

## **SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on  
Thursday, 23 March 2017 at 9.30 a.m.

**PRESENT:** Councillor David Bard – Chairman  
Councillor Kevin Cuffley – Vice-Chairman

Councillors:	John Batchelor	Anna Bradnam
	Brian Burling	Sebastian Kindersley
	Des O'Brien	Deborah Roberts
	Tim Scott	Robert Turner
	Nick Wright (substitute)	

Officers in attendance for all or part of the meeting:

William Allwood (Team Leader (Planning)), Julie Ayre (Planning Team Leader (East)), Julie Baird (Head of Development Management), Thorfinn Caithness (Principal Planning Officer), James Fisher (S106 Officer), Stephen Reid (Senior Planning Lawyer) and Ian Senior (Democratic Services Officer)

Councillors Henry Batchelor, Lynda Harford, Peter Topping and Tim Wotherspoon were in attendance, by invitation.

### **1. APOLOGIES**

Councillors Pippa Corney and David McCraith sent Apologies for Absence. Councillor Nick Wright attended as substitute for Councillor David McCraith.

### **2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Committee authorised the Chairman to sign, as a correct record, the Minutes of the meeting held on 1 March 2017.

### **4. S/0123/17/FL - OAKINGTON (9 STATION ROAD)**

The Committee **approved** the application subject to the Conditions referred to in paragraph 14 (a) and (b) of the report from the Head of Development Management.

### **5. S/3396/16/RM - DUXFORD (8 GREENACRES)**

Rosanna Metcalfe (applicant's agent) and Councillor Edward Harris (Duxford Parish Council) addressed the meeting. Rosanna Metcalfe said that the application was Policy complaint and that there were no technical objections. Councillor Harris objected on the basis of the proposal's overbearing nature, access, high density, and the lack of green space and car parking.

Councillor Peter Topping (the local Member for Whittlesford) addressed the meeting on behalf of Councillor Mick Martin (the local Member for Duxford). Councillor Topping said that easy access to Whittlesford railway station was needed in order that the proposal be seen as sustainable. Access to the proposed site needed better design in order to make

that site harmonious with the rest of the village.

For the Chairman, the key issues were the clustering of the affordable housing, access to the public right of way, and car parking.

Following discussion, the Committee **refused** the application, contrary to the recommendation in the report from the Head of Development Management. Members agreed the reasons for refusal as being unacceptable design, and the failure to spread the affordable housing throughout the development, contrary to Policies DP/2 and HG/3 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework 2007. Members also noted that the northern and western site boundaries were not within the applicant's control and that, the inability to secure a link from the proposal site to the Right of Way rendered the site unsustainable in that there was no easy access to the railway station. Poor design and site layout was another reason for refusal.

#### **6. S/2553/16/OL - LINTON (LAND OFF HORSEHEATH ROAD)**

Members visited the site on 22 April 2017.

Alan Clarkson (objector), Dr Robert Wickham (for the applicant), Councillor Enid Bald (Linton Parish Council) and Councillor Henry Batchelor (a local Member) addressed the meeting. Mr Clarkson objected on the basis of ground levels, overlooking, and surface water drainage. Dr. Wickham highlighted the benefits as being affordable housing, allotments, and contribution to the local economy. He said the applicant was willing to reconsider the layout in order to address overlooking concerns. Councillor Bald said that the proposal would change the character of the village. Her specific concerns related to drainage and archaeology. The landscape buffer proposed was unworkable. Village facilities were already at capacity. Councillor Henry Batchelor objected on the bases of cumulative impact, ground levels and overlooking.

Councillor John Batchelor (the other local Member) said that the minimum requirement of an outline application was to show that the proposal was viable and deliverable. The applicant had not done so, given that the indicative layout failed to meet minimum separation standards, and that the applicant had failed to offer a viable scheme to address surface and foul water drainage issues.

Following further debate, and notwithstanding the absence of any technical objections from statutory consultees, the Committee **refused** the application contrary to the recommendation in the report from the Head of Development Management. Members agreed the reasons for refusal as being the likelihood that the proposal would exert a harmful effect on the landscape and visual amenities of the area, contrary to Policies DP/1, DP/2, DP/3 and NE/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies DPD, 2007 and the adopted Design Guide.

