

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

At a meeting of the Development and Conservation Control Committee held on
Wednesday, 7 December 2005 at 10.10 a.m.

PRESENT: Councillor Dr JPR Orme – Chairman
Councillor NIC Wright – Vice-Chairman

Councillors:	RE Barrett	JD Batchelor
	Mrs PS Corney	SM Edwards
	Mrs A Elsby	R Hall
	Mrs SA Hatton	Mrs JM Healey
	Dr DR Bard	SGM Kindersley
	RB Martlew	Mrs JA Muncey
	Mrs CAED Murfitt	CR Nightingale
	R Page	EJ Pateman
	Mrs DP Roberts	Mrs HM Smith
	Mrs DSK Spink MBE	JH Stewart
	RJ Turner	Dr JR Williamson
	SS Ziaian-Gillan	

Councillors Dr JA Heap, MJ Mason and Mrs VM Trueman were in attendance, by invitation.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Mrs J Dixon, Mrs CA Hunt, HC Hurrell and JF Williams.

1. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Committee authorised the Chairman to sign, as an accurate record, the Minutes of the meeting held on 2nd November 2005, subject to an addition to Minute no. 32 (Appeals against planning decisions and enforcement action - 44 Station Road, Histon) reflecting the comment from Councillor MJ Mason that Inspector Ormerod of Cambridgeshire Constabulary had attended the hearing to give evidence only rather than to support or oppose the appellant's case.

2. MEMBERSHIP OF CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Councillors JD Batchelor, SGM Kindersley and RJ Turner declared their membership of Cambridgeshire County Council, as a personal interest, in respect of every item on the agenda on which that Authority had been consulted.

3. S/2102/05/F - BOURN

APPROVAL contrary to the recommendation contained in the report from the Director of Development Services. Members considered the proposal provided local employment, had local support, made full use of a brownfield site, constituted rural diversification, and posed no significant intrusion into the countryside. The increase in floor space was not considered to be contrary to Policy EM 10 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.

During the course of the debate, Councillor R Page made certain comments with which Councillor SGM Kindersley, as Leader of the Council, took issue because it was important to prevent the Council from being brought into disrepute. Councillor Kindersley questioned Councillor Page's attendance record, but withdrew his comments unreservedly once it was clarified that Councillor Page had attended part of the meeting in November 2005. The exchange of views left open the questions of a formal complaint being

submitted by Councillor Page, and of reference to the Standards Committee.

Councillor Mrs CAED Murfitt declared a personal interest in this application, being distantly related to one of the applicants.

Councillor NIC Wright declared a personal interest by virtue of a passing acquaintance with some of the applicants.

4. S/1954/05/F - COMBERTON

DELEGATED APPROVAL subject to receipt of an approved junction layout plan incorporating, into the vehicular access, various geometric standards in terms of width, radii, and visibility, contrary to the recommendation contained in the report from the Director of Development Services. Members considered that the proposal represented appropriate rural diversification in an ideal and safe location. They noted that there was no suitable or available site outside the Green Belt and in the Village Framework, the current shortage of Montessori nursery places in the locality, and considered, therefore, that there existed special circumstances in this case for permitting development in the Green Belt, subject to the application being referred to the Secretary of State as a departure from the Development Plan.

Councillor R Page declared a personal interest as Chairman of the Countryside Restoration Trust, which owns land adjacent to the site.

Councillor Mrs DSK Spink declared a personal interest by virtue of her acquaintance with the applicant's father.

Councillor NIC Wright declared a personal interest by virtue of his acquaintance with the applicant.

Councillor SGM Kindersley declared that he was a fully paid-up member of the Countryside Restoration Trust.

Miss Chris Westgarth, Chairman of Comberton Parish Council, addressed the meeting.

5. S/1955/05/F - COMBERTON

Members noted that this application had been **WITHDRAWN** by the applicant.

6. S/2022/05/O - RAMPTON

REFUSED for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services.

7. S/1260/05/F - GAMLINGAY

DELEGATED APPROVAL / DELEGATED REFUSAL. Approval personal to the applicant, contrary to the recommendation contained in the report from the Director of Development Services, for a temporary period of five years and subject to it being a replacement for an existing mobile home, and to landscaping and other safeguarding Conditions. The application would be refused if not a replacement for an existing mobile home.

8. S/1993/05/F - GIRTON

DELEGATED APPROVAL for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of

Development Services, subject to no objections being received from the Chief Environmental Health Officer, the receipt of approved plans detailing screening of the units, and to the Conditions referred to in the report.

9. S/1741/05/O - HARDWICK

APPROVAL in accordance with the amended recommendation for approval contained in the report from the Director of Development Services.

10. S/1237/05/F - HARSTON

DELEGATED APPROVAL / DELEGATED REFUSAL. Subject to the receipt of amended plans showing satisfactory improvements to the design of the building, approval would be granted for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services and subject to the Conditions referred to therein. Failing such resolution, the application would be refused on design grounds.

11. S/1869/05/F - HISTON

DELEGATED APPROVAL, subject to the applicant agreeing to revise the design so as to address the concerns raised by the Conservation Manager, and to a Condition requiring the undertaking of an archaeological survey, contrary to the recommendation contained in the report from the Director of Development Services. Members considered that the reasons for refusal detailed in the report could be overcome by negotiation, and that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the locality.

