

Delegation meeting - Minutes

- **Date:** 7 July 2020
- **Time:** 11am to 12:30pm
- **Meeting held:** via Teams
- **Attendees:** Chris Carter (CC), Cllr John Batchelor (JB), Lorraine Casey (LC), Julie Ayre (JA), Toby Williams (TW), Luke Simpson (LS), Jane Rodens (JR)
- **Notes and actions:** Jemma Smith

Minutes approved by: Cllr John Batchelor (Consultant) on 09 July 2020, Chris Carter (Delivery Manager – Strategic Sites) on 09 July 2020

S/4451/19/FL - Land At The Rear Of 5 High Street Rampton Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB24 8QE - Demolition of the existing structures and the erection of 4 dwellings with associated infrastructure and works (JR)

Reason for call-in request

Cllr Gough "given the local controversy about the project and that any recommendation to approve would be contrary to our own policy, I wanted to ensure that the decision was taken by Planning Committee, not taken under delegated powers. We need to be more open than that."

Key considerations

The comments of the local member were noted, specifically with regard to adopted policy. The case officer advised that there are objections from a number of consultees as well as members of the public. It was also noted that some letters of support had been received. The case officer advised that the recommendation would be to refuse the application.

The request from the local councillor does raise the issue of adopted policy and it was considered that the scheme, whilst small, is of a nature and complexity that would justify committee consideration. Further, there have been a series of planning applications for this site, presenting a planning history which would merit consideration by the committee.

Decision

Refer to planning committee. See above

20/02381/FUL – Units A to D Norman Park, Bar Hill – Demolition of existing industrial buildings and erection of buildings for B1(c), B2 and B8 uses and associated parking (LS)

Reason for call-in request

‘Purely because the application is major and previous application went to committee. However, this time round the Parish support and there are no neighbour objections.’

Key considerations

This application was referred to the delegation meeting by the case officer due to the previous decision of refusal on the site being taken by the planning committee.

It was noted that this proposal accords with adopted policy, is located within the Bar Hill framework boundary, and is supported by the Parish Council and the case officer. The previous application included A1 retail development, which would not have accorded with policy, however this has been removed from the current scheme.

As the proposal is to re-provide existing B Class buildings, it was not considered that the application should be referred to the planning committee.

Decision

Delegated decision. See above

S/4304/19/FL Abbey Barns Duxford Road Ickleton Saffron Walden Essex CB10 1SX - Two storey extension to Unit 4 for office/research and development uses (Use Class B1) to create new unit and provision of new car parking (LS)

Reason for call-in request

“Ickleton Parish Council OBJECTS to this application, and requests referral to the District Council Planning Committee in the event of Officer support for the proposals. Our grounds for objecting are as follows - We can appreciate that the proposals may be compliant with Policy E/16 Expansion of Existing Businesses in the Countryside as regards conditions a. to c. of the Policy. We have been able in recent years to support several applications relating to this site, but we are concerned about cumulative impacts and feel that little or nothing has been done to address these. In particular more and more land is being given over to car parking. The current application seeks to

The Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service is a strategic partnership between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council

increase the car parking spaces by 11%. There is a perception locally that there are often more vehicles parked on site than there are parking spaces for them. Car parking by staff or visitors will naturally only be part (albeit a large part) of an overall volume of vehicle movements associated with the site. When permission was granted in respect of application ref S/4129/18/FL, a unit not yet built, the following condition was attached: Prior to the occupation of the development, a Framework Travel Plan for the Abbey Barns complex shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Travel Plan should include a masterplan for the whole of the Abbey Barns complex, details of existing travel behaviour, targets and strong incentives including public transport, car sharing and cycle discount vouchers for staff. The Travel Plan shall be monitored annually over a 5-year period with all measures reviewed to ensure targets are met. (This unit incidentally was planned to have 26 additional car parking spaces associated with it. This unit and the present proposal would appear to increase car parking on site by 29%.) Clearly there was an intention to have a Travel Plan in place before consideration of further expansion proposals. In such circumstances we are disappointed that such a Travel Plan was not submitted with the present proposals. In the absence of a Travel Plan, we feel we cannot conclude that there is no unacceptable adverse impact on the countryside with regard to changes of use of land (d. of the Policy). Neither can we conclude that the proposed development would not (by itself or cumulatively) have a significant adverse impact in terms of the amount or nature of traffic generated (f. of the Policy).'

Key considerations

The comments of the Parish Council were carefully considered. It was noted that the key concern related to transport measures, car parking and the use of a travel plan and new bus stop. It was noted that these had been agreed as pre-commencement conditions of another recent application at the site, but that this development had not yet commenced and so the condition had not yet been triggered.

In terms of the key tests for referring an item to the planning committee for decision, it was agreed that material planning considerations had been raised but that these did not raise significant planning concerns as they could be addressed in the same way as with the other recent application at the site. The proposal was not considered to have any significant issues for adopted policy, nor was the nature, scale or complexity considered to warrant a committee decision. Finally, it was noted that the planning history of the site was relevant, but that this should inform the use of conditions in relation to this application rather than justifying a referral to the planning committee.

Decision

Delegated decision. See above