

development in her ward (Fen Ditton and Fulbourn) and stated that she had been present at discussions on the development at Parish Council meetings, but declared that she would be approaching the matter afresh. Councillors Dr. Claire Daunton and Henry Batchelor declared a non-pecuniary interest on this Item, as Cambridgeshire County Council was the applicant and they were both Members of the County Council, but were not precluded from being part of the decision regarding the application.

Councillors Heather Williams (the Mordens), Judith Rippeth (Milton & Waterbeach) and Geoff Harvey (Balsham) declared non-pecuniary interests for Item 15 (Enforcement Reports) as there were reports relating to Enforcement in their respective wards.

4. **Minutes of Previous Meeting**

The Committee authorised the Chair to sign, as correct record, the Minutes of the meeting held on 29 September 2021 subject to the following amendment:

Minute 4 – Minutes of a Previous Meeting

That the spelling of “Corrine Garvey” was corrected to the accurate spelling, “Corinne Garvey”.

The Committee authorised the Chair to sign, as correct record, the Minutes of the meeting held on 13 November 2021 subject to the following amendment:

Minute 6 – S/3290/19/RM – Fulbourn (Land East of Teversham Road)

In paragraph one, it was to be noted that the Committee was addressed by Councillors Dr. Claire Daunton and John Williams as Local Members. The paragraph subsequently stated:

“...Local Members Councillor Dr. Claire Daunton and Councillor John Williams addressed the meeting, and a written statement from local Member Councillor Graham Cone was presented to the Committee. Representatives from the Lead Local Flood Authority were also present.”

5. **Cambridgeshire County Council - Footpath Diversion (Fen Ditton Footpath 9)**

The report was presented by James Stringer, Cambridgeshire County Council’s Asset Information Definitive Map Officer.

Members noted the considerations for equestrian usage of the Footpath, and when the question of if the local Horse Society had been part of the Planning process arose, they were informed that the Horse Society had indeed been consulted. Members noted that the combined path layout of the application was very good and stated that they were happy that serious consideration had been given to the equestrian use of the footpath.

By affirmation, the Planning Committee **approved** the making and confirmation of a Public Path Stopping Up Order, alongside the other recommendations laid out in the report from the Asset Information Definitive Map Officer at Cambridgeshire County Council.

**The Senior Planning Lawyer
arrived at the meeting and
replaced the Monitoring
Officer.**

6. 21/01881/REM - Cottenham (Land North And East Of Ramphill Farm, Rampton Road)

The Principal Planner (Michael Sexton) presented the report and informed the Committee that there had been a written representation submitted by a resident in opposition to the application but stated that this representation did not raise any new issues that were not covered in the report. Local resident Mike Mason addressed the Committee in opposition to the application. James Griffiths, the agent of the application, spoke in support of the application and answered questions brought forward by Members. Concerns over heating and electric car charging points were presented by the Committee, but the Chair and Delivery Manager informed Members that these concerns were not relevant to the Reserve Matters application. Members noted that the Parish Council had raised concerns that there were a number of roads that would potentially not be adopted by the Highways Authority and enquired what the proportions of unadopted roads on the site would be. The agent stated that the proportion was unknown at the time but informed the Committee that the developers would do what they could to ensure as many of the roads as possible, notwithstanding private drives, would be adopted by the Highways Authority and noted that any funding from residents for the upkeep of the unadopted roads would be ringfenced and protected. The Senior Planning Lawyer highlighted the provision in the Section 106 Agreement which outlined the responsibility of residents to maintain the LEAP and other onsite public open space if the management company ceased to exist. Whilst the provision did not extend to the maintenance of roads, the Senior Planning Lawyer stated that residents would be incentivised to ensure the management company did not fold and added that, in his experience, that the question of unadopted roads is not a material consideration for the refusal of a reserve matters application. The advice from the Senior Planning Lawyer was endorsed by the Delivery Manager.

