



Dear Councillor

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - MONDAY, 17 FEBRUARY
2020**

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 - 14)

This page is intentionally left blank

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 17th FEBRUARY 2020

LATE REPRESENTATIONS SUMMARY

3(a) 19/01667/OUT - Erection of dwelling with improved access to Breach Road. 36 Breach Road Grafham PE28 0BA

There are no late representations for this item.

4(a) 19/01955/FULTDC - Application for Technical Details Consent for a Proposed two storey split level contemporary 4 bedroom dwelling following approval of Permission in Principle Application reference 19/00392/PIP – Land East of 1 The Lane Easton

- **Phase 1 Contamination Report**

The Agent submitted a Phase 1 Contamination Report (available on Public Access). Environmental Health have confirmed that the site walkover did not identify any evidence of former buildings. As such a condition is suggested to deal with any unexpected contamination found to be present on site through the development. This is already identified within Section 8 of the officer report.

- **Archaeology**

A Written Scheme of Investigation for archaeology for this site has been approved by CCC Archaeology. CCC Archaeology has advised that the contractor does not have a date for the implementation of the fieldwork and the subsequent programme of post-fieldwork analysis, publication and dissemination as yet. As such a condition is recommended to cover the whole programme of archaeological works (evaluation and mitigation) required. This is already identified within Section 8 of the officer report.

4(b) 19/02003/FULTDC - Application for technical details consent for two dwellings pursuant to permission in principle reference 19/00175/PIP - Lot 1 Avenue Farm Padgetts Lane Fenton

“ completed Unilateral Undertaking for wheeled bin contributions dated 4th February 2020 was submitted by the planning agent for the application on 5th February 2020.

5(a) 19/00828/S73 - Application for variation of condition 11 (Heritage Assets) and removal of condition 12 (Dormy House Retained) for application 1402210OUT - Houghton Grange Houghton Hill Houghton PE28 2B7

Additional comments on this application were received after the Agenda was published. The comments raise detailed matters, which Officers need to investigate further. In all likelihood, they will need to obtain external expert advice.

Officers are, consequently, not in a position at present to make a recommendation on the application and, therefore, recommend that it is not determined on 17 February 2020.

5(b) 19/00038/OUT - Outline planning application for residential development of up to 30 dwellings and a care home of up to 70 beds, with all matters reserved except for the two main vehicular accesses. - Meadow View Farm Thrapston Road Brampton PE28 4NN

Ward Cllr. Morris has submitted some late reps which are attached.

3 further letters of objection have been received from local residents which raise the following objections to the proposals:

- Concerns the village is growing beyond the amenities and services it currently has (infrastructure concerns).
- Concerns regarding cumulative impacts on Brampton (438 dwellings at RAF Brampton (15/00368/OUT), 63 dwellings at Thrapston Road (16/01255/OUT) and 150 dwellings land NW of Dorling Way (16/00194/OUT))
- Concerns regarding capacity at doctors surgery, where there is no room for expansion.
- CIL payment mitigation concerns.
- No need for a further care home in this location (Ringhill Care Home in Huntingdon closed in 2017).
- Brampton suffers from poor amenities High Street is compact and restrictive with limited parking); increasing the number of people using the facilities will simply make things worse.
- The site should be developed for a new GP surgery and green space.
- Proposals are a departure from the Development Plan as the site is not allocated for development.
- Road safety issues as Thrapston Road has no street lighting and has a 40mph speed limit.

In response, we note the applications which have been approved in Brampton, but also that the 63 dwellings along Thrapston Road was dismissed at appeal. With regard to comments relating to the existing GP practice, as noted in the officer report at paragraphs 6.1 and 7.91, as the proposals are a small-scale major development for less than 200

dwellings, S106 contributions for health cannot be sought as the proposal falls below the threshold identified within the Developer Contributions SPD. Such services are funded through the Community Infrastructure Levy which could fund additional health resources. The proposals are not considered to be a departure from the Development Plan; whilst the application site is not allocated for development it is located within the built-up area of Brampton and part of the Spatial Planning Area of Huntingdon and thus there are no objections to the principle of development. With regard to highway safety concerns, County Highways have no objections to the proposals subject to conditions.

