

## HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of the meeting of the DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PANEL held in the Civic Suite, Pathfinder House, St Mary's Street, Huntingdon, PE29 3TN on Monday, 18 January 2016.

PRESENT: Councillor Mrs B E Boddington – Chairman.

Councillors P L E Bucknell, G J Bull,  
E R Butler, Mrs S Conboy, Mrs A D Curtis,  
D B Dew, Mrs A Dickinson, R S Farrer,  
I D Gardener, Ms L Kadic, J P Morris,  
J M Palmer, P D Reeve, R G Tuplin and  
R J West.

### 44. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Panel held on 14th December 2015 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### 45. MEMBERS' INTERESTS

No declarations of interests were received.

### 46. AGENDA

The Chairman announced that Item No. 5 Tree Preservation Order Sub- Group had been withdrawn from the Agenda.

### 47. APPLICATIONS REQUIRING REFERENCE TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PANEL

The Planning Service Manager (Development Management) submitted reports (copies of which are appended in the Minute Book) on applications for development to be determined by the Panel and advised Members of further representations (details of which also are appended in the Minute Book) which had been received in connection therewith since the reports had been prepared. Whereupon, it was

RESOLVED

#### (a) Kimbolton

*(Councillor P Seabrook, Kimbolton and Stoneley Parish Council, Councillor J A Gray, Ward Member, and Mr D Shaw, Agent, addressed the Panel on the application).*

that the application be approved subject to conditions to be determined by the Head of Development to include those listed in paragraph 8 of the report now submitted.

*At 7.35pm Councillor D B Dew left the meeting and*

*Councillor J P Morris took his seat.*

**(b) Spaldwick**

*(Mrs C Traynor, Applicant, addressed the Panel on the application).*

that the application be refused for the following reasons:

- the erection of a dwelling at this site would constitute nonessential development in the open countryside, outside the built up area of Spaldwick. The proposal, by reason of the scale, massing and location would extend built development into the open countryside, where it would be visually intrusive and would have an adverse impact on the character, visual amenities and setting of the site and the edge of the settlement in general. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the provisions of paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and policies H23, En17 and En25 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995, policies CS1 and CS3 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009, and policies LP1, LP11, LP13 and LP26 of the Draft Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036 (Stage 3) 2013;
- the proposed dwelling by reason of its siting, scale and massing would create a visually intrusive and harmful form of development which would erode the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and fail to conserve the settings of the adjacent grade II\* and grade II Listed Buildings. This harm, whilst less than substantial, would not be outweighed by public benefit in accordance with paragraph 134 of the NPPF. As such the proposal is contrary to paragraph 134 and section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, policies En2, En5, En6, En9, and En25 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995, policy HL5 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan Alterations 2002, policy CS1 of the Adopted Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009, policies LP13 and LP31 of the Draft Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036 (Stage 3) 2013; and
- the site is located in Flood Zones 3 of the Environment Agency Flood Maps. The proposed development is not considered acceptable and would result in inappropriate development in an area of high probability of flood risk contrary to the NPPF which seeks to locate development away from the areas at the highest risk of flooding. The Flood Risk Assessment submitted with this application does not comply with the requirements set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and does not provide a suitable basis for an assessment to be made of the

flood risks arising from the proposed development. The development is therefore contrary to paragraphs 018 - 022 of the Planning Practice Guidance, paragraphs 100-104 of the NPPF, and policy CS9 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995, policy CS1 of the Adopted Core Strategy and emerging policies LP1 and LP6 of the Draft Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036: Stage 3 (2013).

**(c) Stilton**

*(Mr C Campbell, Agent, addressed the Panel on the application).*

that the application be approved subject to conditions to be determined by the Head of Development to include those listed in paragraph 8 of the report now submitted.

**(d) Upton and Coppingford**

*(Mr D Stewart, Upton and Coppingford Parish Council, Mr K Warsap, Objector, and Mr P Branston, Agent, addressed the Panel on the application).*

that the application be deferred to allow the applicant to continue discussions with planning officers ultimately to ensure accurate drawings are submitted to the Planning Department that reflect the true situation on site and, once accurate drawings have been provided to officers and provided officers are satisfied with all aspects of the development, final determination of the application be delegated to the Planning Service Manager.

