

Minutes would be amended to capture Councillor Rippeth's intention to vote.

With the amendment, the Committee authorised, by affirmation, the Chair to sign the Minutes of the meeting held on 13 September 2023 as a correct record.

5. 23/00123/FUL - Land South Of Pond, Cambourne Business Park, Cambourne

Councillor Judith Rippeth withdrew from the Committee, in-line with her declaration of interest

The Principal Planner (SCIP and CIP sites) informed the Committee that the officer's recommendation had been updated to read as follows:

"To DEFER planning application reference 23/00123/FUL to enable the Local Planning Authority to fully review the additional technical information in respect of noise, vibration and electromagnetic radiation submitted by third parties and by the applicants after the publication of the Agenda.

Having regards to Policies SC/10 and SC/14 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 and the requirements of Paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy framework, officers consider that the review of this technical information and officers conclusions upon issues raised in the respect of noise, vibration and electromagnetic radiation is necessary prior to a decision being taken on the application."

Councillor Anna Bradnam, seconded by Councillor Peter Fane, proposed that the Committee move to a vote; the Committee agreed to the proposal by affirmation.

In accordance with the updated officer's recommendation, the Committee **deferred** the application by unanimous vote.

Councillor Judith Rippeth rejoined the Committee

6. 22/05549/OUT - TWI, Granta Park, Great Abington

Councillor Heather Williams joined the Committee

The Chair noted that the Committee had visited the site on 4 October 2023. The Area Team Leader presented the report and provided the following updates to the report:

- The Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly had met on 7 September 2023 and it was confirmed at the meeting that work on Cambridge South East Transport (CSET) Phase 2, referenced in paragraphs 10.133-34 of the report, had been paused. Officers noted this but as it was a "pause" and given the length of time the development was anticipated to take based on the phasing programme (circa 10+ years), it was not considered that this affected the financial contributions requested in these paragraphs.
- An inaccuracy had been identified in the Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) that was last published (Rev B), in which the AMS showed all of the trees of G50 adjacent to the B3 extension proposed as being removed. However, officers identified that two of these trees were being shown as retained on the replacement tree planting strategy and the applicant had confirmed that these two trees were to be retained. In light of this, paragraphs 3.4 and 10.87 of the report should say "removal of 23no." rather than "25no."

Councillor Geoff Harvey left the meeting

In response to Member questions, officers provided clarity on the following considerations:

- Heads of Terms and CSET funding- comment was made that the wording in the Heads of Terms which referenced CSET should state “or alternatives if required” in order to secure transport funding in case the CSET proposals were not delivered.
- Impact on views from the Church of St Mary the Virgin (Great Abington)- officers advised that the view from the Grade II* Listed Church of St Mary the Virgin had, in agreement with Conservation officers, not been included as a key view in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and the Conservation Team had not raised the proposal as having any impact on the heritage asset following their site visits and consideration of the proposal.
- Noise impact- Members made reference to the concerns over noise raised by Little Abington Parish Council (paragraph 9.64) and officers advised that a noise assessment had been submitted with the application and referred to condition 18 which addressed noise mitigation.
- Building heights- officers advised that the Outline consent would prescribe the maximum height of development above ordnance datum and that the reserved matters stage would present details of the scale of buildings. Members enquired as to if it would be possible to lower buildings through excavation and, in response, officers advised that this could be proposed at the reserved matters stage.
- Historic England- Officers advised that Historic England had made no substantial comment on the application and had advised that conservation matters should be considered by officers of the Council.
- Policy E/15(3) of the Local Plan- Officers advised that harm to the surrounding countryside had been acknowledged but that the benefits of the scheme outweighed the harms and thus the balance of material considerations had led to an officer recommendation of approval.

