

## **Planning Committee**

**Wednesday, 10 February 2021**

### **Decisions**

Set out below is a summary of the decisions taken at the meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 10 February 2021. The wording used does not necessarily reflect the actual wording that will appear in the minutes. The decisions below are subject to decision notices being finalised and issued.

If you have any queries about any matters referred to in this decision sheet please contact Ian Senior, 03450 450 500 [democratic.services@scams.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@scams.gov.uk).

**1. S/3921/19/FL - Little Abington (Bancroft Farm, Church Lane)**

By seven votes to four, the Committee refused the application contrary to the recommendation in the report from the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development. Members agreed the reasons for refusal as being:

**Reason 1: PVAA Encroachment / Impact**

The application site is located adjacent to, and partially within, a Protected Village Amenity Area which provides a significant contribution to the legibility of the village, maintaining an important area of open land at the centre of the village that supports the rural character, amenity and sense of tranquillity of Little Abington.

The proposed development, by virtue of its encroachment into this Protected Village Amenity Area, would undermine the undeveloped nature and rural character at the centre of the village, failing to preserve the local rural character, amenity and sense of tranquillity of the area or provide a place-responsive, and legible form of development. The proposal would therefore fail to accord with Policies S/7, HQ/1 and NH/11 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019, particularly paragraphs 127 and 130.

**Reason 2: Character / Heritage Impact**

The proposed development, by virtue of its siting, scale and massing would significantly erode the relatively undeveloped nature of the application site and its rural quality, which contributes positively to the existing character of the Conservation Area. The siting of Plots 1 and 6, being located adjacent to the public highway, would represent an overly dominant and prominent form of development which would detract from the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Furthermore, by virtue of their siting, Plots 1 and 6 would be evident in street scene views to the south towards Church of St Mary the Virgin, a Grade II\* Listed Building, impacting on its setting. When viewed from the east, along the public right of way, views of the Church would be further eroded due to the inappropriate scale and massing of the proposed development.

The proposal would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and setting of the Church of St Mary the Virgin. It is not considered that the proposal results in public benefits that would

outweigh the harm to the significance of the Conservation Area and the Grade II\* listed church.

The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies HQ/1 and NH/14 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 that require development proposals to sustain and enhance the significance of heritage assets, including their settings, as appropriate to their significance, the Council's Listed Building and Conservation Area Supplementary Planning Documents and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019, chapter 16.

(Councillors Cahn, Fane, Hawkins, and Milnes voted to approve the application. Councillors John Batchelor, Bradnam, Daunton, Roberts, Heather Williams, Richard Williams, and Wright voted to refuse.)

**2. 20/02833/FUL - Fulbourn (6 Pierce Lane)**

By six votes to four, with one member not voting, the Committee approved the application subject to the Conditions set out in the report from the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development.

(Councillors John Batchelor, Bradnam, Cahn, Fane, Milnes, and Roberts voted to approve the application, Councillors Hawkins, Heather Williams, Richard Williams, and Wright voted to refuse. Councillor Daunton did not take part in the debate and did not vote.)

**3. 20/04710/HFUL - Steeple Morden (8 Craft Way)**

By affirmation, the Committee approved the application subject to the Conditions set out in the report from the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development.

**4. 20/04089/HFUL - Shudy Camps (14 Main Street)**

By ten votes to nil with one abstention, the Committee approved the application subject to the Conditions and Informatives set out in the report from the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development.

(Councillor Cahn abstained)

**5. 20/04223/HFUL - Fowlmere (20A Pipers Close)**

By affirmation, Committee deferred the application to give the applicant an opportunity to submit a new ownership certificate. New consultation would then take place, following which the application would be presented to Committee for determination.