Councillor Neil Gough addressed the Committee as a local Member with the support of the Parish Council on his comments. Councillor Gough declared two non-pecuniary interests. The first was that he was the Director of the company that sold the land to the developers (Councillor Gough noted that the sale was completed prior to the his assumption of the Directorship), and the second was that the Councillor was a member of the Old West River Internal Drainage Board. The local Member stated that issues had largely been addressed to the satisfaction of the Parish Council and local Members. The Committee asked the local Member if he felt that a suitable drainage solution could be possible and if it would provide further assurance to concerned parties if a condition on drainage would come back to the Committee. The local Member could not declare if relevant parties would feel that a drainage condition could be effectively discharged, but did state that local parties would want to be involved in any discharge of such a condition. The Principal Planner informed the Committee that the site had not been recognised as a flood risk zone, that the Lead Local Flood Authority was consulted by the applicant and that drainage consultees were satisfied with the conditions put in place. Therefore, the Principal Planner advised that the concerns over drainage were not grounds for refusal.

Overall consensus amongst Committee Members was that there had been an improvement to the application, which was welcomed, and that the majority of remaining concerns over the application were not relevant to the Reserve Matters stage. Members expressed concerns over the lack of formal storage space in some of the designs in the report but the Principal Planner informed Councillors that, whilst dedicated storage space was not shown in some of the plans, there was ample storage space that ensured the

application was compliant with storage regulations. The Committee revisited concerns over unadopted roads and drainage, with drainage being the main point of contention. To allay concerns over drainage, the Committee introduced an Action Point for Officers at the Discharge of Conditions stage that requested that the Parish Council were officially consulted over the discharge of the drainage condition and, if there were concerns from the Parish, that it would be brought back to the Committee.

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

7. 21/02585/S73 - Longstanton/Northstowe (Northstowe Phase 2A, Land South Of Longstanton Road)

The report was presented by the Principal Planning Officer (Kate Poyser) with no updates. Anthony Child, the agent of the applicant, addressed the meeting and clarified that this application had been brought to the Committee to improve the environment for the occupants through greater access to open spaces and improvements to ground floor apartments. The Committee was also addressed by Councillor Paul Littlemore on behalf of and with the permission of Northstowe Town Council.

During the debate of the Item, Members felt that, whilst it was not entirely relevant to the application, that public transport concerns were an important point of discussion. The Committee asked if the development would have a bus service when completed, noting that projected decreases in car ownership and the age restricted accommodation on the site could leave many residents in need of effective public transport links, and if the planned urban busway would be complete by the time that the development in question was completed. Cambridgeshire County Council's Principal Transport Officer (Tam Parry) fielded questions on transport and informed the Committee that the urban busway would not be completed until the development in question, and other developments, were completed. The Principal Transport Officer stated that there were ongoing efforts to coordinate the completion of the busway and the affected developments but advised Members that accurate predictions of completion dates would likely be unavailable until 2024. The Committee was informed that there would be an interim bus service provided and were reminded that transport concerns were not relevant to the matter at hand. Concerns were raised over the removal of a parcel of green space in the proposal and the consequent effect on drainage. The Committee was informed by the Principal Planning Officer that, whilst a small amount of green space had been lost, there was no actual change proposed to the greenway or the strategic drainage scheme. The Principal Planning Officer stated that the car park surface was permeable, the swale had only been relocated and not otherwise affected by the changes to the green space and that the central swale would be piped to ensure that water could freely flow into the main swale on the periphery of the site.

The Committee noted that there had been significant improvements to the development proposal, in alignment with the agent's comments, and that there were no grounds for refusal. However, Members did hold some reservations about the development, including concerns over the heights of some buildings and the difficulties of assessing the "beauty" aspect of the National Planning Policy Framework. Councillor Dr. Richard Williams stated that he did not like the application, citing concerns over public transport, building heights and design and density, but noted that there were no reasons for refusal.

By eight votes to none, with one abstention (Councillor Dr. Richard Williams), and subject

to the conditions set out in the report from the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development, the Planning Committee **approved**:

- (a) The design amendment to layout, appearance, scale, access and landscaping of the age-restricted accommodation as part of the approved reserved matters scheme approved under reference S/3499/19/RM on land south of Longstanton Road, Northstowe Phase 2A.
- (b) The discharge of conditions relating to the above site.
- (c) Full planning permission for the temporary change of use of two dwellings to show homes on the above site.