**(e) Buckden**

that the application be approved subject to conditions to be determined by the Head of Development to include those listed in paragraph 8 of the report now submitted.

**(f) Catworth**

*(Mr M Flood, Agent, addressed the Panel on the application).*

a) that application 15/01722/FUL be refused for the following reasons

- the proposed new build dwellings, by virtue of their backland position on an open piece of land on the very edge of the built-up area, would represent an incongruous form of development in an area of transition to the open countryside. The proposal would fail to respect the overriding and established linear/frontage form of development that characterises the area. The proposal would therefore be unacceptable and would fail to

comply with policies En25, H33 and H35 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995 and LP13 of the Local Plan to 2036: Stage 3;

- the proposed new build dwellings, by virtue of the loss of the open garden area associated with the Race Horse listed building, their height, scale, lack of subservience to the existing historic buildings on the site, and design, would adversely impact on views of, and from, this listed building and the conservation area. The dwellings would also have a harmful impact on the setting and significance of the adjacent grade II listed building, 39-41 High Street. The dwellings would therefore fail to sustain or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area, and would undermine the significance of the adjacent listed buildings and their setting. The harm caused would be "less than substantial" to the significance of the buildings as designated heritage assets, but the harm would not be outweighed by the public benefit of the proposal. The proposal would fail to fulfil the requirements under Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. It would also fail to comply with policies En2, En5, En6, En9 and En25 of the Local Plan (1995); CS1 of the Core Strategy 2009; LP13 and LP31 of the draft Local Plan to 2036: Stage 3 (2013), and the NPPF paragraphs 17 (bullet point 10), 56, 58, 64, 131 and 132; and
- the conversion of the curtilage listed B&B building would, by virtue of the subdivision from the Racehorse and the creation of a new, separate residential curtilage, diminish the historic relationship with the Racehorse. The loss of openness would adversely impact the setting of the Racehorse. Furthermore, insufficient detail was included to ascertain whether the historic fabric of the B&B would be negatively impacted by the proposed internal alterations. The harm caused would be "less than substantial" to the significance of the building as a designated heritage asset, but the harm would not be outweighed by the public benefit of the proposal. As such, the proposal would be contrary to policies En2 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan (1995), LP31 of the Draft Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036: Stage 3 (2013), paragraphs 129 and 131-134 of the NPPF, and S.66 and S.72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; and

- b) that application 15/01723/LBC be refused because the conversion of the curtilage listed B&B building would, by virtue of the subdivision from the Racehorse and the creation of a new, separate residential curtilage, diminish the historic relationship with the Racehorse. Furthermore, insufficient detail was included to ascertain whether the historic fabric of the B&B would be negatively impacted by the proposed internal alterations. The harm caused would be "less than substantial" to the significance of the building as a designated heritage asset, but the harm would not be outweighed by the public benefit of the proposal. As such, the proposal would be contrary to policies En2 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan (1995), LP31 of the Draft Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036: Stage 3 (2013), paragraphs 129 and 131-134 of the NPPF, and S.66 and S.72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

*At 9.05pm the meeting was adjourned.*

*At 9.10pm the meeting was reconvened.*

**(g) Great Stukeley**

*Mr D Mead, Agent, addressed the Panel on the application).*

that the application be approved subject to conditions to be determined by the Head of Development to include those listed in paragraph 8 of the report now submitted.

**(h) Hemingford Grey**

*(Councillor R Waters, Hemingford Grey Parish Council, addressed the Panel on the application).*

that the application be approved subject to conditions to be determined by the Head of Development to include those listed in paragraph 8 of the report now submitted.

**(i) Huntingdon**

*(Mr B Barnes and Mr P Wilson, Objectors, and Mr S Tindle, Agent, addressed the Panel on the application).*

that the application be deferred to enable further work to be undertaken on the potential impacts of the application and for engagement to take place with interested parties.

**(j) Ramsey Mereside**

that, following the expiry of the advertisement and site notice making it clear that the application is a departure from the development plan, the Head of Development be authorised to approve the application subject to conditions to be determined by the Head of Development.

**48. APPEAL DECISIONS**

The Panel received and noted a report by the Planning Service Manager (Development Management), which contained details of seven recent decisions by the Planning Inspectorate.

RESOLVED

that the contents of the report be noted.

Chairman