

South Cambridgeshire Hall
Cambourne Business Park
Cambourne
Cambridge
CB23 6EA

t: 03450 450 500
f: 01954 713149
dx: DX 729500 Cambridge 15
minicom: 01480 376743
www.scambs.gov.uk



27 February 2015

To: Chairman – Councillor Lynda Harford
Vice-Chairman – Councillor Brian Burling
All Members of the Planning Committee

Quorum: 4

Dear Councillor

This is a supplement to the previously-published agenda for the meeting of **PLANNING COMMITTEE** on **WEDNESDAY, 4 MARCH 2015**, containing those reports which had not been received by the original publication deadline.

Yours faithfully
JEAN HUNTER
Chief Executive

Requests for a large print agenda must be received at least 48 hours before the meeting. Members of the public wishing to speak at this meeting are requested to contact the Support Officer by no later than noon on Monday before the meeting. A public speaking protocol applies.

	AGENDA	PAGES
4.	S/1344/14/FL - Great Eversden (Site known as OSP, 148 Church Street)	1 - 4
5.	S/2216/14/FL - Steeple Morden (48 Station Road)	5 - 6
8.	S/2186/14/FL - Caldecote (115 Highfields Road)	7 - 8

EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

The following statement must be proposed, seconded and voted upon. The officer presenting to report will provide the paragraph number(s).

“I propose that the Press and public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following item number in accordance with Section 100(A) (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that, if present, there would be disclosure to them of exempt information as defined in paragraph of Part 1 of Schedule 12A (as amended) of the Act.”

Notes

- (1) Some development control matters in this Agenda where the periods of consultation and representation may not have quite expired are reported to Committee to save time in the decision making process. Decisions on these applications will only be made at the end of the consultation periods after taking into account all material representations made within the full consultation period. The final decisions may be delegated to the Corporate Manager (Planning and Sustainable Communities).
- (2) The Council considers every planning application on its merits and in the context of national, regional and local planning policy. As part of the Council's customer service standards, Councillors and officers aim to put customers first, deliver outstanding service and provide easy access to services and information. At all times, we will treat customers with respect and will be polite, patient and honest. The Council is also committed to treat everyone fairly and justly, and to promote equality. This applies to all residents and customers, planning applicants and those people against whom the Council is taking, or proposing to take, planning enforcement action. More details can be found on the Council's website under 'Council and Democracy'.

Agenda Item 4

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

27 February 2015

AUTHOR/S: Planning and New Communities Director

Application Number:	S/1344/14/FL
Parish(es):	Great Eversden
Proposal:	Proposed development of 10 affordable dwellings
Site address:	Site known as OSP 148, Church Street, Great Eversden
Applicant(s):	Accent Nene Ltd
Recommendation:	Refuse
Key material considerations:	Principle of development/Green Belt; Landscape character; Heritage Assets; Highway Safety; Ecology; Archaeology; and Other considerations
Committee Site Visit:	Yes
Departure Application:	No
Presenting Officer:	Andrew Fillmore
Application brought to Committee because:	The application site is owned by South Cambridgeshire District Council
Date by which decision due:	6 th March 2015

Update to Report

Representations

1. Further comments have been received from the Parish Council relating to 'two parishes one village', along with a response from the Chairman and Vice-chairman of the Parish Council to the representations from Cllr Page.

Two parishes one village

2. Some who oppose the houses on OS148 now argue that any affordable homes built should be in Little Eversden Parish which may have the greater need. The Parish council make no distinction between the two parishes and believe the suitability and availability of any site is the appropriate criterion.

3. The Eversdens have been closely connected from late Saxon times and are described as a "unit" in Domesday Book in 1088. Parish Records, Vestry records and Annual Village meetings, are recorded from 1852. These were mostly annual but with other occasional meetings if village events demanded. The Parish Council Act of 1949 prompted gatherings in both parishes. Resolutions were proposed that the Parishes should form a Council serving the whole community. This was put to the County Council who suggested four residents from each Parish would suffice. The joint Council was proposed and passed as; "The Eversdens Parish Council", with five representatives from each Parish. The first Council Meeting was held on 15th October that year and they have been held every six weeks or so thereafter.
4. In the thirty years I have been a Parish Councillor I cannot ever recall this 'separateness' being mentioned or discussed for any other issue. At present one Councillor lives in one Parish but stood to "represent" the other. This has been common over the years. When I and my colleagues debate and vote we do so corporately for THE EVERSDENS. We have one set of accounts, prepare the budget and set our precept as one.
5. This joint community is reflected in where we live. A few moments thought brings to mind 9 families, who in their lives have swapped homes between Parishes. This has been particularly prevalent when families occupy social housing as their needs change and houses become available.
6. The Eversdens Parish Council owns the Village Hall, the Allotments and a central Recreation Ground with Sports Pavilion and Play Area. We have a Table Tennis Club, an Eight O'clock Club, The Eversden Players, a monthly coffee morning, the Café Creative for families, one Toddler group and so on.
7. Our two Churches are supported by joint fundraising; one Church fete. We hold one Christmas Fair fundraising for our facilities. We have one requirement for affordable housing. This attempt to split our community is artificial, and unwelcome.

