it does not present any significantly controversial or sensitive planning issues being located close to an industrial site and not within the conservation area or Protected Village Amenity Area. The proposal is not sufficiently complex or raises any wider policy issues that merit discussion by the planning committee. The officer is asked as part of the delegated decision to satisfy themselves that the site search area has been properly undertaken and that the visual impacts of the proposal can be suitably considered. It was noted that the application is a prior approval proposal and time limited to 56 days following which an automatic approval is issued if no decision was made.

Decision

Delegated decision

S/2553/16/CONDC Land off Horseheath Road

Submission of details required by condition 10 (Archaeology) of planning permission
S/2553/16/OL

Reason for Call-in Request

Linton Parish Council submitted a holding objection as there is insufficient information to discharge the condition. We are unable to comment upon the findings without the required information, so object to this condition being signed off. The Written Scheme of Investigation was approved, and excavation has been carried out, but the report on findings has not been submitted to LPC and does not appear on the website. Also items referred to in the WSI have not taken place, including Open Days, village updates on work and the findings. There has been no information on why the Cursus has been re-designated - an item of great interest for the status of the historic village. We note the correspondence of 9th September 2020 from Kasia, the County Archaeologist: "We have no objection to the commencement of construction on archaeological grounds as the excavation at this site concluded on 4th September. The second part of the archaeological programme (post excavation assessment and analysis phase) is about to commence so the archaeological condition should remain in place until that has also been completed". We agree with the County Archaeologist that until the assessment and analysis has been reported upon the condition should remain in place. LPC Decision: Object and do refer this to the District Council Full Planning Committee

Key Considerations: Heritage impacts, public participation

Reasons for decision: This is a technical submission which relies on expert advice received from the County Council Archaeologist following a review of the report submission seeking discharge of the planning condition. The expert advice confirms the condition can be discharged. The officer is asked to share the advice and final report with the Parish Council, including the consideration of why the existing feature is not considered a Curzon.

Public participation in the archaeological work and its findings was not an absolute requirement of the written scheme of investigation and whilst it was disappointing this wasn't undertaken, it is not a material reason to refer the

application to planning committee. No special policy or other considerations arise which dictate the submission should be presented to the planning committee.

Decision

Delegated decision