

Delegation meeting - Minutes

- **Date:** 1 September 2020
- **Time:** 11am to 12:30pm
- **Meeting held:** via Teams
- **Attendees:** Chris Carter (CC), Cllr John Batchelor (JB), Jane Rodens (JR) Alice Young (AY) Phoebe Carter (PC) Michael Sexton (MS)
- **Notes and actions:** Jemma Smith

Minutes approved by: Cllr John Batchelor (Consultant) on 2 September 2020, Chris Carter (Delivery Manager – Strategic Sites) on 2 September 2020

20/02881/FUL Factory, 84 Duxford Road, Whittlesford, CB22 4NH - Demolition of existing factory premises and the construction of 7 No. dwellings and associated infrastructure, including access, parking, landscaping and ancillary work (Re-submission of S/0029/19/FL)

Reason for call-in request

“At a meeting of Whittlesford Parish Council on 28th July the above proposal to demolish the existing factory premises and construct 7 dwellings was unanimously rejected for the following reasons:

The rear upper windows of the 4 semi-detached properties would overlook the rear gardens of 102 Duxford Road leading to loss of privacy and amenity for the residents of this property.

The proposed semi-detached property nearest to 100 and 102 Duxford Road would it built cause shadowing of these two properties

Since the factory site is in the Cambridge Green Belt and outside the “development framework” of the village any redevelopment for housing should be restricted to “affordable” units for occupation by local residents. The proposal for 3-4 bedroomed, 2-bathroomed detached houses in no way satisfies the normal or anticipated “affordable” housing requirements.

The actual proposed access to the house’s vis a very sharp right-angled bend leaves very much to be desired. Large vehicles such as refuse collection lorries would have considerable difficulty in negotiating this ben particularly since at the bend the road narrows to a single lane.

The access and egress to and from the site onto Duxford Road is relatively narrow and adequate visibility splays would be required to meet road and pavement safety standards.



In the Planning Officer in minded to allow the Application the Parish Council requests that the application be referred to the SCDC Planning Committee and a visit to the site be made prior to any decision as regards approval.”

Key considerations

The comments of the Parish Council were noted.

It was considered that, having regard to the planning history of the site, the previous refusal at planning committee and the policy considerations associated with the site’s location in the Green Belt, that the application does meet the criteria for referral to the planning committee.

Decision

Refer to planning committee. See above.

20/01761/FUL 99-101 Cambridge Road, Milton - Demolition of existing single storey element, erection of rear single storey extension, two storey side extension with roof terrace, overcladding and reform roof profile of existing two storey building

Reason for call-in request

Overdevelopment of the site, 3 storeys with a balcony, additional car parking, limited access for emergency vehicles insufficient design capacity.

Key considerations

The comments of the Parish Council were noted.

It was considered that whilst the issues raised by the Parish Council are material planning considerations, they were not significant in the context of this planning application or the surroundings. The proposal does not raise significant issues for adopted policy, nor is it of a nature, scale or complexity to warrant a referral to the planning committee. Finally, it was not considered that the planning history indicated a requirement for a committee decision.

Decision

Delegated decision. See above

20/02726/HFUL 5 Burgoynes Farm Close Histon & Impington - Conversion of existing open fronted garage into new garden room

Reason for call-in request

Detrimental to the street scene, given the uniformity and character of the development and that open garages are a common feature to the properties. Also access to rear garden and provision of wheelie bins within the conservation area.

Key considerations

The comments of the Parish Council were noted.

The Parish Council did raise material planning considerations in their comments however, given the minor nature of the proposed alterations, it was not considered that these raised significant concerns

The proposal does not raise significant issues for adopted policy, nor is it of a nature, scale or complexity to warrant a referral to the planning committee. Finally, it was not considered that the planning history indicated a requirement for a committee decision.

Decision

Delegated decision. See above

20/02608/HFUL 40 Pelham Way Cottenham - Proposed demolition of existing garage and erection of new single storey extension to the rear/side of the property

Reason for call-in request

No room for parking once the garage is removed and that the proposed extension is overdevelopment of the site

Key considerations

The comments of the Parish Council were noted.