In relation to CIL payments, the governance around CIL funding is currently being discussed and further information will be released in the next financial year.

5(c) 18/01958/FUL - Change of use of existing ground floor shop (A1 retail) to offices (B1/A2) and erection of part two and part 1.5 storey extension to provide for No. 2 dwellings following the demolition of the existing ground floor extension. Internal alterations to the existing first floor flat. - 7 Old Court Hall Godmanchester PE29 2HS

Two further additional letters of objection has been received. Number 5 Old Court Hall raises the the following issues:

- Current issues with parking along Old Court Hall
- Impact of reduced light to patio and sitting room should the proposed development be constructed
- Risk of contamination to land and domestic water supply (there being no provision in application as to how the domestic drains would be made safe after disconnecting the foul waste from the live fish bait tanks at 7 Old Court Hall)
- Access challenges any construction would face

In response, the officer report acknowledges that there are double yellow lines along Old Court Hall (see paragraph 7.55 of the officer report). However, the application proposal includes for 4 off-street car parking spaces which will be allocated for use. Given the location of the site within Godmanchester (part of the wider Huntingdon Spatial Planning Area) the provision proposed is considered to be acceptable, as set out within paragraph 7.62 of the officer report. There are no objections to the access and parking elements proposed from County Highways. With regard to impacts to the light to the patio / sitting room at no.5 Old Court Hall, the officer report at paragraphs 7.34 and 7.35 addresses these matters and concludes that any limited loss of light to the patio area is not considered to be significant enough to warrant a recommendation of refusal. The loss of daylight has been assessed by HDC Urban Design who have concluded that the proposed development will not result in an unacceptable loss of daylight or overbearing impact. With regard to contamination issues raised, this has been discussed with HDC Environmental Health officers who have confirmed that there are no concerns with regard to the live fish bait tanks; such drainage matters/

domestic water supply issues would be covered by building regs if approval is granted. In relation to access issues during construction, as advised in paragraph 7.37 of the officer report, the submission of a CEMP is suggested as a condition.

A further letter of objection from 9A Old Court Hall raises the following:

- Legal access issues - This is a private driveway with ownership under land registry to No. 9A with access rights and maintenance responsibilities shared between No. 8, No. 9 & No. 9A. Access given to No. 7 - to be determined and to what extent. Leeds Day Lawson solicitors have recently received feedback from Land registry and we are awaiting their evaluation. At present maintenance under land registry is the responsibility of nos 8, 9 and 9A with an indication of moderate access rights to No. 7.
- Should planning permission be granted, access for work to be undertaken would have to be via the driveway, which is not considered to be acceptable.
- If planning permission is approved, the car parking indicated on the plans would not be accessible as can only be accessed via the driveway of number 9a. The development would potentially not have off road parking and would effectively be landlocked.
- Driveway is partially obstructed by hedge belonging to number 7 and 8 Old Court Hall – this will cause visibility issues when using the driveway.
- Highway safety and access concerns as Old Court Hall is a busy road. Also need to consider commercial property staff parking, customers and deliveries on a busy road with double yellow lines.
- The number of bins in the small area, to be accessible from the driveway, is unacceptable. No details of who will maintain the bin storage area.
- Owner of 9a will not allow unauthorised access to number 7 from the privately owned driveway.
- Impact on listed buildings and the conservation area.
- Proposals will result in over development of the site and result in overlooking, overshadowing, obstruction to driveway, noise, smells, loss of privacy, dust and vibration.
- Safety issues during construction; causing danger and disturbance.
- No details of building materials/ finished and any visual improvement to the existing number 7 Old Court Hall.
- Damage to property using private driveway during construction.

The objector has made a number of suggested amendments if planning permission is approved, as follows:

- Maintenance of green area, bin & bike storage – responsibility to be clarified.
- Vehicles not to impede driveway.

