



Dear Councillor

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - MONDAY, 20 JULY 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 - 10)**

This page is intentionally left blank

## DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 22 JULY 2020

### LATE REPRESENTATIONS SUMMARY

**3(a) 19/02280/FUL - Refurbishment of The Lodge and its retention as a single dwelling, the erection of 18 dwellings (including five units of Affordable Housing) with associated private amenity spaces and parking, the provision of public open space, landscaping, and improved vehicular and pedestrian access - Land North Of The How, Houghton Road, St Ives**

Since the publication of the Officer Report the following points have been received:

- A further representation has been received from Hemingford Grey Parish Council (COPY ATTACHED).

This acknowledges the reduction in the number of dwellings but continues to recommend REFUSAL as three houses are still sited further south than is necessary which will be visually intrusive with lighting and sun reflection, and would harm views into and out of the Conservation Area, contrary to LP34. The number of trees for removal is too high and potential for others to be lost over time.

Officer response:

The siting of plots 16-18 and the impacts upon designated heritage assets is considered within the Officer Report, specifically paragraph 7.92 refers to the findings of the visibility exercise which was undertaken.

It is acknowledged that some trees are to be removed as a result of the proposed development, however the proposed layout has taken into account a large number of trees and there will be additional planting secured by condition. It is also noted that the transfer of the land to the south will bring the land within the control of the District Council. Tress on the site will also remain part of the Tree Preservation Order.

- Two additional neighbour letters have been received from resident of Houghton Road.

The first concerns traffic movements on Houghton Road. Survey data has been provided and the neighbour considers that use of the road, particularly by large HGV vehicles has increased since the latest A14 upgrade works. It also raises concerns over child safety as a result of the access and route to school and that the full measure of impact from the How development cannot be evaluated through phased applications.

The second neighbour also raises the proposed access and that this development should be served by the Barratt scheme with the driveway to the How sealed off.

Officer response:

The survey data provided by the neighbour has been shared with the County Council Transport Modelling Team and an update will be provided at the Development Management Committee.

In terms of safety, the proposed access and widening has been assessed by the Local Highways Authority and found to be acceptable in relation to the width, geometry and visibility, as confirmed at paragraph 7.112 of the Officer Report. It is accepted that the proposed development will result in more traffic using this access than the existing arrangement, and this is on a route to St Ivo school. The visibility splays for the upgraded access are indicated for the road, but also the foot and cycleway with adequate visibility able to be provided and secured by condition.

As confirmed in the Officer Report, condition 22 of the Barratt planning permission (1301895OUT) required that a road is constructed to the boundary with The How driveway and Planning Inspector Mellor imposed this condition to “ensure that it is possible to form a road connection with land to the west in the event that land comes forward for development in the interests of the proper planning of the area”. The neighbour considered that The How is to the west and should therefore be considered within the context of the Barratt access link rather than the use of the driveway. It should be noted that at the time the planning appeal, the 2012 planning applications for The How for 7 dwellings were pending consideration, and whilst the How development is now proposed for additional units, the Inspector did not reference a link to the south/south west and The How.

With reference to the continued use of the How access and alternative solution to access the site via the existing Barratts scheme, the Officer Report does acknowledge at 7.111 that shared use would be desirable, however the geometry of the access doesn't easily support this, and it is not the application before us, which falls to be considered on its own merits, for the scale proposed. As set out in the Officer Report, this is considered acceptable and having regard to the NPPF tests for refusing an application on highway grounds, would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety, nor would the residual cumulative impacts on the road network be severe.

Officers have negotiated that the land necessary for the 'How Link' can be secured for potential future development, and that the geometry of the link with the land to the west would ensure that the How site could be connected, as well as allowing traffic to flow into (and out of) the Barratt and adjacent David Wilson Home development.

The concerns over development phasing are addressed at paragraph 7.5 of the Officer Report; it is repeated that applications should be considered on their own merits and based on direct impacts with any future application required to assess the cumulative impact of existing and committed development alongside a proposal.

The Officer recommendation therefore remains as set out at section 8 of the Officer Report.

