



Dear Councillor

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - MONDAY, 19 JUNE 2023

I am now able to enclose for consideration at the above meeting the following reports that were unavailable when the agenda was printed.

**Agenda Item
No.**

LATE REPRESENTATIONS(Pages 3 - 18)

This page is intentionally left blank

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 19th June 2021

LATE REPRESENTATIONS SUMMARY

3(a) 22/02104/FUL - Use of land for the stationing of caravans for residential purposes and the erection of a dayroom and laying of hardstanding ancillary to that use. – Land East Of Conquest House, Straight Drove, Farcet

There are no late representations for this item.

3(b) 22/02382/FUL - Construction of 2no 2 bedroom maisonettes – Land at 16 Sand Road, Great Gransden, SG19 3AQ

Since the report was written a further neighbour comment has been received (as at Appendix 1). Officers consider that all matters raised have been addressed in the report and/or by specialist consultees.

Appendix 1

From: DevelopmentControl

Sent: 28 May 2023 17:53

To: DevelopmentControl

Subject: Comments for Planning Application 22/02382/FUL

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 28/05/2023 5:52 PM from

Application Summary

Address: Land At 16 Sand Road Great Gransden Sandy SG19 3AQ

Proposal: Construction of 2no. 2 bedroom maisonettes.

Case Officer: Kevin Simpson

Customer Details

Name:
Email:
Address: 3 Dutton Gardens, Great Gransden, Sandy SG19 3EF

Comments Details

Commenter
Type:
Member of the Public
Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments:

We are writing to object to the development at 16 Sand Road. This development is out of keeping with the surrounding detached and semi-detached properties. It seems to be crammed into a garden space that should be left green, as other spaces in the vicinity are.

The parking arrangements are unsatisfactory when neighbours cars are parked on that stretch of road regularly. Combined with the high flow of traffic in the morning and late afternoon to and from the A428 and the industrial estates on Sand Road, it would be dangerous to reverse out on to Sand Road. Children use the footpath to and from school passing 16 Sand Road, and the movement of cars in this area will make an already unsafe environment much worse.

3(c) 23/00609/FUL - Demolition of derelict outbuildings and residential development of 7 dwellings – Outbuildings rear of 30 and 32 High Street, St Neots

Since the report was written a representation has been received from Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue (comments attached at Appendix 1). These raise concern regarding access and suitability for a fire appliance. However, these do caveat that in these circumstances the installation of an Automatic Water Fire Suppression System (AWFSS) such as sprinklers or water mist can be provided as a compensatory feature.

This matter will be secured by condition.

Appendix 1

I've had a quick look at the proposed plan and the fire appliance access and turning facilities for a Pump Appliance appear to be inadequate.

Appliance type	Minimum width of road between kerbs (m)	Minimum width of gateways (m)	Minimum turning circle between kerbs (m)	Minimum turning circle between walls (m)	Minimum clearance height (m)	Minimum carrying capacity (tonnes)
Pump	3.7	3.1	16.8	19.2	3.7	12.5
High reach	3.7	3.1	26.0	29.0	4.0	17.0

NOTES:

1. Fire appliances are not standardised. The building control body may, in consultation with the local fire and rescue service, use other dimensions.
2. The roadbase can be designed to 12.5 tonne capacity. Structures such as bridges should have the full 17-tonne capacity. The weight of high reach appliances is distributed over a number of axles, so infrequent use of a route.
3. Gradients on any access road to be used by pump appliances should be no greater than 1 in 4. The approach and departure angles to any gradient should not exceed 12 degrees.
4. Hard-standing for high-reach appliances should be as level as possible and should not exceed a gradient of 1 in 12.
4. Overhead obstructions, e.g. cables and branches, that would interfere with the operation of high-reach appliances, should be avoided.

- Any street or private roadway forming part of such a fire access way must be no less than 3.7m wide between kerbs, although this may reduce to 3.1m for a gateway or similar short narrowing.

There should be sufficient space around the fire appliance for fire crews to access its apparatuses and in the event of the vehicle breaking down.