Whilst car parking provision and potential overdevelopment of the site are material planning considerations, they were not considered to raise significant concerns in the context of this planning application. The group did note that we were only considering the call in request rather than the merits of the particular proposal.

The proposal does not raise significant issues for adopted policy, nor is it of a nature, scale or complexity to warrant a referral to the planning committee. Finally, it was not considered that the planning history indicated a requirement for a committee decision.

Decision

Delegated decision. See above

20/02088/HFUL Evergreens, Annexe, Newmarket Road, Stow Cum Quy - Extension and associated works

Reason for call-in request

Stow-Cum-Quy would like to call Planning Consultation for 20/02088/HFUL into a committee please. The Parish Council supports this planning application (and the previous application S/3997/19/FL).

Key considerations

The request of the Parish Council was considered, however there were no reasons given for the call in request. As such, it was not possible to consider the reasons of the Parish.

Notwithstanding, it was noted that this application was similar to one that had been considered by officers previously and that the key issue as it relates to the Green Belt was a straightforward matter that was capable of being a delegated decision.

Decision

Delegated decision. See above

S/2501/19/COND2 Land To The North And South Of Bartlow Road Linton - DOC - Materials

Reason for call-in request

Condition 2: External Materials - Objection

The condition is imposed for the reason of policy HQ/1. This requires:

- all new development “must be of high quality design”
- It must ‘Preserve or enhance the character of the local urban and rural area and respond to its context in the wider landscape’;
- It must provide ‘a coherent, place-responsive design, which is legible and creates a positive sense of place and identity whilst also responding to the local context and respecting local distinctiveness’
- It must be ‘compatible with its location and appropriate in terms of scale, mass, form, siting, design, proportion, materials, texture and colour in relation to the surrounding area’

The proposed materials do not comply with HQ/1 as they are very cheap and synthetic, and do not reflect the distinctive historic materials of the locality and wider landscape, which would include the historic village:

- The roof materials are all concrete, so will fade over time and have a thick texture and profile that is not compatible with the texture and colour of the local context. The concrete ‘pantile’ comes in large blocks of two pantiles, so do not overlap convincingly and the concrete ‘slate’ is much thicker than any slate used in this locality and also interlocks in an unconvincing way. The colours are not clarified.
- The clay pantiles promised to planning committee in the RM application have also been replaced with concrete.
- The bricks are still amongst the cheapest types available. Both types are wirecut, which look cheap and have a texture unlike local bricks. The Surrey red multi is a mix of purple/brown and red not characteristic of Linton and is likely to look patchy, and the Minster Cream also incorporates patches of pink, indicating cheap bricks even in historic contexts.
- No picture is provided of the ‘weatherboarding’ but it is not timber.
- The render is also not clarified, other than ‘render’.
- The windows and doors are upvc and the garadors are painted grp.
- As the District Design Guide notes, these are cheap ‘anywhere materials’, in ‘standardised and intrusive urban’ combinations, that fail to respect the context and local distinctiveness of this village and area. Even affordable housing schemes (such as that at Whaddon) have materials that are of a higher quality than these.

They therefore do not comply with HQ/1 and the conditions should therefore not be discharged.

LPC Decision: Object and do refer this to the District Council Full Planning Committee

Key considerations

The comments of the Parish Council were noted, and whilst detailed technical comments have been provided, it was considered that due to the technical nature of the issue, this matter should be resolved under delegated authority with the advice of specialist officers.

The proposed discharge of condition was not considered to present significant issues for adopted policy, to be of a nature, scale or complexity or have a history that would indicate that the matter should be referred to the planning committee for decision.

Decision

Delegated decision. See above

S/2501/19/COND4 Land To The North And South Of Bartlow Road Linton - DOC - Street Maintenance

Reason for call-in request

Condition 4: Street Management and Maintenance - Objection

The condition requires:

- details of the proposed arrangements for future management and maintenance of the proposed streets within the development
- The streets shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved management and maintenance details until such time as an Agreement has been entered into under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980 or a Private Management and Maintenance Company has been established).

The condition is not complied with:

- The details provided are inconsistent and relate to different versions of the layout. The submission also does not demonstrate it is deliverable within critical areas of the site that are outside the S/1963/15/OL development area. Until there is consistency and an acceptable design, the maintenance scheme is likely to be deficient.
- The submissions (such as the drainage design) show that this is a complex, risky and high maintenance site, but this submission does not demonstrate there is an appropriate level of commitment to management and maintenance over the life of the development:
- There is no certainty over who would carry out the management and maintenance, and who is accountable when there are problems.