Councillor MJ Mason, in attendance as a local Member, declared his membership of Histon Parish Council. He was present at the Parish Council meeting at which this item had been discussed, but was now considering it afresh at the Development and Conservation Control Committee meeting.

12. S/1953/05/F - HISTON

APPROVAL for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to receipt of corrected drawings and to amended plans date stamped 16th November 2005, and to the Conditions referred to in the report.

13. S/1613/05/F - LINTON

APPROVAL, as amended by drawing no. SC.163.6 Revision.C date stamped 2nd December 2005, contrary to the recommendation contained in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the prior completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement requiring a contribution of £10,000 towards education provision, and safeguarding Conditions relating to, among other things, materials and landscaping. Members considered that the proposal was in broad compliance with Policies EM8 and SE2(d) of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004, given that the location of the site close to the High Street / A1307 junction rendered the retention of the site for employment purposes unsatisfactory.

Councillor JD Batchelor declared his membership of Linton Parish Council. He took no part in the discussion of this item by the Parish Council, and was now considering it afresh at the Development and Conservation Control Committee meeting.

14. S/1907/05/O - LONGSTANTON

Members noted that this application had been **WITHDRAWN** by the applicant.

15. S/2118/05/F - GT & LT CHISHILL

Members were **MINDED TO APPROVE** the application, subject to the receipt of a further plan showing the new buildings to be identical to the conversion works previously permitted, to it being advertised as a Departure from the Development Plan, to it being referred to the Secretary of State and not being called in by him for determination, and to the Conditions referred to in the report from the Director of Development Services.

16. S/2006/05/F - MELBOURN

DELEGATED REFUSAL for the reasons outlined in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the comments of the Local Highways Authority, the Ecology Officer and the Countryside Services Team at Cambridgeshire County Council..

RESOLVED to authorise officers to instigate formal enforcement action to secure the removal of unauthorised structures, hardstandings and storage containers and to secure the cessation of the unauthorised uses of land with a six months compliance period, and to commence prosecution proceedings in the Magistrates Court, should the Enforcement Notice not be complied with, subject to a reconsideration of material circumstances at that time.

17. S/2041/05/F - ELSWORTH

Members noted that this application had been **WITHDRAWN** from the agenda.

18. S/1879/05/F & S/2080/04/F - SAWSTON

DELEGATED REFUSAL of application S/1879/04/F following the consideration of any comments received from those notified on 1st December 2005 on the grounds that the proposal would result in a further dwelling being served off this private road resulting in additional congestion on the road and thereby inconvenience to residents and, as the road and road drainage will remain private, potential problems in ensuring that the road drainage is adequately maintained. As the amendment to application S/2080/04/F was as a consequence of application S/1879/05/F, Members also resolved to refuse the amendment.

Councillors Dr DR Bard and Mrs SA Hatton declared their membership of Sawston Parish Council. They took no part in the discussion of this item by the Parish Council, and were now considering it afresh at the Development and Conservation Control Committee meeting.

19. S/1203/05/LB & S/1204/05/F - ABINGTON PIGOTTS

APPROVAL of both applications, as amended by plans date stamped 3rd November 2005, drawing Nos. 04027-07C, 04027-08C, 04027-09G, 04027-10C, 04027-11E, and date stamped 6th October 2005, and drawing Nos. 04027-06C, 04027-12C, 04027-13C, for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the Conditions referred to therein.

20. S/1785/05/F - STAPLEFORD

Members noted that this application had been **WITHDRAWN**.

21. S/1608/05/LB & S/1609/05/F - GT SHELFORD

DELEGATED APPROVAL, as amended by plans date stamped 23rd November 2005 and 2nd December 2005 for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the Conditions referred to therein, and to the applicant, officers and local Members agreeing on a position for the front door.

Councillor SM Edwards declared a prejudicial interest in this application because of his friendship with one of the applicants, withdrew from the Chamber prior to the consideration thereof, did not contribute to the debate and did not vote.

Councillor CR Nightingale declared his Chairmanship of Great Shelford Parish Council. He took no part in the discussion of this item by the Parish Council, and was now considering it afresh at the Development and Conservation Control Committee meeting.

22. S/1581/05/F - GREAT SHELFORD

DELEGATED REFUSAL on the grounds that, by virtue of the density, form, scale and height of the proposed buildings and as the existing and proposed landscaping would not adequately screen the development from the adjoining countryside and Green Belt, the development would not be in keeping with surrounding development and would not provide for an appropriate edge to the village; and, if the Local Highway Authority continues to object to the proposal, also for the reason set out in the report from the Director of Development Services including reference to the proximity of the access to the level crossing. The proposal therefore was contrary to Policy SE 9 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.

Councillor CR Nightingale declared his Chairmanship of Great Shelford Parish Council. He took no part in the discussion of this item by the Parish Council, and was now considering it afresh at the Development and Conservation Control Committee meeting. He also declared his membership of the Great Shelford Village Design Group, but did not attend the meeting from which the comments referred to in paragraphs 30 and 31 of the report originated.

23. S/2105/05/F - FEN DITTON

DELEGATED APPROVAL for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the receipt of revised plans, to there being no objections raised as a result of ongoing consultations, and to the Conditions referred to in the report.