Response to representations from Cllr Page from the chair and vice chair of the Parish Council

8. *There are also indications that various meetings took place at which no minutes or notes appeared, for example 17/9/2013, and there were numerous meetings between the Parish council Chairman, the developers and SC staff which by passed me completely and were not reported to me.*
9. Neither the Chairman or other Parish Council members attended, we can recall no other meetings. On 8th July the Chairman, Vice Chairman and the late John White (who was the Parish councillor dealing with OSP148 on behalf of the PC) did meet with Schuyler Newstead at SCDC offices to discuss the way forward given the impending withdrawal by SCDC of the original planning consent. At this time on 5th July there was an email exchange between Councillor Robin Page and John White which Robin will no doubt have.
10. *Astonishingly in emails the present Chairman Mr Paul Tebbit refers to opponents of the plan to build on OSP148 as Nimbys.*
11. The email shows no lack of respect for those that are against the proposal. It was

sent by the Chairman to Mark Deas thanking him for his attendance at our Parish Council meeting the previous evening, and asking questions that had been raised. Dictionary definition of Nimby; "a person who objects to the siting of developments in their neighbourhood." Whilst rather a shorthand description in the context of the email it infers no lack of respect.

12. *It should be also said that in my view Mr Tebbit actually owns a brown field site where it is highly likely that planning permission for social/affordable housing could be obtained.*
13. Only Councillor Page has been repeatedly suggesting this site. It is a working farm and is not available.
14. *As an open space between the two villages it is also important and it is thought likely that there are important historical aspects that need to be properly explored.*
15. The site is not between the two villages but within Great Eversden. There are three other fields between the villages. No one has yet mentioned the possibility of "important historical aspects".
16. *But yet a document produced for some residents by Bidwells demonstrated quite clearly that other sites could have been considered.*
17. The "consortium" against OSP148 did apparently in Autumn 2013 identify further sites through a survey by Bidwells Land Agents. This information has not been shared with the Parish Council to date.
18. *Interestingly my Freedom of Information revealed that the Council had already received an offer of £50,000 for the site – this offer was apparently refused by the legal officer, Gary Duthie without appearing to refer it to the Planning Committee (email from Gary Duthie to staff 17.6.13) and without reporting it to me as the local member.*
19. The application for OSP148 had already been approved by the Planning Committee in February 2012.
20. *It is interesting to note that objectors to OSP148 carried out a survey. They collected 53 signatures on Great Eversden against the development representing 31 households.*
21. The survey mentioned was carried out in 2006 by 'doorstepping'. The PC carried out an anonymous survey in both villages in the same year and found at that there were 32 Households in favour and 15 against the development of OSP148.
22. Mr Page does not mention the very detailed survey by Cambridgeshire ACRE conducted in January 2014 which confirms a need for 12 affordable houses and finds considerable support for them to be on OSP148, although were not asked to name particular locations.
23. *the hedge along the roadside of the plot should have been declared "important countryside frontage"*
24. The site report notes that the hedge is diseased (elm suckers which grow up and die. A newly planted and well maintained hedge established after the development along with the Orchard and landscaping will be welcome. The proposed scheme

includes a Community Orchard, a children’s play area and a new footpath linking to the Community Village Hall. Importantly this will allow public access to the view of the church especially now that a section of the roadside hedge was surprisingly cut off last spring.

Planning considerations

25. On 28 November 2014, the Minister announced changes in the development thresholds for planning obligations. The statement provided that ‘Due to the disproportionate burden of developer contributions on small scale developers, for sites of 10 units or less, and which have a maximum combined gross floor space of 1000 square metres, affordable housing and tariff style contributions should not be sought.’ These changes were further explained in updates to the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).
26. The updated PPG goes on to advise: **‘The restrictions on seeking planning obligations contributions do not apply to development on Rural Exception Sites’**. As such, should the committee resolve to approve this application, it is officer recommendation that this be subject to the completion of a S106 agreement securing the councils standard contributions (as per table below) towards community facilities, public open space and waste receptacles (£69.50 per dwelling) along with appropriate monitoring fee.