- Access roadways and hardstanding, including manholes should be capable of carrying a 12.5-tonne vehicle, though structures such as bridges should have a minimum carrying capacity of 17 tonnes.
- Dead-end access routes longer than 20m should be provided with suitable turning facilities (hammer head or turning circle), as fire appliances should not have to reverse more than 20m.
- There should be vehicle access for a pump appliance to within 45m of all points within each dwelling-house, measured on a route suitable for laying fire hose.
- Where the proposed new dwellings cannot meet access requirements for fire pump appliances, then an AWFSS - Automatic Water Fire Suppression System (Sprinklers or Water Mist) should be provided as a compensatory feature.
- See Approved Document B – Volume 1: Dwellings (Requirement B5: Access and facilities for the fire service) for further guidance.

3(d) 22/00649/FUL - A new build, two-storey, four bedroom detached dwelling - Land At White Roses, Sawtry Road, Glatton

Since the report was written a representation has been received from Ward Councillor Simon Bywater (as at Appendix 1). Officers consider that all matters raised have been addressed in the report and/or by specialist consultees. The recommendation therefore remains unchanged.

Appendix 1

From: Simon Bywater Cllr

Sent: 14 June 2023 16:17

To: DMAAdmin

Subject: 22/00649/FUL - DMC 19th June 2023 PLANNING APPLICATION 22/00649/FUL – LAND AT WHITE ROSES, SAWTRY ROAD,

Dear Sir,

I'm aware this matter is coming before DMC Monday 19th June and although I'm unable to attend I would like to make representation and my views to be shared with members of the committee.

I find the grounds for refusal rather perplexing and would urge committee to reconsider and allow the application to be granted with perhaps some conditions pertaining to the HDC tree concerns.

The officer report is substantially positive and supported by consultees like Glatton PC. I have also read the letter dated 14th of June by the applicants representative and feel they have made some strong and very good valid points.

I believe that this proposed development will bring numerous benefits to both the immediate vicinity and the wider village.

First and foremost, I appreciate the thoughtful design and consideration that has gone into the planning of this house. The architectural plans demonstrate a harmonious integration of the proposed structure with the surrounding environment, ensuring that it complements the existing aesthetic appeal of the area. The use of high-quality materials and the incorporation of sustainable features showcase a commitment to responsible development, aligning with our collective goal of environmental conservation.

Furthermore, the addition of a new house will undoubtedly contribute to the growth and enhancement of the community. By providing additional housing, we can address the increasing demand for suitable homes in the area. This not only supports the well-being of existing residents but

also attracts new families and individuals who wish to join our vibrant and inclusive neighbourhood.

Moreover, the proposed development aligns with the overall vision and planning objectives outlined by our local authorities. By adhering to the regulations and guidelines set forth by the planning department, the application demonstrates a commitment to upholding the values and aspirations of our community. This will foster a sense of pride and confidence among residents, as we can witness the positive transformation.

It is also worth noting that the proposed house will have a minimal impact on the existing infrastructure.

In conclusion, I wholeheartedly support the planning application. The proposed development aligns with our community's goals of responsible growth, sustainability, and the provision of adequate housing options. I urge you to consider the positive impact this project will have on Glatton and grant the necessary permissions to proceed.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I trust that you will carefully evaluate all aspects of the planning application and make a decision that benefits our community as a whole. Should you require any additional information or wish to discuss this matter further, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards

Simon

[Cllr Simon Bywater](#)

Since the report was written a representation has been received from Ward Councillor Tim Alban (as at Appendix 1). Officers consider that all matters raised have been addressed in the report and/or by specialist consultees. According to the records on file, an amended plan was submitted by the applicant on 2 December 2022 however, this was not accepted

as an amendment and no consultation was carried out. It must be noted that at the time the Council was not accepting amendments to applications. The report was written based on the original plans as submitted.

The recommendation therefore remains unchanged.

On Thu, 15 Jun 2023 at 21:55, Tim Alban (Cllr) wrote:

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like the following to be included in late representations in respect of the above application, please.