24. S/2040/05/F - FEN DITTON

REFUSED contrary to the recommendation contained in the report from the Director of Development Services. Having visited the site, Members felt that the proposal was out of keeping with the locality, and conflicted therefore with Policies SE 4 and HG11 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004. In addition, they considered that the proposal would harm the Conservation Area in breach of Policy EN30 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004, and Policy P7/6 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003.

Councillor RJ Turner declared his membership of Fen Ditton Parish Council. He took no part in the discussion of this item by the Parish Council, and was now considering it afresh at the Development and Conservation Control Committee meeting.

25. S/1744/05/F - THRILOW

APPROVAL for the reasons set out in the Director of Development Services's report to the Development and Conservation Control Committee meeting on 2nd November 2005, subject to the Conditions referred to therein.

26. S/1898/05/F - WEST WRATTING

REFUSED for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services.

Councillors Dr DR Bard, RE Barrett, Dr JPR Orme and NIC Wright had been lobbied by the applicant, but had listened only to what he had to say and did not respond.

27. S/2079/05/F - CASTLE CAMPS

Members noted that this application had been **WITHDRAWN**.

28. APPEALS AGAINST PLANNING DECISIONS AND ENFORCEMENT ACTION

The Committee **NOTED** the following from the report prepared by the Director of Development Services:

- Decision
notified
by the
Secretary
of State
In
respect
of
S/
18
19
/0
4/
F
(M

oa
t
Fa
rm

,
E
as
t
H
atl
ey
)
C
ou
nc
ill
or
S
G
M
Ki
nd
er
sl
ey
de
cl
ar
ed
th
at
he
w
as
Cl
er
k
to
H
atl
ey
P
ari
sh
C
ou
nc
il.

- S
u
m
m
ari
es

of
re
ce
nt
de
ci
si
on
s
of
int
er
es
t

C
ou
nc
ill
or
R
H
all
w
as
no
t
pr
es
en
t
in
th
e
C
ha
m
be
r
for
thi
s
ite
m.

- A
pp
ea
ls
re
ce
iv
ed
- A
pp

- ea
ls
wi
th
dr
a
w
n
or
po
st
po
ne
d
A
dv
an
ce
no
tifi
ca
tio
n
of
fut
ur
e
Lo
ca
l
In
qu
iry
an
d
Inf
or
m
al
H
ea
rin
g
da
te
s
(s
ub
je
ct
to
po
st
po
ne

m
en
t
or
ca
nc
ell
ati
on
)

There were no Local Inquiries or Informal Hearings prior to the next meeting of the Development and Conservation Control Committee on 4th January 2006.

29. MAJOR APPLICATIONS

The Committee **NOTED** that, following last year's letter from the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister setting South Cambridgeshire District Council a new target for the percentage of major applications determined within 13 weeks, a further letter had been received from the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister on the subject. A report from the Deputy Director of Development Services outlined the actions that would be necessary in order to achieve the new target.

The most significant action required was to secure full staffing levels within the Development Control Section as quickly as possible. It was essential that the case load be reduced to, and then maintained at, a figure of about 150 per Case Officer.

The Leader of the Council expressed concern at increased officer workloads brought about by mounting development pressures, extra responsibilities imposed on local government by central Government (without any increase in financial support), and the general adverse effects of having been Council Tax capped, resulting in the reduction in budget levels, and the leaving unfilled of vacant posts. He urged officers to state the Council's case very forcefully through agencies such as Cambridgeshire Horizons.

Other Members highlighted the specific resource-intensive issues of infrastructure provision and community development in new settlements such as Northstowe. The recently announced Development Tax initiative gave further cause for concern.

RESOLVED That Development Services Department resources be concentrated on achieving the recovery plan outlined in the report from the Deputy Director of Development Services.

30. TREE PRESERVATION ORDER IN CALDECOTE, AND SUGGESTED FUTURE PROCESS

Members noted the recent service of a Tree Preservation Order in respect of land at 72 Highfields, Caldecote, and considered streamlining the process for dealing with Tree Preservation Orders.

RESOLVED

(1) th
at
se
rvi

ce
of
Tr
ee
Pr
es
er
va
tio
n
Or
de
r
16
/0
5/
S
C
at
72
Hi
gh
fie
ld
s,
C
al
de
co
te
be
**N
O
T
E
D**,
an
d
th
at
off
ic
er
s
be
gi
ve
n
de
le
ga
te
d
au
th

ori
ty
to
co
nfi
rm
it,
su
bj
ec
t
to
th
er
e
be
in
g
no
ob
je
cti
on
s;
an
d

- (2) Th
at
de
le
ga
te
d
au
th
ori
ty
be
gi
ve
n
to
th
e
Tr
ee
s
an
d
La
nd
sc
ap
e

Of
fic
er
or,
in
th
at
off
ic
er'
s
ab
se
nc
e,
to
th
e
Tr
ee
s
an
d
La
nd
sc
ap
e
As
si
st
an
t
•

•

th
at
th
e
D
ev
el
op
m
en
t
an
d
C
on
se
rv
ati
on
C
on
tro
l
C
o
m
mi
tte
e
(o
r
its
su
cc
es

so
r
co
m
mi
tte
e
or
Gr
ou
p)
re
se
rv
e
to
its
elf
de
ter
mi
na
tio
n
of
w
he
th
er
or
no
t
to
co
nfi
rm
th
os
e
Or
de
rs
to
w
hi
ch
ob
je
cti
on
s
ar
e
rai
se

d
an
d,
if
so
,
wi
th
or
wi
th
ou
t
m
od
ifi
ca
tio
n.