- There is no deliverable process for access and maintenance within the many private properties and where access is limited by slopes, level changes, flooding, woodland, narrow paths and cramped design.
- The details submitted are not adequate for adoption by the Highway Authority, in part because the design is not resilient and does not meet industry standards for vehicle and pedestrian movements, and in part because it would be high maintenance and costly.
- The drainage scheme is not demonstrated to be fit for purpose. It does not reach the standard that the Highways Authority would adopt and the submitted drawings cannot be implemented because they conflict with other planning conditions.
- The drawings show a scheme that does not comply with condition 11 of S/1963/15/OL because the drainage does not discharge to the specified manhole.
- That condition was imposed in order to prevent a scheme such as is now proposed which would lead to flooding and pollution.
- The proposed scheme conflicts with the recommendations of the Rossi Long report. This includes a failure to provide for the maintenance regime to be adapted to ensure the cause of flooding does not occur again in the future.

There are inconsistencies which include:

- This re-submission includes plans of the drainage scheme that has not been accepted. The highways and drainage schemes submitted previously were not accepted by the relevant Statutory Authorities, so it is unclear what drainage this refers to.
- CCC consultees have objected and they will not adopt these site roads, for reasons that include the use of Smart Sponges and the steepness of the incline.
- The plans show a sewer that leads uphill from the pumping station toward a manhole on Bartlow Road. There is a specific condition that prohibits that connection (S/1963/15/OL condition 11) and will only allow connection to 7501, to the south west of the site.
- There is no clarity about the scheme, as the drainage slopes do not reflect the land slopes, and both (where dimensioned) are steeper than good practice and Highways guidance.
- There is no clarity about the basis of the design of this scheme, which is on ground with little porosity and where sequences of porosity tests have consistently failed.
- Drainage appears to depend upon passive infiltration in soakaways and drives, which would not be suitable for the frequent flooding events that are known even after modest rainfall.
- The main soakaway for the primary spine road on the Southern site is located in the river silt where the site has previously flooded, so is likely to fail and to allow contaminated water to overflow.
- The infiltration testing in the submission was inadequate, with testing failing despite the previous prolonged dry weather. The data from 2017 does not represent peak seasonal

levels and describes 3 results selected from 14 trial pits and an assorted series of depths, which does not accord with due process.

- The original design was based on permeable surfaces, but the streets are now impermeable.
- There are no road drains located to deal with surface water flooding from the fields and Bartlow Road.
- There are no road drains at the foot of the steep slopes of the spine roads to protect the houses directly below.
- The road drain scheme appears to be based on a flat site, rather than slopes of 5 metres on the Northern site and 7 metres on the Southern site.
- Without an adequate drainage system and flood prevention measures, the flooding of the development site and village centre is likely, along with contamination of the protected chalk stream.
- The checking and maintenance schedule would appear to be less frequent than would seem necessary for the conditions of the area.
- This schedule refers to Smart Sponges which are expensive to maintain and are likely to fail in flood conditions. These are not adoptable by CCC Highways, who are aware of the issues with them.
- The private maintenance areas contained in the tightly defined dotted lines do not include the soakaways they drain to. The soakaways are likely to be where most of the problems occur, and therefore the accountability is likely to fall to individual householders instead of the developer / management company. That is not an appropriate scheme.
- The maintenance schedule does not include who is accountable for the maintenance, how that is to be dealt with and access is to be gained to the many private properties involved, and what the process would be when there are failures and/or blockages, such as are likely where the scheme proposes excessive slopes and high maintenance smart sponges. There is no detail about who the company is, when they take on the responsibility, and that there is confirmation that they will be responsible for the management and maintenance of the entire scheme in perpetuity.

The submission does not ensure satisfactory development of the site and to ensure estate roads are managed and maintained thereafter to a suitable and safe standard in the interests of highway safety to comply with Policy HQ/1 of the adopted Local Plan 2018. The condition should therefore not be discharged. The proposed management and maintenance scheme also fails to demonstrate it is robust and deliverable, and that it would not cause flooding and maintenance burdens on the existing and new residents.