8.1 Trees. The applicant's agent gives a thorough response so I won't add too much more. However, I believe revised plans which comply with requests made by the planning officer originally dealing with the case, were submitted some months ago and before a recommendation for refusal issued by a different officer. If my understanding is correct, I would urge that they been considered as part of this application.

8.2 Flooding. I believe it is significant that the Environment Agency has offered not objections. From the map attached to this application, there appears to be 6 properties between the site and the brook, some of which appear to be of modern construction. I fail to understand how it can be argued that "The proposed development is therefore unacceptable in principle as it would place people and property at an unwarranted risk of flooding".

8.3 Unilateral Undertaking. This point is also addressed in the letter from the applicant's agent. I understand from the applicant that he is happy to comply with this requirement.

This application is recommended for approval by the Parish Council and along with the lack of objection by the Environment Agency, neither

County Council Highways nor the Hunts DC Conservation Officer have objected.

Development on a site had previously been granted and was set to be approved under delegated powers; I ask members of the Development Management Committee to approve the application before them

Kind regards,

Councillor Tim Alban
Stilton, Folksworth & Washingley Ward

3(e) 22/01580/FUL - Demolition of existing building and erection of new four-storey building comprising 30 No. retirement flats with associated communal facilities and external landscaping, together with re-use of existing vehicular parking facilities on adjacent site. - Centenary House, St Marys Street, Huntingdon, PE29 3PE

Revised drawings

The agent has submitted revising drawings which show a reduction in height of the tallest element and also show the inclusion of landscaping/cycle parking. Officers have not accepted the amended drawings as they do not go far enough to address the reasons for refusal and that the other landscaping/cycle parking changes are something that could be addressed through a planning condition if the proposal was to be recommended for approval.

Submitted illustrative images

The agent has also submitted two illustrative images. Members should note that these are 'illustrative' images (attached) and the agent has not provided details of whether this is to scale or based upon the technical drawings. Members should be careful on how much weight they give such images.

Members should also note that the image from Castle Moat Road appears to be reflective of the above mentioned revised drawings that were not accepted by officers and is therefore not reflective of the drawings as submitted and those that have been assessed/presented to members for consideration.

Viability assessment

The agent has also submitted a viability assessment for the development to argue that it is unviable to provide affordable housing as part of a development.

Officers have not requested such information. Members should not that a viability assessment would need to be reviewed by an independent viability consultant, and the data contained within would need to be scrutinised. This is a lengthy process as a consultant would need to be appointed and then the work would need to be undertaken.

Such information should not be submitted a few days before DMC. The agent has previously attempted to address the provision of affordable housing through the submission of an affordable housing statement which argued that the development had a permitted development fallback position. Officers refer members to the 'Principle of Development' section paragraphs 7.6 to 7.33 of the officer report.

Officers therefore consider that it is unreasonable to submit such information at such a late stage of determination, especially when it has not been requested. It also does not fully address all the harm identified. For these reasons, officers do not accept this information at this late stage.

Site notice

The application has been in a while and officers do not have sufficient evidence of when the original site notice was posted. Officers have therefore posted a new site notice on the 12th June 2023, with the

consultation expiring on the 7th July 2023. Notwithstanding the resolution of Planning committee, if a material consideration is raised from the 21 day public consultation, Chair and Vice Chair will be consulted.

Agent rebuttal to officer recommendation

The agent has done a rebuttal (attached) to the officer recommendation. There is clearly a disagreement between the agent and officers.

Officers will comment on what was raised below:

Scale/Bulk/Design/character of the conservation area – This assessment is clearly outlined in the officer report. The reason for refusal therefore remains.

Balcony depth/residential amenity – The balconies showed on the plans are clearly balconies not Juliette balconies due to their size. Juliette balconies do not allow for occupiers to walk out onto them. The perception of the future occupiers would be that the proposed balconies are balconies. The reason for refusal therefore remains.

Flood Risk - This assessment is clearly outlined in the officer report. The Lead Local Flood Authority who are the technical consultee for flood risk/drainage have advised there is insufficient information. The reason for refusal therefore remains.

Noise and air pollution - This assessment is clearly outlined in the officer report. The Environmental Health Team who are the technical consultee for noise and air quality have advised there is insufficient information. The reason for refusal therefore remains.

