

Delegation Panel meeting - Minutes

- **Date:** 22 July and 05 August 25
- **Time:** 11:00 – 12:30
- **Meeting held:** via Teams

Attendees: 22 July: Martin Smart (Chair of Planning Committee), Dave Baigent (Vice Chair of Planning Committee) with Toby Williams (Delivery Manager) speaking directly to Chair / Vice and the case officer Melissa Reynolds at the end of and following the meeting to agree the outcome.

5 August: Toby Williams (Delivery Manager), Alice Young and Dean Scrivener, with Michael Hammond observing.

Apologies: None received.

Minutes approved by date: 8 August 25

1	25/01993/FUL, 1 Dawes Close (22 July) Subdivision of existing dwelling to 2no 2bed dwelling including bin and bike storage to the front. Reason for Inclusion: Number of objections Key considerations: 5 or more objections Discussion The case officer presented the application. No policy implications arise from the proposal that require important matters of judgement on the implementation of adopted policy that would be of wider significance to the Development Plan. The application is neither complex nor of a scale to warrant Committee consideration. The relevant planning and appeal history was discussed, particularly in relation to the size and configuration of the private amenity space and the layout of the cycle parking and bins. The case officer advised they were not minded to support the proposal, and given the number of objections, in discussion it was concluded that it would not be of wider public interest that the application be presented to planning committee. Overall, the application does not give rise significant issues of material consideration, policy implementation / interpretation, complexity or nature or through its planning history to merit Planning Committee consideration. Consequently, in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Planning Committee, the Delivery Manager considered the proposal should not be referred to the planning committee.	
---	--	--

	Decision: Do not refer to Planning Committee	
2	25/00102/FUL – 310 Histon Road Arbury (5 August) Demolition of an existing detached bungalow and the erection of 3 no. dwellings and alteration to access. Reason for Inclusion: Number of objections Key considerations: 5 or more objections Discussion The case officer presented the application, summarised the issues raised by third parties and the responses from consultees. A Daylight and Sunlight BRE study had been undertaken which demonstrates impacts are acceptable, particularly to the conservatory to the north at 312. The arrangements of bikes and bins had been re-configured from a previous refusal of permission, with bikes to the front. Issues of privacy and use of flat roofs could be overcome by condition. No objections from the LLFA or Drainage officer. Ecology report has overcome wildlife concerns and changes to design have resulted in a scheme more in character. Overall, the majority of the representations raised are satisfied through either technical reports or could be satisfied via condition, noting the need for a construction traffic management plan and conditions to remove use of the flat roofs at the rear. To this extent the concerns raised by third parties are not a matter of principle and could be mainly mitigated through a conditional permission which do not give rise to significant planning concerns warranting the committee's consideration. No policy implications arise from the proposal that require important matters of judgement on the implementation of adopted policy that would be of wider significance to the Development Plan. Whilst for three dwellings, the application is neither complex nor of a scale to warrant Committee consideration. Its nature is that of a minor application with only localised impacts. The relevant planning history is relevant but is not complex. Overall, the application does not give rise significant issues of material consideration, policy implementation / interpretation, complexity or nature or through its planning history to merit Planning Committee consideration. Consequently, the Delivery Manager considered the proposal should not be referred to the planning committee on the basis that, following the issuance of these minutes to the meeting, with a deadline of feedback by 8 August, no further discussion is requested from either the Chair or Vice Chair of the Planning Committee. Decision: Do not refer to Planning Committee	AY

3	25/01756/FUL – 55 Greystoke Road Cherry Hinton (5 August) Change of use to large 7no. bed HMO (Sui Generis Use) following conversion of existing garage to habitable space. Cycle parking shelter and refuse storage proposed to front of dwelling Reason for Inclusion: Number of objections Key considerations 5 or more objections Discussion The case officer presented the application. Proposal is for a 6 bed HMO to a 7 bed HMO involving a conversion of the garage space, cycle parking to be provided to front. The case officer noted no objections from Environmental Health and that the proposal complies with licencing standards. 14 objections have been received. These are mainly associated with existing and intensified use of the property, focused on anti-social behaviour. References to late night parties being undertaken. The discussion focused on the lack of existing planning control for the small scale HMO and the ability of the LPA to impose a management plan condition to ensure better management of the property + existing Env. Health controls available to the Council concerning alleged nuisance. As the proposal itself would only allow for one additional occupant, the balance of any additional cumulative use impact would be minimal compared to the benefits of a management plan condition to the applied to the use of the property. Given the existing use, no HMO policy implications arise from the proposal that require important matters of judgement on the implementation of adopted policy. The application is neither complex nor of a scale to warrant Committee consideration. Its nature is that of a minor application involving the additional occupation of one individual. There was no relevant planning or appeal history. Overall, the application does not give rise significant issues of material consideration, policy implementation / interpretation, complexity or nature or through its planning history to merit Planning Committee consideration. Consequently, the Delivery Manager considered the proposal should not be referred to the planning committee on the basis that, following the issuance of the minutes to the meeting, with a deadline of feedback by 8 August, no further discussion is requested from either the Chair or Vice Chair of the Planning Committee. Decision: Do not refer to Planning Committee	DS