8. 20/03598/OUT - Longstanton/Northstowe (Land West Of Station Road, Longstanton)

The Principal Planning Officer (Strategic Sites) presented the report and informed the Committee that there were amendments the Summary Heads of Terms included in the report (*attached to this Minutes document below this Item*) and that he would provide clarity on how the figures were derived. The applicant's agent, Peter McKeown, addressed the meeting. The agent was asked by Members to provide examples of changes resulting from consultations with the Town and Parish Councils. The agent highlighted changes to the drainage scheme, access to the guided busway and vehicular access to the Station Road entrance to the development that were a result of consultation with local parties. In response to another question, the agent informed the Committee that the four-storey building on the site was introduced, primarily for design reasons but also to provide accommodation, in response to consultations with the Cambridgeshire Quality Panel and South Cambridgeshire District Council Planning. The Committee was also informed by the agent that the parameter plans and illustrative master plan had been changed significantly after the consultations with the Quality Panel.

There was significant debate over the four-storey landmark building, with Members stating that a landmark building does not necessarily need to be a large building in the corner of a development and they expressed a general desire for developers to consider other ways of introducing landmark buildings to developments. Concerns were raised over the design of the landmark building, but the Committee was reminded by the Chair and the Delivery Manager that design was not part of the Outline Planning application and would be dealt with at the Reserved Matters stage. Members also expressed concerns over the height of the building and questioned if it would be in keeping with the character of the surrounding area. The Principal Planning Officer informed the Committee that there would be no buildings of similar height in the immediate vicinity, but noted that four-storey buildings would likely be introduced in later Phases of the Northstowe Development and the Delivery Manager noted that the development was in close proximity to the enterprise zone, a dense area of development, and therefore the building in question would likely be in keeping with the character of the area when further developments were completed. The Senior Planning Lawyer advised the Committee that, if the application was approved, the parameter plans would make it difficult to reject a Reserved Matters application on the basis of the height of the four-storey building.

Concerns were raised over junction traffic flow modelling, with desires to prioritise pedestrians over cars noted, and the fact that some traffic was modelled as overcapacity. The Delivery Manager noted that pedestrians were not being discouraged from using crossing points and the vehicular traffic light cycle was based off the assumption that there would not necessarily be pedestrians waiting to cross at every cycle and, by not having to

wait for pedestrian crossings every time the lights changed, the proposed cycle would reduce congestion somewhat. The Delivery Manager also stated that, whilst modelling was still overcapacity at the AM peak, changes to the scheme had resulted in improvements and had reduced the Degree of Saturation.

Comments were offered on archaeological, drainage and biodiversity issues. Condition 10 was highlighted by the Principal Planning Officer to alleviate concerns over archaeology and any potential finds onsite. In order to mitigate potentially significant drainage issues down the line, a request was made for the provision of a statement detailing how the development would ensure that it meets the drainage capacity of the site. The potential off-siting of the scheme(s) to meet the 10% biodiversity net gain requirements was scrutinised and it was questioned if the developers could respond to potential future change to policy requirements on biodiversity net gains. The Delivery Manager stated that developers were only obliged to meet the legislative requirements in place at the time of the application and could only be encouraged to go beyond this, and also informed the Committee that in, the first instance, biodiversity net gain options would be sought on-site and off-site options would only be explored if there were no suitable on-site measures available. The Delivery Manager acknowledged the desire for off-site measures to be as close to the site as possible but noted that it could not be dealt with at the Outline Planning application stage.

The Senior Planning Lawyer requested that the Committee confirmed that they were happy with the details of the Tariff Base and that it could be dealt with by the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development, and requested that they endorse that the indexation of any Section 106 agreement payments due to run from the date of resolution. The Delivery Manager clarified these requests and the Committee agreed to them.

By affirmation, the Planning Committee **granted delegated authority** to officers to grant outline planning permission, subject to:

- (a) The planning conditions set out in the report from the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development, with final wording of any amendments to these to be agreed with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Planning Committee prior to the issuing of planning permission; and
- (b) The prior completion of a Section 106 Agreement.