31. CAMBOURNE MASTERPLAN

The Committee considered a report seeking amendment of the Master Phasing plan, part of the overall Masterplan, which sets out a guide as to the number of dwellings to be constructed Lower, Upper and Greater Cambourne.

The New Village / Special Projects Officer (Cambourne) referred to a number of concerns raised by local residents, mainly centred on the perceived adverse impact on the character of Cambourne.

A Member stated that communities had to evolve in the context of changing commercial circumstances. In the case of Cambourne, the Developers had expressed concern about the future viability of the project in the absence of a recognition of the need for such adjustment. It remained to be seen whether or not further development in Cambourne would come forward under the Local Development Framework.

RESOLVED

Th
at,
su
bj
ec
t
to
th
e
co
m
pl
eti
on
of
th
e
M
e

m
or
an
du
m
of
U
nd
er
st
an
di
ng
an
d
to
th
er
e
be
in
g
no
ad
ve
rs
e
co
m
m
en
ts
fro
m
C
a
m
bo
ur
ne
P
ari
sh
C
ou
nc
il,
th
e
m
ov
in
g
of
64

un
its
fro
m
U
pp
er
C
a
m
bo
ur
ne
to
Gr
ea
t
C
a
m
bo
ur
ne
be
ap
pr
ov
ed
as
an
a
m
en
d
m
en
t
to
th
e
ex
ist
in
g
M
as
ter
pl
an
.

The Meeting ended at 3.00 p.m.

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

At a meeting of the Development and Conservation Control Committee held on
Wednesday, 2 November 2005 at 10.00 a.m.

Councillors:	Dr DR Bard	RE Barrett
	JD Batchelor	RF Bryant
	Mrs PS Corney	SM Edwards
	Mrs A Elsby	R Hall
	Mrs SA Hatton	Mrs JM Healey
	Mrs CA Hunt	SGM Kindersley
	RB Martlew	Mrs JA Muncey
	Mrs CAED Murfitt	CR Nightingale
	EJ Pateman	Mrs DP Roberts
	Mrs HM Smith	Mrs DSK Spink MBE
	JF Williams	Dr JR Williamson
	SS Ziaian-Gillan	

Councillors MJ Mason and TJ Wotherspoon were in attendance, by invitation.

1. CHAIRMAN OF THE MEETING

In the absence of Councillor Dr. JPR Orme, Councillor NIC Wright (Vice-Chairman of the Development and Conservation Control Committee) took the Chair for the duration of the meeting.

2. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs J Dixon, HC Hurrell, Dr JPR Orme, JH Stewart and RJ Turner.

3. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN FOR THE MEETING

Councillor NIC Wright proposed that Councillor Mrs JM Healey be appointed Vice-Chairman of the meeting. This was seconded by Councillor SGM Kindersley and it was

RESOLVED That Councillor Mrs JM Healey be appointed Vice-Chairman of the meeting

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Committee authorised the Chairman to sign, as a correct record, the Minutes of the meeting held on 5th October 2005.

5. S/1845/05/F - STAPLEFORD

REFUSED, as amended by plans date stamped 27th October 2005, contrary to the recommendation contained in the report from the Director of Development Services. Members considered that, by virtue of the size and scale of the proposed houses, the development would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of development along this section of Hinton Way.

6. S/1608/05/LB AND S/1609/05/F - GREAT SHELFORD

WITHDRAWN from the agenda.

7. S/1209/05/F - LITTLE SHELFORD

DELEGATED REFUSAL contrary to the recommendation contained in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to independent highways advice (in accordance with protocol) endorsing the Committee's reason for refusal based on concern about traffic flow and use of the existing access onto Church Street as the sole access for the existing restaurant and residential accommodation on the site. Otherwise, the Council could be faced with paying costs at appeal should it not be able to provide substantive evidence to support a Highway objection. Having visited the site, Members cited concerns over the adequacy of car parking provision and loss of open space in the Conservation Area as further reasons for refusal. Members requested that, should the independent highways advice not be supportive of a refusal on highways grounds, the application should be presented again to a future meeting of the Committee.

8. S/1447/05/F - HORNINGSEA

REFUSED contrary to the recommendation contained in the report from the Director of Development Services. Having visited the site, Members expressed reservations about the proposed design, especially of the flat-roofed element, and considered that the proposal would not complement existing buildings adjacent to the site, and would detract from the Conservation Area. It therefore conflicted with Policies P1/3 and P7/6 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and SE5, EN30 and EN31 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.

9. S/1744/05/F - THRILOW

DEFERRED for a site visit.

10. S/1715/05/F - WILLINGHAM

APPROVAL for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the Conditions referred to therein.

11. S/1747/05/F - WILLINGHAM

APPROVAL, as amended by an e-mail dated 12th October 2005 from the applicant, for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the Conditions referred to therein.

12. S/1644/05/A - WILLINGHAM

APPROVAL of the lantern closest to the entrance door, subject to the Conditions referred to in the report from the Director of Development Services.

REFUSED consent for the lantern on the western end of the front elevation because it would result in unnecessary light pollution and visual clutter when viewed in conjunction with existing signage and the adjacent street light and, therefore, have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, thus conflicting with Policy EN39 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.

