



Inspectors had sent to South Cambridgeshire District Council on 15 November 2017 in which the Inspectors had made it absolutely clear that their “final conclusions would be contained in our reports to [South Cambridgeshire District and Cambridge City Councils] and it is not appropriate for you to jump to conclusions prior to the receipt of our reports.” The Planning Policy Manager also emphasised that it was important to note that, technically, the Examination remained open until the two Councils received the final reports.

Councillor Deborah Roberts commented that the Inspector clearly supported the *Liverpool* method of calculating five-year supply, and that the Council’s AMR included a calculation on that basis. She asked what was being done to push forward with completion of the local plan examination process. The Planning Policy Manager responded that the Inspector had included a modification for consultation that used the *Liverpool* method of calculation, but made clear that all the Modifications were those that may be necessary to make the Plan sound. She referred again to the letter from the Inspectors, and that as well as the general point about not giving weight to the Modifications ahead of the final inspectors report, the Inspectors referred specifically to their concerns earlier in the examination about the overall strategy and that in her view the 5 year supply methodology was inextricably linked to the development strategy.

Councillor John Batchelor queried the approach taken by South Cambridgeshire District Council’s barrister at a recent appeal relating to a site in Linton, which he considered as indicating that the Council could demonstrate a five-year supply. The Team Leader (West) responded that, as previously advised to Members, the Council’s barrister had not argued that a five-year supply was in place but that a number of other policies still needed to be given significant weight when making this balanced assessment. In particular, he made it clear that full weight should be given to policies DP/3 and NE/4 which, between them, sought to protect the countryside from inappropriate development. Indeed this had always been the case.

Councillor Sebastian Kindersley asked what the five-year supply would be using the *Liverpool* method of calculation. The Planning Policy Manager said that she didn’t have the figure with her but recalled that, jointly with Cambridge City Council, and using the *Liverpool* method with a 20% buffer, it was in the order of 5.8 years [subsequently confirmed as the correct figure]. Councillor Kindersley also asked whether the Council had sought legal advice on whether pressure could be put on the Inspector or PINS to speed up the conclusion of the local plan examination. The Planning Policy Manager said that officers had worked with the Council’s QC throughout the examination, including considering any potential to speed up the process. Councillor Kindersley praised the Planning Policy team for its role in the examination process, but asked that the explicit question be asked of the QC. Officers said they would consider the request.

## **2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Sebastian Kindersley declared non-pecuniary interests in respect of Item 8 (S/3428/17/OL - Steeple Morden (Land West of Station Road)) and Item 9 (S/3787/17/FL - Barrington (7 Back Lane)) as the local Cambridgeshire County Councillor. In respect of Item 8 (S/3428/17/OL - Steeple Morden (Land West of Station Road)), Councillor Kindersley had made some factual statements on Facebook, but was now considering the matter afresh.

Councillor Charles Nightingale declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of Item 4 (S/3591/17/FL - Thriplow (Thriplow Farm, Lodge Road)). He knew the farming family making the application personally but not professionally.

Councillor Deborah Roberts declared non-pecuniary interests in Item 4 (Councillor Charles Nightingale declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of Item 4 (S/3591/17/FL - Thriplow (Thriplow Farm, Lodge Road)), Item 5 (S/3567/17/FL - Thriplow (New Barn, Brook Road))) and Item 6 (S/3566/17/FL - Foxtton (Land East of Fowlmere Road)). She was a member of Foxtton Parish Council and had attended meetings there and at Thriplow Parish Council, at which this application had been discussed. Councillor Roberts was considering the three applications afresh.

### 3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Committee authorised the Chairman to sign, as a correct record, the Minutes of the meeting held on 4 April 2018.

---

**The Team Leader (West) said that, because of the linked nature of Items 4, 5 and 6, those items would be considered in order, and then voted upon in the same order following discussion of all three.**

---

### 4. S/3591/17/FL - THRILOW (THRILOW FARM, LODGE ROAD)

Lisa Foster (objector), Jamie Wilding (representing the applicant), Philip Kratz (agent for Foxtton Parish Council), Councillor Chris Jackson (Thriplow Parish Council), and Councillor Peter Topping (local Member) addressed the meeting.

In response to questioning, the case officer told Members that the proposed density was acceptable to the Local Planning Authority, and that there was no requirement for a viability assessment. The Environment Impact Assessment was addressed in paragraph 17 of the report.

Other issues considered during the Committee debate were extent of the development, sustainability, school capacity, and deliverability. Members also noted that Thriplow has the status of a Group Village.

