

# Delegation meeting - Minutes

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

**Attendees:**, Cllr Henry Batchelor (Chair of Planning Committee), Cllr Fane (Vice Chair of Planning Committee), Phil McIntosh (PM), Karen Pell-Coggins (KPC), Charlotte Spencer (CS), Dean Scrivener (DS), Michael Allen (MA).

## **Apologies:**

**Minutes approved by:** Phil McIntosh (Interim Delivery Manager (West) in consultation with Cllr Fane (Vice Chair of Planning Committee), on 16 October 2022

## **22/02833/FUL      Photon House, Station Road, Linton**

**Change of use of existing offices (Class E) to Veterinary Hospital (sui generis) including new external lift shaft, new single storey link and retrospective permission for existing detached building for use as Veterinary Hospital (sui generis)**

### **Reason for Call-in Request:**

Previous comments from LPC, submitted on the 22<sup>nd</sup> August, still stand. LPC continue to strongly object to the granting of retrospective permission for the temporary building for the following reasons. The proximity to the neighbouring building. Materials used on the temporary building are out of keeping with surrounding properties. Request as a minimum for the building to have brick cladding

### **Key considerations**

The case officer (KPC) introduced the proposed application noting that the Parish was objecting to the retrospective nature of the metal clad building. Officer explained the site and local context including use of images to show buildings in the locality which are commercial/industrial in nature. Case officer noted there had been 1 comment from neighbouring commercial building.

The concerns of the Parish were noted. However, 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 only one representation has been received, as such there was a low 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

## **22/03110/FUL 38 Station Road (West)**

**Demolition of a garage and the erection of a new detached dwelling and vehicular access points for the existing and proposed dwellings from 38 Station Road, Whittlesford.**

### **Reason for Call-in Request:**

Over development of existing site together with adding to ongoing parking issues

### **Key considerations**

The case officer (CS) introduced the proposed application noting that the reasons for the Parish objection and that there was also 1 neighbour objection. Officer explained proposed development and context with neighbours. It was noted a previous application was refused at the site and an appeal had been lodged. The reason for refusal was due to impact upon trees. Concerns raised by the Parish did not form part of the previous reason for refusal.

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 only one representation has been received, as such there is a low 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

## **20/04264/FUL, 20/04263/FUL, 20/04297/FUL, 20/04298/FUL, 20/04299/FUL, 20/04858/FUL, 21/01618/FUL, 21/01173/FUL, 21/01172FUL Land at Moor Drove, Histon**

**9 planning applications relating to gypsy and traveller pitches, caravans and associated buildings.**

### **Key considerations**

These applications had not been called-in by the Parish or local Councillors, although the Parish have objected to the applications and recommend refusal. The applications were referred to the Delegation Panel due to the nature of the development.

The planning applications are split between two case officers (DS and MA) and relate to different applicants. MA introduced the sites and explained the context of the 9 plots where pitches and caravans are existing, or are proposed, under these applications. Aerial photos of the site were used to explain the site context which noted an adjacent an "L" shaped piece of land which has been approved (on appeal) for use as gypsy and traveller pitches/caravans. The other sites sit around this parcel

of land which is owned and occupied by the Price family. It was noted the site was well screened by trees. The officers explained site lies within the Green Belt (GB) and that the development is deemed to be inappropriate development in the GB. Very Special Circumstances (VSCs) are therefore, required to be demonstrated to overcome the harm to GB and any other harm. Officers explained the current local plan policy did not identify a need for gypsy and traveller pitches, only pitches for travelling showpeople plots. Officers also explained that a new gypsy and traveller accommodation assessment was due to be carried out, although this was delayed.

Officers explained that the applications had been with the Council for some time and several attempts had been made through the respective agents to obtain information regarding the personal circumstances of the occupants and why the pitches were required in this location, in order to consider whether VSCs exist. Some were noted to be relatives of the owner (Mr Price) but little detail had been provided, with mainly numbers of occupants and names of adults and children (although there had been some information about schools attended by children and registered at the local surgery). It was noted officers are of the view that the information provided is deficient and does not amount to VSCs.

The nature of the development is not of significant scale although is acknowledged involves a number of existing and proposed pitches. The planning history is not complex although has included some historic appeals where pitches were allowed. Although the site involves GB land, this in itself, is not a reason to refer an application to planning committee. As such, the material planning considerations are not considered to be so significant nor are there significant policy considerations. There is also a low level of public interest. Taking all these factors into consideration, on balance, it was considered by the Interim Delivery Manager that the proposals did not warrant referral to the planning committee.

## **Decision**

Do not refer to Planning Committee