Amended Summary Heads of Terms:**S106 Summary Heads of Terms**

Topic	Total Request	Request Detail
Transport Projects	£256,000	Lump sum.
Secondary Education	£331,382	Calculated by dwelling size and tenure (£0-£21,612)
Primary Education	£466,059	Calculated by dwelling size and tenure (£0-24,855)
Early Years	£177,842	Calculated by dwelling size and tenure (£0-£5,220)
Libraries	£39,857.50	£372.50 per dwelling
Strategic Waste	£20,330	£190 per dwelling
Indoor sport	£94,747	Lump sum
Outdoor Sport	£112,453.27	Calculated by dwelling size
Indoor Community Facilities	£108,273.70	£1011.90 per dwelling
Burial land	£22,260	£210 per dwelling
Community Development Strategy	£45,000	Lump sum
Community Endowment	£10,000	Lump sum
Small Grants Scheme	£1,337.50	£12.50 per dwelling
S106 monitoring	£1,000	Lump sum
Bins	£10,610	£85 per flat, £350 per 1,100l bin for flats
Maintenance of open space		Based on quotes for maintenance of the open space for a period of 10 years to be obtained in the event open space is adopted by Town/District Council.
Affordable Housing	40%	70% social rent, 30% intermediate

9. **21/03350/REM - Longstanton/Northstowe (Northstowe Phase 1, Sports Pavilion, Station Road)**

The report was presented by the Principal Planning Officer (Mike Huntington) who informed the Committee that South Cambridgeshire District Council was the applicant and that there were no updates to the report. A written statement from a member of the public (Gaurang Daruwala) was circulated amongst Members, and Martin Lindus addressed the Committee as an agent of the applicant. When questioned on the subject, the agent clarified that the lighting to the exterior of the building was implemented through low level bollards in the car park and that there was no upward pointing lighting proposed for the side of the building. The agent informed the Committee that the lighting scheme was designed to provide visibility for visitors whilst not creating excessive light pollution that would impact both residents and local wildlife. The agent was also questioned on the potential for the site and car park to be a catalyst for anti-social behaviour. The agent noted that the layout of the car park was not conducive to joyriding, stating that it would be segmented and broken up by bays and features, and also informed the Committee that there were no proposals in the scheme to provide CCTV or other monitoring systems but expressed a willingness to discuss potential mitigation measures with the applicant. Councillor Paul Littlemore of Northstowe Town Council also addressed the Committee and, in response to a question, clarified comments on the Impact Assessment, stating that the comments were put forward to provide clarity to the Town Council on the Construction Management Plan and whether relevant conditions would be discharged through conditions laid out in the Outline Planning application or the Reserve Matters application in question.

In the debate, Members noted concerns expressed by the Parish Council over boundary treatments in the car park. The Principal Planning Officer informed the Committee that there was nothing on boundary treatments in the report, but stated that a condition on boundary treatment could be added to Materials Planning condition. Councillor Richard Williams, seconded by Councillor Heather Williams, proposed an amendment of the Materials Planning condition.

By affirmation, the Committee **approved** the addition of the wording "The submission shall also include detail of any boundary treatment to the car park, as well as details of permeable surfacing to the car park associated with condition 7 (Surface Water Drainage)" to condition 2 (Materials).

The concerns expressed by Councillor Littlemore over the Construction Management Plan were addressed by the Committee. The Delivery Manager noted that the report stated that, if considered appropriate by the Committee, a condition on a Construction Management Plan could be added. Councillor Dr. Tumi Hawkins, seconded by Councillor Heather Williams, proposed the addition of a Construction Management Plan.

By affirmation, the Committee **approved** the addition of condition 9 (Construction Management Plan) which stated:

"No development shall take place until a Construction and Environment Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall take place in accordance with the approved details" with the following Reason:

"To ensure that the potential environmental and nuisance impact of the construction of the development on existing and future residents is minimised, in accordance with South Cambridgeshire Local Plan policy HQ/1".