13. S/1710/05/F - WILLINGHAM

APPROVAL, as amended by plans (90) 01A and (21) 02A dated 11th October 2005 and

plan dated 21st October 2005, for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the Conditions referred to therein.

14. S/1771/05/F - LOLWORTH

REFUSED in line with the amended recommendation contained in the report from the Director of Development Services, on the grounds of the scale of development and the need to protect the horse chestnut tree on site. Members noted that service of the Tree Preservation Order was imminent.

Mrs Louise Milbourn, Chairman of Lolworth Parish Meeting, addressed the Committee.

15. S/1732/05/F - DRY DRAYTON

APPROVAL for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the Conditions referred to therein.

Councillor SM Edwards declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this application because his business rents a unit nearby on the Industrial Estate, and withdrew from the Chamber prior to its consideration. He took no part in the debate and did not vote.

16. S/6310/05/O - CAMBOURNE

REFUSED for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services.

17. S/1709/05/F - COTTENHAM

REFUSED for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services.

18. S/1674/05/RM - DUXFORD

APPROVAL of Reserved Matters (siting, design and external appearance of the buildings) as amended by plan date stamped 31st October 2005, pursuant to outline planning permission dated 14th June 2004, reference S/0791/04/O, for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the Conditions referred to therein.

Councillor Mrs HM Smith declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this application due to her friendship with the occupier of 53 Moorfield Road, and withdrew from the Chamber prior to its consideration. She took no part in the debate, and did not vote.

19. S/1787/05/F - FOWLMERE

APPROVAL for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the Conditions referred to therein (Condition 3 requiring window additionally to be non-opening)

20. S/1818/05/F - GIRTON

APPROVAL for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the Conditions referred to therein.

Councillor SM Edwards declared a personal interest in this application by virtue of being a customer of the applicants.

21. S/1650/05/O - HARSTON

REFUSED for the reasons set out in the report.

22. S/1237/05/F - HARSTON

DEFERRED for a site visit and for further information, including details of ownership of New Road.

23. S/1651/05/RM - IMPINGTON

REFUSED contrary to the recommendation contained in the report from the Director of Development Services. Members considered the proposal to be of poor design.

24. S/1544/05/F - SHEPRETH

REFUSED for the reason set out in the report from the Director of Development Services.

25. S/1809/05/PNT - FEN DRAYTON

PRIOR APPROVAL for the siting and appearance of the telecommunications monopole and associated development, subject to its colour being determined by officers.

26. S/1713/05/O - TEVERSHAM

REFUSED for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services.

27. S/1669/05/F - TEVERSHAM

DELEGATED APPROVAL / REFUSAL. Delegated approval was given for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to there being no new significant objections to the revised plans; to the prior completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement securing affordable housing; public art and an education contribution; to the Conditions referred to in the report and to an additional Condition requiring the provision of individual refuse bins. Should any of these requirements not be met, the application would be refused.

28. S/1839/05/F - GREAT ABINGTON

APPROVAL for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the Conditions referred to therein and an additional Condition requiring the provision of spaces on site for construction vehicles during the construction period.

29. S/1499/05/F - GREAT ABINGTON

APPROVAL for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services presented to the Committee's meeting on 5th October 2005, and subject to the Conditions referred to in the October report

30. S/0733/05/F - CROYDON

DELEGATED APPROVAL for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, and to an additional reason being compliance with Policy HG11 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004; subject to the prior completion of a Section

106 Legal Agreement securing the submission and implementation of a landscape and boundary treatment scheme; which shall include the protection of trees during demolition and construction and the retention of trees and hedgerows identified within the scheme in perpetuity, and to the Conditions referred to in the report.

31. S/1273/05/F - GAMLINGAY

APPROVAL contrary to the recommendation contained in the report from the Director of Development Services. Members considered that the proposal was in keeping with the character of the locality, accorded with the Village Design Statement for Gamlingay, and respected the agricultural heritage of the area. The application complies therefore with Policy HG15 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.

32. APPEALS AGAINST PLANNING DECISIONS AND ENFORCEMENT ACTION

The Committee **NOTED** the following from the report prepared by the Director of Development Services:

- Decisions notified by the Secretary of State
- Summaries of recent decisions of interest

In connection with the summary relating to 44 Station Road, Histon, Councillor MJ Mason declared a personal interest as the appellant had registered two complaints against him.

- Appeals received
- Local Inquiry and Informal Hearing dates scheduled before the next meeting on 7th December 2005
- Appeals withdrawn or postponed
- Advance notification of Local Inquiry and Informal Hearing dates (subject to postponement or cancellation)

33. APPEAL STATISTICS AND GRAPHICAL DATA

The Committee noted a report on Appeal Statistics covering the period from 1st July 2005 to 30th September 2005, together with a variety of graphical representations of statistics for the year and three-month period ended 30th June 2005.

The Deputy Director of Development Services commended the statistics in the context of the staffing levels currently being faced within the Development Services Department. He particularly highlighted the backlog of "informals" that was resulting in complaints being received. A temporary revised acknowledgment letter was being used to explain the current difficulties resulting from the freezing of three key Development Control posts. Should it be possible to fill these posts, then the Council would stand a chance of getting closer to the nationally recommended case load of an average of 150 applications per post (at present, the South Cambridgeshire District Council average case load stood at 186, and this would drop to about 160 were the posts to be filled). On behalf of the Committee, the Chairman of the Meeting paid tribute to the continued high quality of work undertaken by officers.