**4(a) 20/00086/FUL - Application for an additional dwelling to 18/01692/FUL and amendments to the planning layout - Land West Of Garden Court And 1 To 16 Upwood Road Bury**

**&**

**4(b) 20/00085/S73 - Variation of Condition 2 (plans) for application 18/01692/FUL to facilitate an additional plot - Land West Of Garden Court And 1 To 16 Upwood Road Bury**

Since the Report was published a number of updates are required with regard to consultee responses and updates regarding the S106 contributions to formal sports provision.

The HDC Green Space Officer - has confirmed that the amount of useable open space provided on the site is considered acceptable.

The Wildlife Trust - consider that the revised biodiversity assessment of the development does not ensure no net loss, because the 1% gain that the assessment concludes will be provided is so marginal that it could easily be lost or not realised during construction. Therefore, refusal of the additional dwelling and loss of the attenuation pond would be justified, unless there was a mechanism to hold them to the 1% net gain. Is there a way we might require them to create more / better habitat on site if they were shown to be failing to deliver sufficient net gain at completion of the development or during any aftercare period subject to a Landscape and Ecology Management Plan condition? If so then the development could proceed from a biodiversity perspective, however, if not then the proposals should be redesigned to provide sufficient contingency in biodiversity units.

Officer comment: As set out at paragraph 7.14 of the Committee Report on application 20/00086/FUL, Policy LP30 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036 requires that development ensure that there is no net loss in biodiversity and provide a gain where possible. The submitted Biodiversity Offset Report concludes that a 1% net gain in biodiversity can be achieved. The Committee Report sets out that a condition requiring the delivery of the net gain in biodiversity is proposed and the detailed draft wording of the condition is set out below. It is considered that this condition would ensure that the 1% net gain would be delivered.

“No development above slab level shall take place until full details of Landscape/Biodiversity and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) measures, taking into account the detailed landscaping proposals and

based on the recommendations set out in the Biodiversity Offset Report by Lockhart Garratt dated June 2020, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The LEMP should build on the recommendations in the Biodiversity Offset Report to demonstrate that the development hereby approved results in a 1% net gain in biodiversity and shall include but not be limited to details of the specification, location, programme for implementation, maintenance and monitoring of the biodiversity enhancement measures.

The content of the LEMP shall include the following.

- i. Description and evaluation of features to be managed.
- ii. Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management.
- iii. Aims and objectives of management, including a biodiversity net gain (taking account of the off-site mitigation).
- iv. Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives, including the details of how and at what intervals the biodiversity of the site will be measured.
- v. Prescriptions for management actions.
- vi. Preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five-year period).
- vii. Details of the body or organization responsible for implementation of the plan, including details of the legal and funding mechanism(s) by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the developer with the management body(ies) responsible for its delivery.
- viii. Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures, including how contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented if monitoring shows that the development is failing to deliver the biodiversity objectives of the originally approved scheme.

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and shall remain in place thereafter.”

CCC Highways - confirm that the additional dwelling and the associated changes will not have a significant impact on the public highway.

Further to paragraphs 5.3 and 7.19 of the Committee Report on application 20/00085/S73 and paragraph 7.36 of the Committee Report on application 20/00085/S73, Ward Members have responded that the proposed formal sports provision contribution of £59,354 is acceptable and that it should be divided equally between Ramsey and Upwood Cricket Clubs for projects for improvements to facilities at both clubs.

#### **4(c) 18/02603/FUL - Erection of 4 affordable houses – Land South Of 10 Greenfields, St Ives**

One additional representation was received from No.15 Greenfields who made the following comments:

- 4 houses and 8 cars is a lot to cram into the limited area, especially as the access appears to be a shared access with 10 and 11 Greenfields.
- The flooding issues must also be taken into account as the water has to go somewhere, if the properties are built elevated it would appear that they wouldn't be affected by any flooding, but the water would be pushed the other properties adjacent to this area, causing them problems in the future.
- Approximately a quarter of the recreational land would be taken to accommodate the widening of the access roadway which would be unfair to residents of Greenfields as it would leave little green areas for community use.