The concerns over security and anti-social behaviour were explored by the Committee. The Delivery Manager noted that the addition of CCTV was a difficult issue to address and that the Reserved Matters application was not the appropriate stage to remedy Member's

concerns on the subject. The Senior Planning Lawyer informed the Committee that there was nothing in the Section 106 Agreement that dealt with security or CCTV. It was noted by the Delivery Manager that the applicant (South Cambridgeshire District Council) would be the Local Authority responsible for taking any action to manage anti-social behaviour issues and the Delivery Manager acknowledged that local Police had not been consulted on the application. Councillor Heather Williams proposed that an informative on the responsibility for managing security and CCTV issues be added.

By affirmation, the Committee **approved** the addition of an informative which stated: "The applicant should consider the introduction of security measures such as CCTV to help effectively manage the use of the pavilion and the car park".

Mr. Daruwala was given the opportunity to verbally express his concerns over the application. Further debate explored the concern raised by Mr. Daruwala over cooking noise and smells, and the Principal Planning Officer informed the Committee that the Environmental Health Officer made no comment on the application as there were no environmental health issues. Members noted that Mr. Daruwala's concerns had been addressed before his verbal representation after discussions of his written submission were undertaken. The Committee noted that the addition of the conditions and informatives made the application satisfactory.

By affirmation, the Planning Committee **approved** the Reserved Matters submission, subject to both the conditions added by the Committee and those originally laid out in the report from the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development.

10. **S/2442/19/FL - Willingham (The Piggery, Haden Way)**

Michael Sexton, the Principal Planner, presented the report and informed the Committee that there were written submissions provided by members of the public, but these did not raise any new issues that were not covered in the report. The Committee was addressed by the agent for the applicant, Nathaniel Green. The agent offered clarity over concerns presented by the Committee and noted that the conditions of the application ensured that the site would remain a single pitch site, and that any violation of this would be a matter for enforcement, and that the inclusion of both a static and touring caravan, as well as the day room, was standard practice in the establishment of a single-pitch gypsy site.

When asked if the piggery buildings could be converted into accommodation, the Principal Planner informed the Committee that the application was to demolish the buildings and that alternative uses of the buildings was not the subject of the application. The Principal Planner, in response to a question, stated that there were no policy objections to the change to the use of the land. The Committee agreed that the permitted development rights needed to be revoked if the application was approved but some Members expressed concerns that the piggery buildings would not be demolished, whilst others stated that demolition might not be completely necessary if the site could be successfully utilised without demolition. The Delivery Manager informed Members that once the site became a gypsy pitch the permitted development rights would be lost and noted that the application included a demolition so, if approved, it would be fair to assume the buildings would be demolished but stated that a condition on demolition could be included if the Committee felt it necessary. A motion to include a condition on demolition was proposed by Councillor Dr. Martin Cahn, seconded by Councillor Dr. Tumi Hawkins. The motion was

denied by a vote of seven votes to two.

Members noted the concerns of the public towards the application but felt that the conditions laid out in the report were strong and Members were confident that enforcement could deal with any issues that could arise on the site. The Committee agreed that there was a need for such sites in the District and that the site was suitable for the proposal.

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

**Councillor Dr. Claire
Daunton left the meeting
and did not vote on any
subsequent Items. In
accordance with Standing
Orders, the Committee
agreed by affirmation to
continue the meeting
beyond four hours.**

11. 20/02161/FUL - Coton (Land At And To The Rear Of 24 High Street)

The report was presented by the Senior Planning Officer. A member of the public, Cathy Shaw, spoke in opposition to the application and, when questioned, informed the Committee that flooding in the area was affecting a number of properties, many of which had installed pumps to their properties to remove water runoff due to the recurring flooding. The Committee was also addressed by the agent of the applicant, Kath Slater, who answered questions from Members. When questioned if the chalk/ clay boundary had been assessed, the agent informed the Committee that geotechnical analysis would take place as part of the satisfaction of the condition regarding the drainage plan. The agent informed Members that a drainage assessment had not been done as the site was in flood zone 1 and was deemed to have a low risk of flooding, and also stated that the applicant would accept a rewording of the drainage condition. Councillor Carolyn Postgate, acting on behalf of and with the authorisation of Coton Parish Council, also made a verbal representation. The Councillor clarified that the Parish Council felt that the application was in contravention of policies HQ/1, H/16 and NH/8, and also answered questions on traffic, stating that vehicles often exceed the speed limit on the highway adjoining the pre-existing access to the site and that the increased use of the site access could pose a danger to residents.