- Vehicles not to be parked on driveway or use green area (Including caravans, trailers, bikes, motorbikes, mopeds, equipment and materials).
- Private drive notices to be visible from the road and approved by the driveway owner (9A).
- No customer parking. No customer access via the driveway. No commercial and only private excess would be preferred.
- Driveway usage not the liability of driveway owner.
- Responsibility for the upkeep and maintenance of the whole driveway to be shared with the proposed dwellings (currently split between 8,9 & 9A).
- Aesthetics of current building to be improved. At present windows are broken, rotten window frames, paint flakes off, an array of insects and spiders and in need of an external re-paint.
- Hours of business to be limited. Suggest maximum of 8am – 6pm (to hopefully stop the use of the office premises being used for purposes such as a taxis rank in the future).
- 48 Hour advisory to be given of any impediment to the driveway access, and to be decided at that point.
- Commercial business deliveries/ pickups (Uploading and unloading) to be made through the front of the property (off Old Court Hall). Not to use or impede the driveway.
- Should building work commence, recognition of the fact we have 2 young children should be observed. Building work should only take place between reasonable hours. Suggest 8am – 5pm Mon – Fri.

With regard to the above matters, the officer report at paragraph 7.82 recognises that the access for parking at the site is not within the applicants ownership and that legal advice by the owners (9a Old Court Hall) has been actioned. As noted, this is a civil matter. With regard to the impact on adjacent listed buildings and the conservation area these matters have been fully considered in the officer report and HDC Conservation raise no objections to the proposals. Amenity matters have also been assessed in the officer report and details of materials will be conditioned on any approval. With regard to safety concerns and building works, a CEMP is proposed to be secured by condition, as referenced at paragraph 7.37 of the officer report. In relation to the proposed amendments to the proposals, some of the matters raised are considered to be civil matters whilst others will be covered by condition details in any case. With regard to improving the aesthetics of the current building, this is for the owners to address in due course and is not within the remit of the current proposals (noting that if permission is granted the building may well be subject to external renovation works).

**5(d) 19/02293/FUL - Demolition of garage and erection of dwelling. -
21 St Anselm Place St Neots PE19 1AP**

“A representation has been submitted by the planning agent for the application on 13th February 2020.

The representation includes a topographical site survey (attached) showing ground levels within the application site. This document was referred to in the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) originally submitted but was not included within the application.

The representation states that this topographical survey demonstrates the site to be entirely above 16.0 AOD. It is stated within the representation that the pixelated nature of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment limits its accuracy and when on the margins of a pixel, a site specific FRA is the most accurate way to assess which flood zone the site falls within. Within the representation the agent concludes that the information submitted in the FRA and topographical survey shows the site to be in flood zone one and not flood zone two as the Officer report indicates. It is then stated that a sequential test is not required.

The representation also notes that no objections from the Environment agency or the Lead Local flood Authority have been received.”

This page is intentionally left blank

From: John Morris (Cllr) <John.Morris@huntingdonshiredc.org.uk>

Sent: 13 February 2020 16:15

To: Development Management Committee

<DevelopmentManagementCommittee@huntingdonshire.gov.uk>

Cc: Fisher, Laura <Laura.Fisher@huntingdonshire.gov.uk>; Jaarsma, Jacob (Planning)

<Jacob.Jaarsma@huntingdonshire.gov.uk>; Control, Development (Planning)

<Development.Control@huntingdonshire.gov.uk>; [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]; McCurdy, Nigel (Corporate Director - Place)

<Nigel.McCurdy@huntingdonshire.gov.uk>; Kerr, Clara (Planning Serv)

<Clara.Kerr@huntingdonshire.gov.uk>

Subject: DMC 17 Feb 2020 - 'late reps' - agenda item 5b, 70 bed care home, Thrapston Rd, Brampton - outline planning application

**DMC 17 Feb 2020 - 'late reps' - agenda item 5b, 70 bed care home + 30 homes
Thrapston Road, Brampton - outline application**

Dear Development Management Committee members,

Unfortunately I am unable to attend in person to address DMC on 17th February. Please therefore accept this email as my 'late reps' submission.