The Committee **refused** the application contrary to the recommendation in the report from the Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development. Members agreed the reasons for refusal as being:

- An unsustainable form of development given scale of proposal, limited range of services and facilities in Thriplow, lack of alternative travel modes and overreliance on car travel.
- The proposal would have an adverse impact on the character and setting of the village, encroaching into countryside and affecting setting of the green belt.

### 5. S/3567/17/FL - THRILOW (NEW BARN, BROOK ROAD)

Richard Webber (objector), David Walston (representing the applicant), and Philip Kratz (agent for Foxtton Parish Council) addressed the meeting.

The ensuing debate referred to the impact on the Green Belt, and the absence of a

sequential site search.

The Committee **refused** the application contrary to the recommendation in the report from the Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development. Members agreed the reasons for refusal as being the absence of any special circumstances such as to overcome the inappropriateness of development in the Green Belt

#### 6. **S/3566/17/FL - FOXTON (LAND EAST OF FOWLMERE ROAD)**

The case officer corrected two errors in the report. Land ownership amounted to 900 hectares (not acres) and capacity of the rainwater harvesting tank should be 500,000 litres (not 5,000 litres). Further representations had been received relating to noise, which had already been addressed in the report. The case officer read out comments received from Fowlmere Parish Council.

Roger Frost (objector), David Walston (representing the applicant), Philip Kratz (agent for Foxtton Parish Council) and Councillor Lawrence Wragg (Fowlmere Parish Council) addressed the meeting.

Councillor Deborah Roberts (local Member) said that the scale of development was something that simply could not be mitigated.

The ensuing debate focussed on flood risk, the extent, location and density of the associated housing, location of the silos, and impact on the Green Belt.

The Committee **refused** the application contrary to the recommendation in the report from the Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development. Members agreed the reasons for refusal as being

- The absence of very special circumstances such as would overcome the inappropriateness of development in the Green Belt
- The impact on the character and openness of that Green Belt

#### 7. **S/4548/17/OL - COTTENHAM (LAND AT OAKINGTON ROAD)**

Members visited the site on 23 April 2018.

The case officer said that the decision would have to be delegated to officers

- To allow the receipt of, and consultation on, revised site plans
- The receipt of revised ownership certificates and expiry of notices served in relation thereto
- The absence of any further material change in circumstances, or any additional material planning considerations
- Should the Committee approve the application, the prior completion of a Legal Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Helen Murphy (objector), Gabriel Lau (applicant's agent) and Councillor Frank Morris (Cottenham Parish Council) addressed the meeting.

During the Committee debate, Members focussed on the site location being outside the village framework, and its impact on the Green Belt. Other concerns were cumulative effect and deliverability.

The Committee gave officers **delegated powers to refuse** the application contrary to the recommendation in the report from the Joint Director for Planning and Economic

Development. Members agreed the reasons for refusal as being

- Located on the edge of the village some distance from services and facilities,
- the development would unduly encroaching into countryside and affecting setting of the green belt.

**8. S/3428/17/OL - STEEPLE MORDEN (LAND WEST OF STATION ROAD)**

Members visited the site on 23 April 2018.

Steve Fisher (objector), Andy Thompson (applicant's agent). Councillor Chris Whittington (Steeple Morden Parish Council) and Councillor Cicely Murfitt (local Member) addressed the meeting.

During the ensuing Committee debate, Members focussed on the speculative nature of the application, over-development, character, and the importance of the green frontage.

The Senior Planning Lawyer advised the Committee that the best way to secure the maintenance of landscaping and a minimum number of affordable homes would be by a Legal Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

The Committee **refused** the application contrary to the recommendation in the report from the Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development. Members agreed the reasons for refusal as being that the proposed development would have an adverse impact on the street scene and setting of the Conservation Area which would conflict with policies DP/2 and CH/5 of the South Cambridgeshire District Council adopted Local Development Framework 2007.

**9. S/3787/17/FL - BARRINGTON (7 BACK LANE)**

Following a short debate, the Committee **deferred** this application so that officers could ascertain the height of the proposed dwellings relative to the existing building.

**10. S/0312/18/OL - ICKLETON (LAND REAR OF 11 COPLOE ROAD)**

The Committee **approved** the application subject to the Conditions and Informatives set out in the report from the Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development.

**11. S/0997/18/FL - CAMBOURNE (CAMBOURNE BUSINESS PARK)**

The Committee **approved** the application subject to Conditions 1 and 2 set out in the report from the Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development, and Condition 3, amended to require cessation of use within one year from the start of development on site, rather than from the date of the Decision Notice.

---

**The Meeting ended at 3.35 p.m.**

---