

refers) a non-pecuniary interest as an Elected Member of the applicant Local Authority, Cambridgeshire County Council.

Councillor Neil Scarr

In respect of S/1066/13/OL in Fulbourn (Minute 148 refers), a non-pecuniary interest as present at Fulbourn Parish Council meetings at which this matter had been discussed.. Councillor Scarr was considering the matter afresh.

Councillor Ben Shelton

In respect of application S/0560/14/FL in Stapleford (Minute 151 refers), a non-pecuniary interest as a member of both Stapleford and Great Shelford Parish Councils.

144. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Committee authorised the Chairman to sign, as a correct record, the Minutes of the meeting held on 7 May 2014.

145. S/2239/13/FL - SAWSTON (LAND TO NORTH OF DEAL GROVE OFF BABRAHAM ROAD)

Pat Westcott (objector), Meghan Bonner (applicant's agent), Jackie Smith (community supporter), and Councillor Kevin Cuffley (a local Member) addressed the meeting.

Members visited the site on 3 June 2014.

Members heard objections relating to access, the adverse impact on neighbours and an important ecological corridor, the loss of some trees and privacy, and noise.

The Committee was **minded to give officers delegated powers to approve** the application subject to

1. Reconsideration of ecology and access issues (including access from the A1307) in consultation with Parish Councils and local Members representing Sawston and Babraham.
2. Further consideration of the environmental impact, including from lighting on site;
3. Safeguarding Conditions and, if appropriate, the prior completion of a Legal Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990; and
4. The application being referred to the Secretary of State as a Departure from the Development Plan and not being called in for determination by him.

146. S/2529/13/FL - CROYDON (PORTLET, HIGH STREET)

Louise Grace (objector), Saffron Garner (applicant's agent), and a speaker from Croydon Parish Council addressed the meeting.

Members visited the site on 3 June 2014.

Members heard an objection based on scale, noise and the operation of an inappropriate commercial business from residential premises close to neighbours. They considered the possibility of requiring some form of acoustic fencing.