#### **7. S/1411/16/OL - COTTENHAM (RAMPTON ROAD)**

The Planning Team Leader (East) highlighted a letter dated 24 February 2017 and 20 additional letters of objection. She read out a letter from Councillor Simon Edwards (a local Member) that had previously been circulated to Committee members. In the letter, Councillor Edwards expressed his opposition to the application because of

- the cumulative effect of additional traffic
- adverse impact on neighbour amenity, and the setting of the Rampton Road Alms Houses
- adverse impact on the Conservation Area and open Parkland in Westwick,

- together with the Grade 2 listed Westwick Hall
- the impact on highway capacity and safety in the village of Oakington.
- air pollution
- Sustainable transport is limited, because the route to the Guided Bus stop in Oakington cannot be reached safely by bicycle as Oakington Road has no safe cycleway, or path, and is a narrow road carrying fast moving traffic. A Section 106 contribution should be sought to fund a cycle path from Cottenham to Oakington, should the application be approved.

Malcolm Dee (objector), Laurie Lane (applicant's agent), Councillor Frank Morris (Cottenham Parish Council) and Councillors Tim Wotherspoon and Lynda Harford (local Members) addressed the meeting.

Malcolm Dee referred to the impact of increased traffic on the Alms houses, and on the safety of residents. Laurie Lane said that the applicant had listened to previous objections, and taken steps to ensure that there would not be any harm caused to the setting of the Alms houses. He agreed that a requirement to submit a Reserved Matters application within two years would be acceptable. Councillor Morris said that the application would cause significant harm, referring to the site's rejection as part of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. Concerns included traffic and drainage, as well as harm to the Listed Buildings. Councillor Wotherspoon was concerned about increased traffic, noise, and the implications for air quality. Further concerns related to the size of the roundabout, extent of the signage required, and vibration. Affordable housing must be secured by Section 106 not Condition. Councillor Harford recognised the tensions involved with this application, and the sensitivity needed in balancing the harm and benefit. Councillor Harford made reference to the provision of community transport.

During the ensuing Committee debate, the following points were made:

- Cottenham had a Village Design Statement
- The proposal was out of scale
- The proposed roundabout was over twice the size of the current one
- There would be an adverse impact on heritage assets
- The proposal was unsustainable
- The inability to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply was not the only issue to take into account
- Traffic and highway implications
- Key statutory consultees had not objected

Upon the Chairman's casting vote, there being one abstention, the Committee gave officers **delegated powers to approve** the application subject to

1. A Legal Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 securing
  - a. Affordable Housing
  - b. Open Space
  - c. Community Facilities
  - d. Waste Receptacles
  - e. Education contribution
  - f. Health contribution
  - g. Transport requirements
  - h. Surface Water Scheme maintenance
  - i. Archaeological Exclusion Zone maintenance
  - j. Landscape and Ecological Management Plan for all areas outside private

ownership;

2. The Conditions set out at (a) to (pp) in the report from the Head of Development Management; and
3. An additional Condition requiring that no more than 200 residential dwellings, including 40% affordable, and 70 dwellings with care be built on this site.

---

**Councillor Brian Burling left the meeting after the conclusion of Item 7 and was not present for item 8.**

---

**8. S/1818/15/OL (APP/W0530/W/16/3151609)- COTTENHAM (LAND OFF RAMPTON ROAD)**

The Planning Team Leader (East) referred Members to the written comments from Councillor Simon Edwards (a local Member), read out during consideration of Application S/1411/16/OL.

Malcolm Dee (objector) and Councillor Frank Morris (Cottenham Parish Council) addressed the meeting. Malcolm Dee referred to the impact of increased traffic on the Alms houses, and on the safety of residents. He expressed surprise that the Heritage Statement had not prompted a revised officer recommendation. He said that alterations to the proposed roundabout were needed to protect the Alms houses. Councillor Morris expressed disappointment in the Committee's decision to give officers delegated powers to approve Application S/1411/16/OL, which could increase harm in the long term.

Following a brief debate, the Committee gave officers **delegated powers to agree** a 'Statement of Common Ground' on the appeal App/W0530/W/16/3151609, which would result in South Cambridgeshire District Council not defending the Highway and Landscaping reason for refusal, and the Appellant submitting to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority additional drawings relating to transport, landscaping and a mitigation package.

---

**The Meeting ended at 2.25 p.m.**

---