Councillor SGM Kindersley reaffirmed the Council's obligation to be realistic and effective in determining applications.

34. PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

Members noted a report on performance criteria.

35. UNDETERMINED APPLICATIONS OVER 13 WEEKS

The Committee noted details of applications awaiting decisions for more than 13 weeks.

36. DELEGATED POWERS - MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS TEAM

The Committee considered a report seeking to extend the powers of determination of planning applications to newer posts in the Major Development team.

In response to concern raised about the transparency of some decisions made under delegation, and the effective involvement in such circumstances of local Members and parish councils, the Deputy Director of Development Services assured Members that the procedures being followed were regularly reviewed to ensure compliance with the current scheme of delegation.

It was **RESOLVED**

that delegated powers be approved for the Major Development Manager (akin to those of the Development Control Quality Manager) and for the Northstowe and City Edge principle officers (akin to those of the Area Planning Officers and the Cambourne principle officer) as set out in appendices to the report.

37. PROPOSED REGISTRATION OF PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY - ARBURY CAMP

The Committee considered a proposal by Cambridgeshire County Council to register a public right of way in Arbury Camp (Parish of Impington).

Members discussed a number of issues raised bby Councillor MJ Mason, a Member for Impington.

It was **RESOLVED**

That officers respond to consultation from Cambridgeshire County Council highlighting the concerns of South Cambridgeshire District Council relating to the Right of Way's proposed status as a Byway Open to All Traffic, and its relationship to the planned Guided Busway.

38. TREE PRESERVATION ORDER - LONGSTANTON

The Committee considered a report reviewing Tree Preservation Order no.08/05/SC, made under delegated powers at Thatcher's Wood, Longstanton.

As a result of objections raised in connection with the Order, a site visit had taken place on 12th October 2005 consisting of the Vice-Chairman of the Development and Conservation Control Committee (Councillor NIC Wright) and local Member (Councillor A Riley).

It was **RESOLVED**

that Tree Preservation Order 08/05/SC in Longstanton be confirmed, subject to the deletion of all reference to those trees numbered . T4,T5 and T6 in the First Schedule of the Order (each in poor condition) and T21 (removed prior to service of the Order).

39. CAMBOURNE SECTION 106 LEGAL AGREEMENT - TRAILER PARK

Further to its meetings on 2nd March 2005 when it lifted the “embargo” on issuing planning permissions for market housing at Cambourne, and on 13th May and 3rd August 2005, when it resolved to continue this practice in order for the developers’ consortium to progress the legal matters associated with the provision of the trailer park, the Committee considered a further report updating Members on progress.

It was **RESOLVED**

That the embargo on issuing planning permissions for market housing at Cambourne should remain lifted for the time being allowing the developers time to conclude the legal formalities, and that a further progress report be presented to the Committee at its meeting on 4th January 2006.

The Meeting ended at 3.00 p.m.

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control Committee 2nd November 2005
AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

S/1744/05/F – Thriplow
House and Garage on land Adjacent 22 Middle Street for S Hurst

Recommendation: Approval
Date for determination: 8th November 2005

Conservation Area

Site and Proposal

1. The site, which extends to approximately 0.07 hectares/0.18 acres previously formed part of the garden area of No.22 Middle Street, a brick, boarding and large flat tile two-storey dwelling with part of the roof dropping to single storey eaves height. A detached double garage currently sits on the site. To the south of the site is No.24, a monopitch roof detached bungalow with a gable end pitched roof garage to the front and a utility room door and utility room, bedroom, en-suite and secondary living room windows in its north elevation facing the site. There is a 2.5m high hedge along the site's road frontage save for the existing access at the southern end of the frontage. A separate new access to serve No.22 has recently been completed. The boundary between the site and No.24 is marked by fencing of varying heights and a new 1.8m high fence has been erected along the boundary between the site and No.24. There is a holly tree within the site close to the boundary with No.24.
2. This full application, received on the 13th September 2005, proposes the erection of a 4-bedroom detached house and detached triple garage on land to the south of No.22 Middle Street. The triple garage would serve the proposed dwelling (two bays) and No.22 (one bay). The main two-storey part of the house would measure 6.9m to ridge and 4.2m to eaves with an attached 4.2m to ridge and 2.2m to eaves single storey element to the side. The house would be faced with timber boarding over a brick plinth. The main part of the house would have a slate roof. The single storey element would have a pantile roof. The garaging building, which would stand gable to the road behind the frontage hedge, would be faced with bricks with a pantile roof. It measures 4.5m to the ridge and 2.2m to eaves. The density equates to 14 dwellings to the hectare.

Planning History

3. Planning permission for the erection of a part two-storey (7.5m high), part one-and-a-half storey house, and a double garage with a ridge running parallel to the road, on the site was refused in November 2004 under reference **S/2036/04/F** for the following reasons:

"This part of the Thriplow Conservation Area is relatively loosely spaced, with the spaces between the buildings being almost as significant to the character of the street scene as the buildings themselves."