In the debate, Members questioned if policy H/16 applied to the application and, if so, how compliance was being achieved. The Delivery Manager informed the Committee that policy H/16 did apply and Officers felt that the application complied with the policy, but stated that it was ultimately up to Members to decide if they felt satisfied that the application was compliant with the policy. The Senior Planning Officer noted that policy H/16 had been taken into account and also stated that Officers felt that policy HQ/1 had also been satisfied and that the development would not be detrimental to the character of the area. In response to a question on policy NH/8, the Delivery Manager noted that the site was separated from the green belt by an area of land and that the development was

low density which would further mitigate impact on the green belt. Members were satisfied that the application would not impact the listed building in close proximity to the development, but consensus on the impact on the green belt was not found. Further concerns were expressed over parking and highways. The Senior Planning Officer informed the Committee that, whilst on-street parking would be lost, ample parking would be provided on the site. The Committee indicated their surprise at the lack of objection to the application from the Highways Authority, but the Senior Planning Lawyer informed Members that the lack of objection from the Highways Authority meant that highways concerns would not be a valid reason for refusal. Members noted that the drainage scheme was not relevant to the application in front of them and accepted that it would be discussed at a later date but still conveyed reservations over drainage and expressed disappointment over the lack of assessment of flooding and drainage.

Upon proposal by Councillor Heather Williams, seconded by Councillor Dr. Richard Williams, the Planning Committee **approved** via affirmation, minus the vote of Councillor Claire Daunton, the change of wording in condition 6, replacing “by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of the buildings hereby permitted” with “by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development hereby permitted”.

The Delivery Manager clarified that, if Members were to refuse the application, the reasons for refusal would be the lack of compliance with policies HQ/1 and H/16. Members felt that policy NH/8 would also be a reason for refusal.

By four votes to two (Councillors Henry Batchelor, Peter Fane, Judith Rippeth and Geoff Harvey voted for whilst Councillors Heather Williams and Dr. Richard Williams voted against), with two abstentions (Councillors Dr. Tumi Hawkins and Dr. Martin Cahn) and minus the vote of Councillor Dr. Claire Daunton, the Planning Committee **approved** the application, subject to the updated conditions set out in the report from the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development.

12. **21/03068/FUL - Orwell (Former Garage Site, Meadowcroft Road)**

The Principal Planner, Michael Sexton, presented the report with no update. It was noted by the Principal Planner that the local Member, Councillor Aidan Van de Weyer, had distributed an email expressing support for the application and that there had been written representations received from members of the public but that these did not highlight any new issues that were not covered in the report. A local resident, Peter Kruger, addressed the Committee in opposition to the development. Members acknowledged the speaker's concerns over foul water drainage, sought clarity over the nature of the concern and enquired as to whether the issue had been reported to Anglia Water. The speaker stated that there had been significant flooding at the entrance to the site which logically would have been caused by faults in the pipework between the entrance to the site and the pumping station and brook the other side of the site. The Committee was informed that storm water was not reaching the brook and foul water was not reaching the pumping station, instead they were combining and causing flooding at the entrance to the site. The speaker stated that Anglia Water had been notified of the issue by multiple residents.

In the debate, the Committee continued to address the concerns over foul water and questioned if the issues in the sewers were grounds for refusal. The Principal Planner stated that if the issues were confirmed, it would be a maintenance issue for Anglia Water and would not provide the grounds for any technical objection against the application. In responding to further questions on the topic, the Principal Planner noted that Anglia Water had not been consulted on the application but stated that the Council's Sustainable

Drainage Engineer supported the application subject to the conditions laid out in the report. Members also noted the concerns over parking but the Principal Planner quelled concerns on this issue when he informed the Committee that the site would have dedicated, self-contained parking spaces that would not encroach on existing parking space. The demand for affordable housing in the District was noted by the Committee, and Members felt that the application met a need and was a good use of derelict land. It was stated that the majority of concerns were met by the conditions laid out in the report, but the issue of foul water drainage was significant. To remedy this, Councillor Dr. Tumi Hawkins, seconded by Councillor Heather Williams, proposed an informative on the subject of foul water drainage.