LPC Decision: Object and do refer this to the District Council Full Planning Committee

Key considerations

The comments of the Parish Council were noted, and whilst detailed technical comments have been provided, it was considered that due to the technical nature of the issue, this matter should be resolved under delegated authority with the advice of specialist officers.

The proposed discharge of condition was not considered to present significant issues for adopted policy, to be of a nature, scale or complexity or have a history that would indicate that the matter should be referred to the planning committee for decision.

Decision

Delegated decision. See above

S/2501/19/COND7 Land To The North And South Of Bartlow Road Linton - DOC - Cycle Stores

Reason for call-in request

Condition 7: Cycle Stores - Objection

The condition requires: • ‘details of the cycle stores’

• The reason is ‘To provide adequate cycle parking in accordance with Policy TI/3 of the adopted Local Plan 2018’.

The relevant policies require residential cycle storage to be:

- within a covered, lockable enclosure; in the form of a shed or garage;
- Secure, accessible and convenient.
- designed and located to minimise conflict between cycles, pedestrians and vehicles. General design policy HG/1 requires high quality design.

The condition is not complied with:

- The proposed cycle storage areas are not accessible and convenient. For several houses (48m 36-38, 18-23, etc) the cycles will have to be carried up steps to reach the store.
- For the houses accessible by paths alone, such as along the western boundary, the access paths are narrow, cramped and shared.

The need to provide high quality design is not complied with:

- The cheap prefabricated metal boxes being provided are not high quality design.

- The area is damp, with poor porosity, so metal containers will soon rust and become unsightly.

The proposals are likely to lead to harm:

- The poorly accessed stores are unlikely to be used, and therefore cycle parking is likely to be uncontrolled and cycles parked in public and prominent areas
- There are likely to be conflicts between cycles, pedestrians and vehicles.
- The lack of robust high quality design is likely to lead to a loss of storage provision during the life of the development.

As the proposals do not meet the requirements of Condition 7, the condition should not be discharged.

LPC Decision: Object and do refer this to the District Council Full Planning Committee

Key considerations

The comments of the Parish Council were noted, and whilst detailed technical comments have been provided, it was considered that due to the technical nature of the issue, this matter should be resolved under delegated authority with the advice of specialist officers.

The proposed discharge of condition was not considered to present significant issues for adopted policy, to be of a nature, scale or complexity or have a history that would indicate that the matter should be referred to the planning committee for decision.

Decision

Delegated decision. See above

S/2501/19/COND9 Land To The North And South Of Bartlow Road Linton - DOC – LEAP

Reason for call-in request

Condition 9: LEAP Proposals - Objection

The condition requires:

- details of the proposed Local Equipped Area of Play to including the location, number and types of pieces of play equipment.
- The reason is 'To ensure the Local Equipped Area of Play is satisfactory in accordance with Policy SC/7 of the adopted Local Plan 2018'

Policy SC/7 requires that the play areas comply with the Open Spaces SPD, which requires good quality designs that ‘meet the needs of local children; that they are attractive, safe and creative places where children and teenagers can enjoy physical activity, socialising and quiet contemplation. The design of equipped play areas is vital to ensuring the maximum possible benefit to physical development, fitness and the play experience.’

The condition is not complied with as:

- There is a failure to provide a representative range of equipment suitable for a range of age groups, and teenagers are excluded by the design.
- The older children are not provided for and the Recreation ground is some 1.8km away - over 2km to the LVC sports fields and sports centre.
- Again the quality is low, being cheap wooden types liable to degenerate quickly in the damp areas of the site.
- The quantity of equipment is low for the expected number of children.
- The age range catered for is limited, without anything for older children, children or items suitable for other age groups (Trim Trails, etc).

The proposal therefore does not comply with policy SC/7 and the condition should not be discharged.

LPC Decision: Object and do refer this to the District Council Full Planning Committee

Key considerations

The comments of the Parish Council were noted, and whilst detailed technical comments have been provided, it was considered that due to the technical nature of the issue, this matter should be resolved under delegated authority with the advice of specialist officers.

