

# Delegation meeting - Minutes

- **Date:** 18 August 2020
- **Time:** 11am to 12:30pm
- **Meeting held:** via Teams
- **Attendees:** Chris Carter (CC), Cllr John Batchelor (JB), Cllr Pippa Heylings (PH), Katie Christodoulides (KC), Tom Gray (TG)
- **Notes and actions:** Jemma Smith

**Minutes approved by:** Cllr John Batchelor (Consultant) on 18 August 2020, Cllr Pippa Heylings (Consultant) on 18 August 2020, Chris Carter (Delivery Manager – Strategic Sites) on 18 August 2020

## **20/02066/FUL- 180 High Street, Harston Erection of a residential development containing nine units comprising a mixture of houses and apartments along with access, car parking, landscaping, and associated infrastructure following demolition of existing buildings.**

### **Reason for call-in request**

Comment: Whilst acknowledging the need for development on the site and the requirement for housing within Harston, this development raises several areas of concern that raise objections: 1. the proposed height of certain elements - particularly the apartments and buildings overlooking neighbours 2. the design and construction materials - whilst not wishing a pastiche design, more sympathetic materials 3. car parking and access - particularly access at a junction on a 40mph road 4. visual impact as an entry point to the village - the high street is primarily a green / tree lined access, this design proposes a brick wall - should require softening / mature vegetation

If the officer is minded to pass this application, I would request it goes to planning committee for consideration.

### **Key considerations**

The comments of the Parish Council were considered carefully with reference to the criteria for referring planning applications to the planning committee.

It was noted that material planning concerns had been raised with regard to the height, design and visual appearance of the proposal. It was agreed that these issues were

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

particularly significant for this site given its visual prominence at this busy junction. This, coupled with the level of public interest meant that it was agreed that the application should be referred to the planning committee for decision.

For completeness, it was not considered that the proposal raised any significant implications for adopted policy, or that the site history was determinative.

## Decision

Refer to Planning Committee. See above

## 20/01369/HFUL - 24 Mill Lane, Linton – single storey extension

### Reason for call-in request

The previous planning applications were generally welcomed to improve a poorly constructed and uninteresting building in a highly visible area at the heart of the historic village. However, we disagree with comments of the Senior Conservation Officer regarding the appropriateness of this extension and particularly the materials to be used. The revised Heritage, Impact and Design Statement still does not recognise that this site borders the designated Village Green - not a playing field - which has specific significance as an important public space in the village and Outstanding Conservation Area. This designation was after the draft appraisal of 2007/8 so would not then have been taken into account in that appraisal. The Statement indicates that this extension is for the use of elderly relatives and a "lifetime home", yet there is no provision for the elderly or disabled, e.g. wheelchair access, wider doors, wet room, etc., so this is patently false. The major concern is that extension remains too high, being notably higher than the current extension on that side. LPC note that the ridge line has been reduced, however this is only by a foot or so and does not alleviate LPC's original concerns. This extension would be intrusive in the long view over The Grip Meadow, further affecting the open rural character of the area and the setting of the Grade 1 listed church and nearby listed buildings and buildings of interest. The views across the valued landscape and character of the area would be adversely affected, especially by the intrusion of its industrial roof. The bulk of the extension is disproportionately large, very similar in footprint to the current house and not subservient to the main building, despite the slightly lower roofline. Being less than 25 metres away from the cottages on the other side of the path: it would fill their outlook and be overbearing with subsequent loss of amenity. The diagrammatic side view does not give a clear idea of how close the building will be to the path, nor the shadowing of the area and inducing a feeling of enclosure for those using the path. We note that the northern boundary hedge has been left to grow much higher than usual, presumably to support the contention that the new structure will be hidden by

the hedge. Another major problem concerns the materials. In this area there are barns - Church Lane with a thatched roof, Coles Lane/High Street corner, Mill House and Hadstock Road with clay tiled roofs, etc. There were other thatched barns that were re-located to Chilford Hall to build the Health Centre - these would be the vernacular materials. Grey metal roofs are only seen in farmyards, fields or as part of industrial units on the outskirts of the village, not within the historic Conservation Area. There is nothing similar as a precedent in the village. This is a steep-pitched roof, not nearly-flat as a church roof might be (as seen in the illustration provided), and would be highly visible. It is an inappropriate material for the area, heavy and industrial, and out of keeping with the house. It would detract from the historic character of the Outstanding Conservation Area. Metal roofs are known to be noisy in rain and hail, so this would also constitute a noise nuisance for the residents and neighbours. We recognise that there are now more details of the "living pool", but this is still sited on floodplain, liable to be flooded and that the contents could affect the protected and rare chalk stream (a Brown Trout Stream), especially as flooding is likely to be exacerbated by the development at Bartlow Road. Swimming here might rather lack privacy, and the Village Green is heavily used, is part of the Safer Route to School, Heritage Trail, etc, as described in previous comments. Please refer to the additional comments sent with the previous application. Should any extension be allowed, it should be conditioned that the pavilion/study/shower room should not be occupied as a separate dwelling from the main house. LPC Decision: Object and refer to the District Council Full Planning Committee

## Key considerations

The comments of the Parish Council were considered carefully with reference to the criteria for referring planning applications to the planning committee.

Whilst noting that the proposal is for a single storey extension to the property, this was noted to be a large extension. It was considered that the Parish Council had raised some material planning concerns, particularly with regard to the conservation area, design and materials. It was also noted that this application had attracted a significant level of public objection, given the relatively minor nature of the proposal.

It was considered that the nature of the application, particularly the materials and its location in the conservation area and adjacent to the village green, was sufficient, when combined with the level of public interest, to justify this application being referred to the planning committee for decision.

For completeness, it was not considered that the proposal raised any significant implications for adopted policy, or that the site history was determinative.

## Decision

Refer to planning committee. See above