Daylight & sunlight to 2 & 3 st marys street - This assessment is clearly outlined in the officer report. The reason for refusal therefore remains.

Recommendation

Members should note that the Officer recommendation has been amended to:

MINDED TO REFUSE – for the reasons outlined in the office officer, subject to the outcome of the public consultation, and to delegate the authority of the final decision to Chief Planner in consultation with Chair and Vice Chair.

Appendix 1



Appendix 2



Appendix 3

SUMMARY HISTORY OF THE PRE-APPLICATION PROCESS

30/7/21 - First Pre-Application submitted and agreed by HDC as an 'IMPORTANT AND STRATEGIC SITE' - £1350 fee paid by client.

5/11/21 - After numerous chasings by Headley Stokes HDC -Tim Hartley confirms Pre-Application report will be received by 17/11/21.

1/12/21 - HDC Tim Hartley confirms Pre-Application report not completed
After numerous chasing 28/2/22 - HDC Planners confirm by e-mail no progress on Pre-Application report.

1/3/21 - HDC receive instruction from client to withdraw Pre-Application.

[For detailed breakdown see earlier e-mail of 24/1/23]

SCALE/BULK/DESIGN

Pathfinder House on both Castle Moat Road and St Marys Road has a height and scale larger than the proposed scheme.

Dominant material - Ibstock London weathered multi-stock brick or similar which fits into the local yellow brick.

Elevations reduced in scale with the brick sections and balconies so that we do not get large slabs of wall as seen in Castle Hill House.

Most of third floor consists of glazed wall set-back from the main elevation to reduce overall scale of building.

Scale of building reduces to three storeys on St Marys Rd side towards Cromwell Court

BALCONY DEPTH

The balconies are designed as JULIET BALCONIES. These are not intended to be sat or stood on but can be used to store plants and act as a green buffer with the outside world. The flats have generous proportions and ample communal amenity space so do not need the full balconies.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

A large communal garden at third floor level and reading lounge is provided for all occupants Second/first and ground levels all have generous communal lounges which ensures that the provision of amenity space is more than sufficient for this type of building.

FLOOD RISK

The building is not in a flood zone. Our Drainage Consultants Bullards are confident that they can design a sustainable drainage scheme that will receive the local Water Authority approval. This item should thus be listed as a CONDITION.

NOISE & AIR POLLUTION

Noise Consultants Nova Acoustics have produced a report dated 21/6/22 .Within the executive summary on page 4 this confirms the glazing system and ventilation system recommended in section 4 of the report.

The proposed development will meet the council's policy and Building Regulation requirements. This item should be **CONDITIONED** with reference made to the Nova Acoustics report. It is standard practice to provide full technical details within the acoustic area with the Building Regulation submission.

DAYLIGHT & SUNLIGHT TO 2 & 3 ST MARYS STREET

Submitted Smith Marston lighting report confirms that 2 & 3 St Marys Street would be impacted in relatively small ways by the scheme. The Lighting Report summary under 4.5.1 confirms that the development will have a relatively low impact on the light receivable by neighbouring properties. Whilst 4.5.2 confirms this small loss of light due to the proposed development is 'not unusual in an urban location'.

Our client will need to meet rights of light legislation and appoint Lighting Surveyors as necessary to specifically address all issues with any adjoining dwellings impacted by the scheme. This is an area of legislation over and above planning requirements.

CHARACTER OF THE CONSERVATION AREA

By nature of its scale and design the scheme will have a positive impact on the Conservation Area. The dominant corner area with its circular drum will become a local cherished feature of the townscape. The addition of the green wall surrounding the drum and extensive third level roof level garden areas will add significantly to both biodiversity and the green credentials of the site. The alternative to this scheme will be for our client to simply convert the existing building to flats and retain an ugly 1970's building within the townscape for the foreseeable future.

3(f) 22/01983/FUL - Proposed conversion from shop units to dwelling and roof extension to create first floor - 18 High Street, Warboys, Huntingdon, PE28 2RH

There are no late representations for this item.

This page is intentionally left blank