1. *The proposed dwelling, by virtue of its scale, design and detailing, together with the fact that it would almost completely fill the gap between Nos. 22 and 24 Middle Street, would have a detrimental impact upon the street scene and would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. In addition, the design, detailing, siting and orientation of the proposed garage in relation to the road would not be in keeping with the character of its surroundings. Consequently the proposal would contravene: Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 Policies P1/3 which requires a high standard of design that responds to the local character of the built environment, and P7/6 which requires development to protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the historic built environment; and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 Policies EN30 which states that permission will be refused for schemes within Conservation Areas which do not fit comfortably into their context and SE5 which requires new development to be sensitive to the character of its surroundings*
- 2 *The visual impact of the garage, and its subsequent harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, would be compounded if the garage was built back-to-back with that proposed under planning reference: S/2035/04/F.*
- 3: *The proposed dwelling, by virtue of its height and proximity to the southern boundary of the site, would be an overbearing presence when viewed from the living room, dining room and bedroom windows in the north elevation of No.24 Middle Street. These windows would also be overlooked by the first floor bedroom window in the south elevation of the new dwelling to the detriment of the privacies of the occupiers of the neighbouring property. Consequently the proposal would contravene South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 Policy SE5 which requires new development to be sensitive to the amenities of the locality.”*
4. At the same time, planning permission was refused for a double garage for No.22 which was proposed to be attached to the double garage for the dwelling proposed under reference **S/2036/04/F** and new access for No.22 under reference **S/2035/04/F** for the following reasons:
 1. *“The proposed garage, by virtue of its design, detailing, siting and orientation in relation to the road, would have a detrimental impact upon the street scene and would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Consequently the proposal would contravene: Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 Policies P1/3 which requires a high standard of design that responds to the local character of the built environment, and P7/6 which requires development to protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the historic built environment; and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 Policies EN30 which states that permission will be refused for schemes within Conservation Areas which do not fit comfortably into their context and HG12 which resists additions to dwellings that would have an unacceptable impact upon the street scene.*
 2. *The visual impact of the garage, and its subsequent harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, would be compounded if the garage was built back-to-back with that proposed under planning reference: S/2036/04/F.”*

5. Permission was granted for a new access for No.22 in November 2004 under reference **S/2034/04/F**.
6. Conservation Area Consent for the demolition of the existing garage and shed was granted in December 2004 under reference **S/2242/04/CAC**.
7. Permissions for extensions to No.22 were approved in 1984 and 1996 under references **S/0484/84/F** and **S/0660/96/F** respectively.

Planning Policy

8. Structure Plan 2003 **Policy P1/3** requires a high standard of design for all new development which responds to the local character of the built environment.
9. Structure Plan 2003 **Policy P7/6** states that Local Planning Authorities will protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the historic built environment.
10. Local Plan 2004 **Policy SE5** states that residential developments within the village frameworks of Infill Villages, which includes Thriplow, will be restricted to not more than two dwellings comprising, amongst others, a gap in an otherwise built-up frontage to an existing road, provided that it is not sufficiently large to accommodate more than two dwellings on similar curtilages to those adjoining, and provided the site in its present form does not form an essential part of village character, and development is sympathetic to the historic interests, character, and amenities of the locality.
11. Local Plan 2004 **Policy EN30** states that proposals within conservation areas will be expected to preserve or enhance the special character and appearance of the conservation areas in terms of their scale, massing, roof materials and wall materials. It also states that the District Council will refuse permission for schemes within conservation areas which do not specify traditional local materials and details and which do not fit comfortably into their context.

Consultations

12. **Thriplow Parish Council** recommends refusal stating "Thriplow Parish Council is strongly opposed to this application.
13. Comments received from Parish Councillors are:

Whilst appreciating that this proposed dwelling is smaller than the previous proposal, this design is ugly and feather edged boarding is inappropriate in this location. It does not blend in or complement in any way the houses to either side.

Any development on this garden plot detracts strongly from the approach to No.22 as it was, and therefore its appeal to buyers. It would completely cramp the style of a once attractive dwelling. It is pointless for planners to argue over design features, it is the principle of building on this piece of land anything larger than a small bungalow, with a shared access to Middle Street, that should receive prior consideration.

Whilst the proposal shows greater separation between the proposed dwelling and No.24, the proximity to the existing No.22 is unacceptable.

This is not 'land adjoining' 22 Middle Street, it is part of what has always been 22 Middle Street.

The proposed dwelling appears to be squeezed onto this plot. A smaller house would fit better onto the site and the village does need some smaller homes.

A shared access with No.22 would be preferred. Putting an additional access on to Middle Street on a difficult bend will have safety implications on what is now a busy through-road.

Parish Councillors are unanimous in their opposition to this proposal and would ask that it be refused."

14. **Conservation Manager** raises no objections to the proposal. He states that the current application follows on from a refusal for a similar scheme (but to a different design) last year and the current scheme has evolved from his discussions with the applicant and agent. He is broadly satisfied that the issues he previously raised have now been addressed and that the current scheme would not harm the Thriplow Conservation Area. He would wish to see conditions attached to any approval requiring samples of materials, the agreement of the size and details of the rooflights and the removal of permitted development rights.
15. **Chief Environmental Health Officer** raises no objections subject to safeguarding conditions to protect residents from noise disturbance during the construction period.
16. At the time of application S/2036/04/F, the **Trees and Landscape Officer** raised no objections to the loss of the holly tree.
17. At the time of application S/2036/04/F, the **County Archaeologist** requested that a standard archaeological condition be attached to any consent.