The proposed discharge of condition was not considered to present significant issues for adopted policy, to be of a nature, scale or complexity or have a history that would indicate that the matter should be referred to the planning committee for decision.

Decision

Delegated decision. See above

S/1963/15/COND20 Land To The North And South Of Bartlow Road Linton – Lighting

Reason for call-in request

Discharge of condition 20 - Lighting Scheme – Holding Objection

This condition requires:

‘a lighting scheme, to include details of any external lighting of the site such as street lighting, floodlighting, security lighting’

It shall include a layout plan with beam orientation, full isolux contour maps and a schedule of equipment in the design (luminaire type, mounting height, aiming angles and luminaire profiles, angle of glare) And shall assess artificial light impact in accordance with the Institute of Lighting Engineers (2005) ‘Guidance Notes for the Reduction of obtrusive Light’.

The requirement has not been complied with:

- The submission only includes details of 12 street lights.
- There are no details provided of lighting for individual houses. It is clear that lighting will be necessary, as many of the house are beyond the areas lit by the 12 street lights, and a significant number are accessed via steps and slopes on this steeply sloping site. It is unrealistic and unsafe to leave this lighting unmanaged.

The submission is flawed:

- This again is a re-submission of a previous document that is not updated to the June 2020 amended scheme. The document describes its remit as a ‘desktop exercise’ so does not take into account the levels, slopes and site specifics. As the planning drawings consistently fail to show the existing neighbouring bungalows and these bungalows are not on streetview, they are unlikely to be adequately assessed. The natural environment is also not likely to be appropriately assessed as a ‘desktop exercise’.
- This is a very sensitive area, highly visible over the valued landscape and on rising ground. • The submission proposes no lighting away from the main spine road, which is unrealistic and ensures that lighting on this site (housing, garages, gardens, etc) is likely to be uncontrolled.
- This appears to be inconsistent with the plans provided for the Pumping Station condition, which shows bollards which appear to have lights.
- Concerns remain over light spillage outside of the development, distraction of lights to drivers on the A1307 and effect of light on wildlife and the amenity of the nearby Pocket Park /Leadwell Meadows wildlife and public leisure area.

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

The submission does not demonstrate that it provides a realistic scheme that provides all details of lights and the likely light pollution arising from the development. It therefore should not be approved. LPC Decision: Object and do refer this to the District Council Full Planning Committee

Key considerations

The comments of the Parish Council were noted, and whilst detailed technical comments have been provided, it was considered that due to the technical nature of the issue, this matter should be resolved under delegated authority with the advice of specialist officers.

The proposed discharge of condition was not considered to present significant issues for adopted policy, to be of a nature, scale or complexity or have a history that would indicate that the matter should be referred to the planning committee for decision.

Decision

Delegated decision. See above

S/1963/15/COND22 Land To The North And South Of Bartlow Road Linton - DOC - Fire Hydrants

Reason for call-in request

Discharge of condition 22 - Fire Hydrants - Objection

This condition requires: 'a scheme for the provision and location of fire hydrants to serve the development to a standard recommended by the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service'.

The submission is flawed:

- Many of the hydrants in the Southern Site cannot be accessed by fire engines and are located where fire engines cannot turn round. They are located up steep slopes, along paths and steps in parts of the site where the roads are not adopted and the paths are much narrower than 3.7m wide.
- The roads, paths and turning areas where they are located are steeply sloping.
- The roads are not adopted by Highways, in part because of the steep slopes.
- The layout is based on a desktop exercise and there is no evidence that Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service would be able to access these hydrants.

Due to the constraints of the site, and the Highways Authority's refusal to adopt the access and road systems within the site (because they are inadequate for use by

vehicles), a desk-based exercise is unlikely to demonstrate that this scheme would 'ensure an adequate water supply is available for emergency use'.

LPC Decision: Object and do refer this to the District Council Full Planning Committee

Key considerations

The comments of the Parish Council were noted, and whilst detailed technical comments have been provided, it was considered that due to the technical nature of the issue, this matter should be resolved under delegated authority with the advice of specialist officers.

The proposed discharge of condition was not considered to present significant issues for adopted policy, to be of a nature, scale or complexity or have a history that would indicate that the matter should be referred to the planning committee for decision.

Decision

Delegated decision. See above