Number of bedrooms	Community facilities	Public open space*
1	£284.08	£625.73
2	£371.00	£817.18
3	£513.04	£1130.04
4+	£703.84	£1550.31

** Figures take into account of onsite open space including Local Area of Play*

Recommendation

27. The updates to the Planning Practice Guidance relate solely to the issue of securing financial contributions and do not alter the officer recommendation, which is that the development is inappropriate for the reasons set out in the main report.

Report Author: Andrew Fillmore – Principal Planning Officer
 Telephone: (01954) 713180

Agenda Item 5

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

4 March 2015

AUTHOR/S: Planning and New Communities Director

Application Number:	S/2216/14/FL
Parish(es):	Steeple Morden
Proposal:	Erection of two detached dwellings, detached garage and access following demolition of existing dwelling.
Site address:	48 Station Road Girton
Applicant(s):	Moatside Properties
Recommendation:	Delegated Approval
Key material considerations:	Principle of Development Visual Impact Residential Amenity Highway Safety
Committee Site Visit:	3 March 2015
Departure Application:	No
Presenting Officer:	John Koch
Application brought to Committee because:	Parish Council recommendation of refusal conflicts with Officers recommendation
Date by which decision due:	29 December 2014

Update to Report

Paragraphs 20 – 28 - Residential Amenity

1. The owner of 50 Station Road, Steeple Morden has written to complain that his objections have not been considered in the report. He has previously objected that the erection of a two storey dwelling as proposed would result in a loss of amenity for 50 Station Road. The report ignores the fact that the first floor windows at the rear of the proposed property will face directly towards our property.
2. Officers note that the distance between the proposed rear bedroom windows in the new dwelling and the front of his property is approximately 23 metres. The District Design Guide recommends a minimum back-to-back distance of 25 metres between

opposing first floor windows. As the overlooking is to the front of the existing property, officers do not consider there will be a seriously harmful loss of amenity.

3. **Paragraph 31 - Other matters**

While it is true the hedge on the southern boundary is not in the applicant's ownership, the neighbour asks if a condition could be imposed preventing the applicant or subsequent owner from complaining to the Council in the future that the hedge is too tall and affecting their enjoyment of their home or garden. If the height of the hedge is reduced as a result of such a complaint then there will be an even greater loss of amenity to them as the first floor windows at the rear of the proposed property will look directly in to the Kitchen and upstairs bedrooms.

4. Unfortunately it is not possible to condition any approval to prevent a request under the High Hedges legislation.

5. The recommendation therefore remains one of delegated approval.

Report Author: John Koch – Team Leader
Telephone: (01954) 713268

Agenda Item 8

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

4 March 2015

AUTHOR/S: Jemima Dean

Application Number:	S/2186/14/FL
Parish:	Caldecote
Proposal:	Change of use of existing annex to create independent 3 bedroom dwelling
Site address:	Westwind, Highfields Road, Highfields Caldecote
Applicant(s):	Mr D Baldwin
Recommendation:	Delegated Approval
Key material considerations:	Principle of Development Design Amenity Highway Safety
Committee Site Visit:	No
Departure Application:	No
Presenting Officer:	John Koch
Application brought to Committee because:	Parish Council recommendation of refusal conflicts with Officers recommendation
Date by which decision due:	28 November 2014

Update to Report

Paragraph 13 – Consultations Caldecote Parish Council

1. The Parish Council has confirmed the reason for the recommendation for refusal was that the property is subject to a section 106 agreement restricting the use of the annexe to be ancillary to the main dwelling.
2. This is confirmed by the section 106 agreement dated 30 November 2012. The underlying reason for this is that the site lay outside the village framework boundary and in the countryside for planning policy purposes in accordance with Local Development Framework policies DP/3 and DP/7.
3. Cllr Hawkins (in her capacity as ward member) has also replied stating the application should not be granted approval, and I do not see that the 5-year housing land supply

issue should be abused by the applicant in this way. Nor the conditions attached to the previous approval be ignored.

4. The above issues are discussed in paragraphs 18 – 25 of the main report. It is a fact that the lack of a five year supply of housing land is a material consideration and one which was not present at the time the annex was originally granted planning permission. Officers remain of the view that the existence of the section 106 agreement does not prevent this application coming forward and that there are insufficient grounds on which to refuse the application.
5. It will, however, be necessary for the applicant to secure a Deed of Modification to the section 106 agreement before any planning permission can be issued.

Report Author: John Koch – Team Leader
Telephone: (01954) 713268