The Committee was addressed by the agent of the applicant, Justin Bainton of Carter Jonas, who responded to questions regarding pre-application engagement with local stakeholders by the applicant, drainage management and excavation required for development. Further clarity was provided by both the agent and officers in response to questions on public access to the site and the proposals for tree planting. Councillor Tony Orgee of Great Abington Parish Council addressed the Committee on behalf of the Parish Council. Councillor Orgee responded to questions regarding building heights and meetings held between the Parish Council and applicant. Officers provided clarity over the changes to the proposed maximum heights made between the Design Review Panel stage and submission of the application. Jessica Ashbridge, Parish Clerk, addressed the Committee on behalf of Little Abington Parish Council.

In the debate, the Committee agreed that the principle of development for the site was acceptable, noting the significance of Granta Park as an Established Employment Area and the economic benefits of the proposal. The maximum building heights and any harm arising from the scale of the proposed parameters were discussed. Impact on heritage assets were noted but Members stated that the less than substantial harm was outweighed by the benefits of the proposal, with the development potentially strengthening mitigation in some areas. The visual impact on the landscape was discussed, with some Members stating that the harm was minimal with the proposed mitigation and others expressing a view that the proposed parameters would lead to unacceptable levels of harm. The Committee noted that details of scale and massing would be addressed at the reserved matters stage. Concerns were raised over the loss of oak and maple trees detailed in the proposal and officers advised that the details of planting would be secured by reserved matters, with it being inappropriate to condition a direct replacement of the trees referenced at outline consent. The Committee agreed to add an informative which captured the desire to see at least 8 oak and 2 maple trees to be planted and maintained

in an area of the site that was not part of future development plans to mitigate biodiversity losses.

The Committee agreed that the transport obligation in the Heads of Terms should make reference to alternatives to CSET.

By 8 (Councillors Dr Martin Cahn, Peter Fane, Anna Bradnam, Ariel Cahn, Dr Lisa Redrup, Judith Rippeth, Peter Sandford and Eileen Wilson) votes to 1 (Councillor Heather Williams), the Committee **approved** the application in accordance with the officer's recommendation, and subject to the completion of a S106 agreement and conditions, as laid out in the report from the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development.

7. **23/00329/LBC - TWI, Granta Park, Great Abington**

The Area Team Leader presented the report. Councillor Tony Orgee of Great Abington Parish Council addressed the Committee on behalf of the Parish Council and in opposition to the application. In response to a question, Councillor Orgee detailed his understanding of the history of the site.

Officers responded to questions and provided clarity over the buttressing of the wall, the intention to keep the existing opening in use as part of the landscaping strategy for the linked outline consent and that the retaining of historic materials was secured by conditions. Some Members concurred with the Conservation Officer's comments, stating that the harm from the proposal was minimal, whilst others felt that the benefits of the proposal did not outweigh the harm to heritage assets.

By 8 (Councillors Dr Martin Cahn, Peter Fane, Anna Bradnam, Ariel Cahn, Dr Lisa Redrup, Judith Rippeth, Peter Sandford and Eileen Wilson) votes to 1 (Councillor Heather Williams), the Committee **approved** the application in accordance with the officer's recommendation, and subject to the conditions, as laid out in the report from the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development.

8. **Compliance Report**

The Principal Planning Compliance Manager presented the report and provided a verbal update on the online compliance reporting system. Members requested that details of how long cases had been open be included in future reports and officers agreed to investigate how this information could best be presented and stated that an update would be provided at the next meeting. In response to Member comments, officers advised that delays at the Planning Inspectorate were impacting appeals against enforcement action taken by the Council and that updates on timelines were not being received from the Planning Inspectorate. Members also enquired as to if officers had any suggestions on how the compliance service could be improved, especially given the challenges arising from delays from the Planning Inspectorate, and officers agreed to bring a response to the next meeting of the Committee.

The Committee **noted** the report.

9. **Appeals against Planning Decisions and Enforcement Action**

The Delivery Manager introduced the report and provided further update on impact of the delays at the Planning Inspectorate on open appeals.

The Committee **noted** the report.

The Meeting ended at 12.25 p.m.