Upon proposal, the Planning Committee **approved** via affirmation the addition of an informative stating:

“The applicant is advised to engage with Anglian Water in respect of the existing and proposed foul water drainage arrangements, pursuant to the requirements of condition 7 of this consent which requires the submission and approval of a scheme for the disposal of surface water and foul water drainage and maintenance for the development.”

By affirmation, minus the vote of Councillor Claire Daunton, the Planning Committee **approved** the application, subject to the conditions laid out in the report from the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development.

Councillor Dr. Richard Williams left the meeting and did not vote on subsequent Items.

13. 21/01146/FUL - Barrington (Barns Adjacent To 20 West Green)

The report was presented by the Principal Planner, Jane Rodens, with no updates. The applicant, Michael Lauterpacht, addressed the Committee. When questioned, the applicant informed Members that the proposed building would reflect the history of the site by incorporating a barn-style aesthetic, utilising timber cladding and slate roofing and constructing the building with a similar footprint to that of the old buildings.

Members commended the application for its significant attempts to enhance the area and preserve the aesthetic of the site. The proposed reuse of timber from the old buildings was praised, and the Committee felt that the application was an excellent use of the land as the existing buildings could not be retained.

By affirmation, minus the votes of Councillor Dr. Claire Daunton and Councillor Dr. Richard Williams, the Planning Committee **approved** the application, subject to the conditions set out in the report from the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development.

14. 21/01147/LBC - Barrington (Barns Adjacent To 20 West Green)

As the previous Item was a different application on the same development, the Committee felt satisfied that the report presentation and public representation from the previous Item was sufficient to inform their decision. The Delivery Manager clarified that the Committee was to decide if there was justification to demolish the curtilage listed building.

By affirmation, minus the votes of Councillor Dr. Claire Daunton and Councillor Dr. Richard Williams, the Planning Committee **approved** the application, subject to the conditions set out in the report from the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development.

15. Enforcement Report

There were no updates from the Principal Enforcement Officer on the contents of the enforcement report and the Delivery Manager presented the report. The Committee was informed by the Delivery Manager that the appeal on the application in Linton (Land To North And South Of Bartlow Road) had been approved on 8 November 2021 and, consequently, the site had an approved drainage scheme.

Councillor Heather Williams questioned the report on Whitehall Farmhouse as it was identical to the report presented at the last meeting. The Councillor questioned if the inclusion of this report was an error and asked if the Principal Enforcement Officer had assumed responsibility for the review of the application. The Delivery Manager informed the Member that the reports inclusion was an error, and that the Principal Enforcement Officer had assumed responsibility for the application.

The Member for Balsham, Councillor Geoff Harvey, enquired if there had been any progress towards the organisation of a joint visit to the Cottage Nursery, Cardinals Green, Horseheath site as it was part of his Ward. The Delivery Manager was unable to answer the question at the meeting but stated that he would seek an answer from the Principal Enforcement Officer and provide the information to the Member.

The Committee **noted** the report on enforcement action.

16. Appeals against Planning Decisions and Enforcement Action

The Delivery Manager presented the Appeals report and explained the new wording on application 21/01411/HFUL (29 Coppice Avenue, Great Shelford), stating that the decision had been turned away as the appeal submission was submitted after the deadline.

Councillor Heather Williams stated that she was pleased to hear that the application on Mill Lane, Sawston had been brought to a hearing and enquired as to when a decision would be presented to the Committee. The Councillor also noted that there was no table detailing those appeals that were awaiting decision and stated that the inclusion of such a table in future reports would be useful. The Delivery Manager informed the Committee that the outcome of the Sawston application would likely come forward in the upcoming weeks, and also stated that Items awaiting decisions are included in the appeals report once a decision has been reached but noted the Member's request to include information of appeals awaiting decisions in future reports.

The Committee **noted** the report.

The Meeting ended at 5.36 p.m.