I am opposed to this application on planning policy grounds as set out below. I would be grateful if you would consider these points when considering this application.

1. the cumulative impact of permissions already granted in Brampton over the past 5 years or so is having **considerable impact on the infrastructure within the village**. In recent years approximately 900 permissions have been granted for new homes which when completed will increase the number of homes in the village by almost 50%

2. If this application is approved it would be a departure from the local plan as **the site is not allocated for development in the local plan** and would be a loss of agricultural land.

3. Although the report suggests the site is "in the built up area", there is no definition in the local plan of "the built up area" and the most recent use of the land was for agricultural purposes. **It is farmland.**

4. An alternative and better use for the site might be for something like a 'community garden', along similar lines to the excellent Community Garden* in Godmanchester which is a wonderful community asset for GMC residents.

<https://m.facebook.com/huntingdonshirecommunityplantandtreenursery/>

5. **HDC has a 5 year land supply and has no need to allocate this site for development**, nor approve this application. The titled balance is no longer a factor as we have a 5 year land supply and an adopted Local Plan to 2036 which was adopted by HDC in May 2019.

6. I have this week obtained some feedback from the Practice Manger at Brampton GP Surgery regarding **the unacceptable pressure a that two 70 bed care home could place on our local GP surgery**. Planning permission has already been granted for a 70 bed care home on Brampton Park. **If a second care home was to be granted planning permission, this would**

provide an unacceptable strain on the Brampton GP Surgery and have a detrimental impact upon existing levels of service provision.

Brampton Surgery is a privately owned property and the owners do not have capacity to extend this further without fully funded investment. Current NHS premises funding enables the Brampton GP Surgery to apply for 70% of funding via a premises grant but the remaining 30% shortfall remains unmet.

As a Practice experiencing a rapid period of growth the Brampton Surgery has a plan in place to try and meet the needs of expanding Practice population. Ideally this would incorporate previous plans to extend as one option to increase provision.

The Brampton GP Surgery is also considering alternative ways of working to ensure that the model of service delivery remains sustainable. The Practice Manager of the Brampton GP Surgery has stated:

"Without doubt **the planned 2 large care homes in the village, one at Brampton Park and a second at Meadow View will have a detrimental impact upon existing levels of service provision** if premises funding is unavailable to support us in accommodating this".

7. The estimated CIL contributions for the proposed 70 bed care home would only be about £260,000. **. Even if all of this sum was to be invested in Infrastructure in Brampton, it would be insufficient to fund the cost of additional infrastructure needs such as Heath, Education, Library Services, cycling infrastructure etc. 1km of cycling infrastructure alone could cost upwards of circa £200,000.

At para 7.96 (final bullet point) the report claims that the proposed scheme
"* Provide appropriate infrastructure to meet the needs generated by the development."

It is clear that this claim is not correct. In my view **the scheme clearly fails to provide appropriate infrastructure** as evidenced by the comments received by the Practice Manager of the Brampton GP Surgery.

For all of the above reasons I am opposed to this application. I hope this submission will assist you in coming to an informed decision.

I would be grateful if the decision of the committee can be taken as a recorded vote and for the minutes of the meeting to record how many members vote for, against or abstain.

Kind regards,

John Morris
Huntingdonshire District Councillor for Brampton & Hinchingsbrooke
twitter: @johnmbrampton

<http://applications.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/moderngov/documents/s108503/1900038OUT.pdf>

* Godmanchester Community Garden is a 4 acre site and a friendly community nursery with low cost plants, fruit and vegetables for sale. Has been managed by HDC Countryside Services (due to transfer to Godmanchester Town Council) supported by a team of volunteers.

** The CIL contribution for a Care Home would be calculated at £67.40 per m² which is almost half the normal rate for CIL. If a care home is approved for up to 70 bed-spaces it is estimated that this may only generate up to only about £260,000 in terms of a CIL contribution.

This page is intentionally left blank