*Officer response: The scale and density of the proposed development is considered acceptable with regard to accessibility, functionality and visual impact. The proposed development would not impede the use, access and functionality of neighbouring properties and is not considered to be out of character within this residential area.*

*The comments regarding flooding issues are noted. A full assessment of the flood risk associated with this proposed development is detailed between paragraphs 7.9 – 7.25 of the DMC Officer Report and forms reason 1 of the recommended refusal decision.*

*In terms of the loss of recreational land, CCC Highways Officers have recommended the access should be increased to 5m in width for a distance of 10m from the highway edge which would necessitate using part of the private recreational land. Whilst regrettable, the proposed loss of the green area is relatively small scale, is not considered equate to near a quarter of the recreational land as stated and does not substantiate a reason for refusal.*

#### **4(d) 19/02166/FUL - Retrospective application for the erection of three dwellings and revised access arrangements from approved planning permission (18/1801/FUL) and change of use of land from leisure use (Class D2) to residential use - The Former Abbotsley Squash Club, Potton Road, Abbotsley**

No late reps for this item

**4(e) 20/00012/FUL - Full planning application for the erection of 4 new bungalows and 2 new chalet bungalows, visitor parking, landscaping and associated works - Land South Of, Hill Close, Brinton**

- Paragraph 7.114 refers to the LLFA noting that the site is in Flood Zone 3. The LLFA have since confirmed the site is within Flood Zone 1 (areas with the lowest risk of flooding) and amended comments have therefore been received.
- The reference to a recommended condition relating to 'surfacing material of proposed street' should be removed from the list of proposed conditions, as the street is existing. Any new surfacing details would be considered under hard and soft landscaping details (which are recommended to be secured by condition).
- Three further letters objecting to the proposals have been received from local residents raising issues relating to the following:
  1. The 2013 proposals (and S106 Agreement) have been breached in both spirit and detail.
  2. The site should have been a community orchard.
  3. Residents have been paying the maintenance company for the orchard, which has not been planted.
  4. Objections to the addition of social housing within the proposals.
  5. There is strong local opposition and a PC recommendation of refusal.
  6. Suggestions that the chief executive of the applicants has a financial interest in the maintenance provider of the orchard, which is causing concern.
  7. There has been pre-determination of the proposals and bias shown by HDC.

In response, all the above Planning issues have been covered in the officer report prepared for DMC.

**From:** [developmentcontrol@huntingdonshire.gov.uk](mailto:developmentcontrol@huntingdonshire.gov.uk)  
**To:** [DevelopmentControl](#)  
**Subject:** Comments for Planning Application 19/02280/FUL  
**Date:** 14 July 2020 15:07:25

---

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

Comments were submitted at 3:07 PM on 14 Jul 2020 from Mrs Gail Stoehr.

## Application Summary

**Address:** Land North Of The How Houghton Road St Ives

**Proposal:** Refurbishment of The Lodge and its retention as a single dwelling, the erection of 18 dwellings (including five units of Affordable Housing) with associated private amenity spaces and parking, the provision of public open space, landscaping, and improved vehicular and pedestrian access

**Case Officer:** Charlotte Fox  
[Click for further information](#)

## Customer Details

**Name:** Mrs Gail Stoehr  
**Email:** [parish.clerk@hemingfordgreyparishcouncil.gov.uk](mailto:parish.clerk@hemingfordgreyparishcouncil.gov.uk)  
**Address:** 30 West Drive, Highfields Caldecote, Caldecote, Cambridgeshire CB23 7NY

## Comments Details

**Commenter Type:** Town or Parish Council  
**Stance:** Customer objects to the Planning Application

### Reasons for comment:

**Comments:** The Parish Council objects to this application and recommends refusal:  
The Council notes that there are fewer houses than there were before but that three houses have come lower down the slope than necessary.  
The application is contrary to LP34 of the Local Plan for Huntingdonshire District Council, as this refers to 'views in and out of a conservation area' (Hemingford Meadow is part of St Ives conservation area). The proposed houses are lower down the slope and therefore would adversely affect the views in and out of the meadow/conservation area. The views of and from the meadow/conservation area should be preserved.  
The proposed houses lower down the slope would be more visually intrusive, with light pollution from the housing and street lighting impacting on the meadows/conservation area due to sun reflecting from windows in summer and artificial lighting in winter.

There are still too many trees being removed and there is the potential for trees to be lost over time.