

Delegation meeting - Minutes

- **Date:** 6^h September 2022
- **Time:** 11:00 – 12:30
- **Meeting held:** via Teams

Attendees: Cllr Henry Batchelor (Chair of Planning Committee), Phil McIntosh (PM), Katie Christodoulides (KC), Charlotte Peet (CP), Rebecca Smith (RS).

Minutes approved by: Cllr Batchelor (Vice Chair of Planning Committee)

22/02816/FUL Land Adj 133 Caxton End, Bourn, Cambridge

Conversion of agricultural building to 1no 3bed two storey dwelling.

Reason for Call-in Request:

Bourn Parish Call In – Bourn Parish Council supports this application and requests that should the planning authority be minded to reject the application, it should be referred to this committee.

Key considerations

The case officer introduced the proposed application noting the site context and planning history of the application site (previously refused application), including a previous planning permission from 1970 for a workshop which was restricted by condition to motor and agricultural engineering repairs. The revised application was submitted to address the previous reason for refusal. The officer explained that there were 7 reps in support of the proposal. The key issue is the principle of development in the context of policy H/17 of the Local Plan.

The support of the Parish was noted and support from some local residents. The scale of the application is not significant, nor does it raise significant planning policy concerns or significant material planning considerations. The planning history of the site is not complex, although the recent refusal is acknowledged. Although some comments of support had been received, this was not considered to be a high level of public interest. On this basis the Interim Delivery Manager considered, on balance, the proposal did not warrant referral to the planning committee.

Decision

Do not refer to Planning Committee

22/02571/FUL 39A Station Road West, Whittlesford

Demolition of existing buildings, creation of access road from Station Road West, and construction of a residential development of 68 No. residential units together with associated landscaping, car and cycle parking, and refuse storage.

Reason for Call-in Request:

Whittlesford Parish Council would like the application to be referred to the planning committee. They unanimously rejected this application for all the reasons of the previous application. The application is identical to the previous application and remains an overdevelopment of the site.

Key considerations

The case officer introduced the proposed application noting the location of the site and its context. The officer explained the application was a resubmission following on from a previous

application determined at planning committee in June. The previous application (reserved matters) was refused in line with officer recommendation. Outline planning permission was granted for residential use of the site in 2018. The comments from the Parish were noted regarding the similarity of the proposal in relation to the recently refused application. The proposal is for a major development with a number of significant material planning considerations. Furthermore, owing to the recent decision being made by Members for a similar development, the Interim Delivery Manager considered the proposal should be referred to the planning committee.

Decision

Refer to Planning Committee

22/01647/HFUL 82 Church Lane, Girton

Ground floor front, side and rear extensions and roof extension to create first floor.

Reason for Call-in Request:

Girton Parish Council observations and rationale for objection. Planning Committee objected unanimously on the following grounds: This application adversely affects Street Scene in the same way as 2 Duck End is deemed to be by officers, and this should be taken into account in any final decision. Girton Parish Council ask for SCDC to take this application through a Planning Committee

Key considerations

The case officer introduced the proposed application noting the site context. Since the application was submitted the application had been amended, reducing the scale of the proposed extension to the existing dwelling. The comments from the Parish were noted in relation to the original proposal. Limited comments have been received from Members of the public. The scale of the application is not significant, nor does it raise significant planning policy concerns or significant material planning considerations. The planning history of the site is not complex and there was not a high level of public interest. On this basis the Interim Delivery Manager considered the proposal did not warrant referral to the planning committee.

Decision

Do not refer to Planning Committee