

## **SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on  
Wednesday, 1 June 2016 at 10.30 a.m.

**PRESENT:** Councillor David Bard – Chairman  
Councillor Kevin Cuffley – Vice-Chairman

**Councillors:** John Batchelor Anna Bradnam  
Brian Burling Sebastian Kindersley  
David McCraith Charles Nightingale (substitute)  
Deborah Roberts Tim Scott  
Robert Turner

Officers in attendance for all or part of the meeting:

Julie Ayre (Planning Team Leader (East)), Julie Baird (Head of Development Management), Thorfinn Caithness (Principal Planning Officer), Alistair Funge (Planning Enforcement Officer), John Koch (Planning Team Leader (West)), Stephen Reid (Senior Planning Lawyer) and Ian Senior (Democratic Services Officer)

### **1. APOLOGIES**

Councillors Pippa Corney and Des O'Brien sent Apologies for Absence. Councillor Charles Nightingale substituted for Councillor O'Brien.

### **2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Sebastian Kindersley declared a non-pecuniary interest in Minute no. 7 (S/2689/15/FL - Haslingfield (115 New Road)) as Cambridgeshire County Councillor for the Electoral Division of Gamlingay, which covers the parish of Haslingfield. He was uncertain whether or not he had been present at Parish Council meetings at which this application had been discussed but, in any event, was considering the matter afresh.

### **3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Committee authorised the Chairman to sign, as a correct record, the minutes of the meeting held on 11 May 2016 (contained in the Agenda Supplement dated 27 May 2016) subject to the following additions:

#### **Minute 12 - S/2403/15/FL – Fowlmere (Deans Farm, Long Lane)**

In the paragraph beginning “ Councillor Lawrence Wragg...”, replace “His concern related to the increase in traffic: the site was accessible only by car as there was no footpath” with “He voiced the Parish Council’s strong concerns relating to

- The conflict with planning policy
- Implications for future applications by setting a precedent
- the increase in traffic
- accessibility of the site by car only as there was no footpath”

### **4. S/2510/15/OL - CALDECOTE, (LAND EAST OF HIGHFIELDS ROAD)**

Members visited the site on 31 May 2016.

The Committee noted that this application had been **withdrawn from the agenda**.

In respect of application S/2830/15/OL in Balsham (Land at 22 Linton Road), the Planning Lawyer had advised that this was the safest course of action following the receipt of legal advice from Queen's Counsel that would require careful consideration by planning officers. Given the similar issues, and the implications for similar planning applications in Group Villages, planning officers withdrew application S/2510/15/OL from the agenda.

**5. S/3190/15/OL - ORWELL (LAND AT HURDLEDITCH ROAD)**

Members visited the site on 31 May 2016.

The Committee noted that this application had been **withdrawn from the agenda**.

In respect of application S/2830/15/OL in Balsham (Land at 22 Linton Road), the Planning Lawyer had advised that this was the safest course of action following the receipt of legal advice from Queen's Counsel that would require careful consideration by planning officers. Given the similar issues, and the implications for similar planning applications in Group Villages, planning officers withdrew application S/3190/15/OL from the agenda.

**6. S/2830/15/OL - BALSAM (LAND AT 22 LINTON ROAD)**

Members visited the site on 31 May 2016.

The Committee noted that this application had been **withdrawn from the agenda**.

The Planning Lawyer had advised that this was the safest course of action following the receipt of legal advice from Queen's Counsel that would require careful consideration by planning officers.

**7. S/2689/15/FL - HASLINGFIELD (115 NEW ROAD)**

Mr. Miller (applicant) addressed the meeting. He said that the application reflected pre-application comments.

The case officer provided an update, confirming receipt of a Heritage Statement from the applicant. This has been considered by the Council's Historic Buildings Team and there are no objections.

Committee Members sought assurances over the retention of the existing trees and hedges along the boundary with 117 New Road. The case officer confirmed that the application had been considered on the basis that there were no trees to be removed, however there was a landscaping pre-condition in place to agree an appropriate quality landscaping scheme for the site, and this would ensure satisfactory retention and supplementary planting.

The Committee **approved** the application subject to the Conditions and Informatives set out in the report from the Planning and New Communities Director.

**8. ENFORCEMENT REPORT**

The Committee **received and noted** an Update on enforcement action.

In respect of enforcement action being pursued at The Maltings, Millfield, Cottenham, the

Planning Lawyer referred Members to an information report contained in the agenda supplement, giving notice of the next steps to be taken.

## 9. **APPEALS AGAINST PLANNING DECISIONS AND ENFORCEMENT ACTION**

The Committee **received and noted** a report on Appeals against planning decisions and enforcement action.

The Planning Team Leader (West) gave a PowerPoint presentation relating to recent appeal decisions at Shepreth Road, Foxton and Boxworth End, Swavesey.

**The Foxton appeal** related to an application from Gladman Developments Ltd. for up to 95 homes, with access and public open space, with an alternative proposal for 76 dwellings. The Appeal was refused. The main issues were

- Character of surrounding area
- Impact on Foxton House (Listed Grade II)
- Housing land supply – 3.9 years
- No relevant planning history
- Weight to be given to “out of date” policies

Foxton had been identified as a Group Village, and the proposed site was outside the village framework. Local services were considered to be within an “acceptable distance” from the site. Wider employment opportunities existed and bus and train services were available. It was intended that pedestrian and cycle links, together with public transport, should be improved. The Inspector gave Policies ST/6 and DP/7 limited weight at best. The presentation touched on the character of the surrounding area, densities and the limited visual envelope. It explored the setting of Foxton House, the removal of trees, its visual and historic relationship with the appeal site, and the serious harm that the development would have on Foxton House. The Inspector’s key conclusions were

- The need to give due weight and understand the Section 66 test
- Although there was a “significant” housing need, housing would be “general benefit which could be located on any sustainable site in the area”
- Sustainability “roles should not be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent.”

**The Swavesey appeal** had been conducted by written representations, and allowed. It had been against the refusal of an outline application for 30 dwellings, public open space and a children’s play area. Swavesey was a Group village and the site was outside the village framework. The main issues were five-year housing land supply, character and appearance of the area, and precedent.

Swavesey was due to be upgraded to a Minor Rural Settlement. The Inspector said existing housing policies should be given “limited weight”. The presentation considered the character of the surrounding area, and the potential for setting a precedent. The Inspector concluded that the five-year housing land supply issue outweighed any potential limited harm to the environment. Would a hearing have resulted in the appeal being refused?

## 10. **PAUL SEXTON - PRINCIPAL PLANNING OFFICER**

Councillor Deborah Roberts noted that, had Application S/2510/15/OL (Caldecote) not been withdrawn from the agenda, this would have been Paul Sexton’s last Planning Committee meeting before his retirement.

Councillor Roberts paid tribute to Paul, wishing him all the very best for the future. She observed that there had never been a cross word between them, and described Paul

Sexton as a gentleman.

The Chairman and Committee endorsed Councillor Roberts' comments.

---

**The Meeting ended at 11.23 a.m.**

---