Representations

18. Objections have been received from the occupiers of Nos. 24 and 24a Middle Street. The main points raised are:
 - a. The spaces between buildings is almost as significant to the character of the street scene as the buildings themselves;
 - b. The proposed garage siting would create a solid mass of building which would have a detrimental effect on the street scene and conservation area;
 - c. The existing southern boundary fence would provide insufficient privacy from the french doors in the rear of the proposed dwellings;
 - d. The landing window would have a direct view into No.24's principal rooms;
 - e. The bedroom window in the southern elevation would have views into No.24's bedroom and kitchen;
 - f. Probable loss of a substantial holly tree;
 - g. Bland, overbearing and out of proportion elevation facing No.22;
 - h. A hip or half-hip should be incorporated at the southern end of the single storey element;
 - i. A two-metre high wall with tiles on top, to match the existing wall along No.24's southern boundary, should be erected along the boundary between the site and No.24;
 - j. The original No.22 and its grounds should not be allowed to be divided into two properties;
 - k. Inadequate storm water drainage;
 - l. Another entrance would increase the likelihood of more accidents in this notorious black spot; and
 - m. Little has changed since the previous refusal.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

19. The main issues in relation to this application are: the impact on the street scene and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area; and impact on neighbours. With regards to some of the other issues raised: a new access to serve No.22 has previously been approved and the existing access that previously served No.22 is to be used to serve the proposed dwelling only; and the Trees & Landscape Officer has raised no objections to the loss of the holly tree.
20. This scheme (which is lower, simpler in design and fills less of the space between Nos. 22 and 24 Middle Street than the scheme refused under reference S/2036/04/F) is considered to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and street scene. The proposed garage, being gable end to the road like the garage at No.24 to the south, albeit sitting behind the front boundary hedge rather than on the frontage like the garage at No.24, is also considered to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and street scene.
21. This scheme, by only having a single storey element projecting towards No.24, also overcomes the third reason application S/2036/04/F was refused (impact on occupiers of No.24). That said, I consider it important to ensure that a 1.8-2m high boundary treatment along No.24's boundary be provided to protect the privacy of the occupiers of No.24. Ideally, this would be a wall with tiles on top to match No.24's existing southern boundary wall as requested by the occupier of No.24. The occupier of No.24 has requested that the scheme be amended to incorporate a hipped roof at the southern end of the single storey element to reduce the impact on his amenity. This is not considered necessary to ensure that the proposal would not unduly affect the amenities of the occupiers of No.24 and, whilst there may be examples of hipped roofs in the village, the Conservation Manager considers that the proposed gable end is preferable in terms of the proposed design and appearance of the dwelling. There is a first floor landing window in the southern elevation of the main part of the dwelling facing No.24 approximately 10m from the boundary between Nos. 22 and 24. Given the limited size of this window and as it only serves a landing, I consider that it would be difficult to argue that it would result in a serious degree of overlooking of No.24. However, I will ask the applicant to consider replacing this window with a rooflight(s) to minimise any perceived overlooking and will report his response verbally at the meeting.

Recommendation

22. Approval
 1. Standard Time Condition A (3 years) (Reason A);
 2. SC5 – Samples of materials to be used for external walls and roofs (RC To ensure the development preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the Conservation Area);
 3. SC5 – Details of the rooflights (RC To ensure the development preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the Conservation Area);
 4. SC51 – Landscaping (RC51);
 5. SC52 – Implementation of landscaping (RC52);
 6. SC60 (all) – Details of boundary treatments (RC To ensure the development preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the Conservation Area; and to protect the amenity of the occupiers of the hereby permitted dwelling and neighbouring dwellings);

7. SC5f – Details of materials to be used for hard surfaced areas within the site (RC To ensure the development preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the Conservation Area);
8. SC22 – No further windows, doors or openings of any kind shall be inserted at first floor level in the side (north and south) elevations of the development (RC22);
9. SC21 (Part 1, Classes A, B and C (Enlargement, improvement or other alteration of a dwellinghouse, including additions and alterations to the roof)) – Removal of permitted development rights (RC To ensure that additions or alterations that would not otherwise require planning permission do not detract from the character and appearance of the Conservation Area);
10. During the construction period, ... SC26 (0800, 0800, 1800, 1300) – Restriction of hours of use of power operated machinery (RC26);
11. SC66 (on the application site) – Archaeology (RC66).

Reasons for Approval

1. The development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003:** P1/3 (Sustainable design in built development) and P7/6 (Historic Built Environment);
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:** SE5 (Development in Infill Villages) and EN30 (Development in Conservation Areas)
2. The development is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise: impact upon character and appearance of the Conservation Area; impact on amenity of occupiers of Nos. 22 and 24; highway safety; loss of holly tree; and inadequate storm water drainage.

Informatives

In relation to **Condition 3**, the rooflights should be 'conservation type'. Further information can be obtained from the Council's Conservation Section.

In relation to **Conditions 6**, the applicant is encouraged to consider erecting walls with tiles on top along the southern and northern boundaries to match No.24's existing southern boundary wall.

Should driven pile foundations be proposed, before development commences, a statement of the method for construction of these foundations should be submitted to and agreed by the District Council's Environmental Health Officer so that noise and vibration can be controlled.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003

Planning file Refs: S/1744/05/F, S/2242/04/CAC, S/2036/04/F, S/2035/04/F, S/2034/04/F, S/0660/96/F and S/0484/84/F

Contact Officer: Andrew Moffat – Area Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713169