

PLANNING COMMITTEE DATE: 11 December 2024

Agenda No: 8

REFERENCE NO: F/YR23/0993/O

SITE ADDRESS: Land South West of The Hollies, Hospital Road, Doddington.

PROPOSAL: Erect up to 3 x dwellings (outline application with all matters reserved) and associated highway improvement works.

UPDATE:

1. Further representations

- 1.1 Further comments received from the resident at 5 Askham Row raising the following summarised concerns (a full copy of the representation can be found on public access);
- (i) The application includes no details to suggest whether trees or hedgerow are being retained or removed to facilitate the development – an Arboricultural Impact Assessment is required
 - (ii) The ecology assessment does not consider the proximity of the site to a pond. Appropriate surveys are required prior to the application being determined.
 - (iii) The application when considered cumulatively with the applicant's other recent approved development cumulatively triggers obligations as per policy LP5.
 - (iv) The proposal does not consider the relationship of the proposal with the existing stables/hay store which would introduce concerns in respect of odour and noise and disturbance given the juxtaposition.
 - (v) Procedurally, no ownership certificate has been served on the County Council despite the site now including Hospital Road.
 - (vi) The Application Form indicates a relationship with a Council Employee/Member yet this has not been identified as a reason for the application being reported to the Planning Committee.

1.2 *Officer Response*

(i) Trees & hedgerow

The Council's Ecologist has reviewed these concerns and provided further comments on 10th December 2024, in addition to those received and set out in the committee report (section 5.4). The application is in outline with all matters reserved and therefore specific details of any tree or hedgerow retention/ removal would not yet be possible to establish. There are no trees afforded any statutory protection at the site. However, the Council's Ecology officer has noted this potential in their response highlighting that any such removal would need to be undertaken in accordance with the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Furthermore, loss of hedgerow/ trees is cited as a concern in respect of the urbanising effect the development would have on the area (section 10.7 refers).

In summary, it is considered that the potential loss of trees/ hedgerow have been considered insofar as the outline application submitted thus far allows. Should the application be approved, precise details of any tree or hedgerow loss alongside a mitigation and enhancement plan could be reasonably secured. This is

notwithstanding the developer's statutory duties under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.

(ii) Pond

The pond referenced is located approximately 100m south east of the site (taken centrally) and was recently granted permission under F/YR23/0070/O. The pond measures approximately 65m² in area. The application site falls mainly in an area of low-risk impact to Great Crested Newts (GCN) and the site itself forms an area of managed land, adjacent to the highway. The Council's ecologist has responded directly to concerns raised in this regard (comments received 10 December 2024) and considers that the presence of newts is highly unlikely and therefore unnecessary to require further surveys in this regard.

(iii) Cumulative Development

Local Plan policy LP5 (Part B) sets out that;

If a development scheme comes forward which in accordance with Part A of this Policy does not require the provision of affordable housing, but the scheme is followed by an obviously linked subsequent second development scheme at any point where the original permission remains extant, or up to 5 years following completion of the first scheme, then if the combined total of dwellings provided by the first scheme and the second or subsequent scheme provides 5 or more dwellings, then the above thresholds will apply cumulatively. The precise level of affordable housing to be provided will be 'back dated' to include the first scheme.

Whilst the applicant for this proposal is the same as those for developments recently approved on the opposite side of Hospital Road, having regard to the juxtaposition of the site relative to recently approved sites officers do not consider that these are 'obviously linked'. The application site would rely on separate means of access to the properties, separate utilities infrastructure and is physically divorced, other than bearing a relationship by way of a reliance on Hospital Road for primary highway access. As such, Officers do not consider that the requirements set out in LP5 (Part B) would be triggered here.

(iv) Stables and Hay store

The permitted stable and hay store are proposed to be located approximately 50m north-west of the likely nearest dwelling (subject to final layout) and given its size (160m² in area) and nature it is unlikely to yield any significant adverse impacts on residential amenity. This is notwithstanding that it is understood to be operated by the applicant themselves at this time and notwithstanding it is not yet constructed. As such, officers do not consider there would be any obvious risks of residential amenity being adversely affected sufficient to warrant refusal in this regard.

(v) Ownership certificate

Cambridgeshire County Council's Local Highway Authority have been consulted on by the LPA and have commented this application (section 5.2 refers) and therefore have not been prejudiced. Should the application be approved, we would expect the applicant to serve notice and allow 21 days to elapse before the LPA could issue the decision. The recommendation proposed in this regard could be to approve subject to there being no additional material reasons raised by the LHA following serving of the notice.

(vi) Scheme of Delegation

The applicant in their application form has declared that the Agent acting behalf of the applicant is related to an elected member. The Council's scheme of delegation sets out instances where applications must automatically go before the Planning Committee. The instance raised in the application form does not trigger an automatic referral to the Planning Committee.

- 1.3 In conclusion, the matters raised and as set out above do not alter the Officer's conclusions and recommended refusal reasons as set out at section 12 of the committee report.

Recommendation:

Refuse as per the recommendation at section 12 of the officer's report.