

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on
Friday, 22 April 2016 at 9.45 a.m.

PRESENT: Councillor Lynda Harford – Chairman
Councillor David Bard – Vice-Chairman

Councillors: Anna Bradnam
Pippa Corney
Sebastian Kindersley
Des O'Brien
Tim Scott

Brian Burling
Kevin Cuffley
David McCraith (substitute)
Deborah Roberts
Robert Turner

Officers in attendance for all or part of the meeting:

Julie Ayre (Planning Team Leader (East)), Julie Baird (Head of Development Management), John Koch (Planning Team Leader (West)), James Platt (Senior Planning Officer), Stephen Reid (Senior Planning Lawyer), Ian Senior (Democratic Services Officer) and Paul Sexton (Principal Planning Officer (West))

Councillors Janet Lockwood and Bridget Smith were in attendance, by invitation.

1. PRE-APPLICATION PRESENTATION TO MEMBERS FROM PERSIMMON HOMES : BANNOLD ROAD SITE, WATERBEACH (TO BE UNDERTAKEN IN ACCORDANCE WITH PROTOCOL AGREED AT MEETING 6TH APRIL 2016)

Representatives of Persimmon Homes attended in order to present their proposals to Members and to answer questions from them. The protocol for doing so, in public session, had been agreed by Members at their meeting on 6 April 2016.

The presentation covered the following points:

- Persimmon Homes had already secured Outline planning permission for 90 dwellings on site by virtue of a successful appeal against South Cambridgeshire District Council's decision to refuse consent.
- Persimmon Homes would apply for Outline planning permission for an additional 43 dwellings (or thereabouts) on site concurrently with the Reserved Matters application in respect of the Consent already granted for 90 dwellings.
- The proposed building line facing onto Bannold Road would not have an adverse impact on the south-western attenuation pond.
- While Persimmon Homes were unable to commit to a total of 133 dwellings on site (including 90 allowed on appeal), they could confirm that 40% of the total number would be affordable, with a mix of tenures (70 / 30 including starter homes), thus complying with local planning policy.
- In terms of timescales, Persimmon Homes intended to submit a Reserved Matters application in respect of the 90 dwellings allowed on Appeal, and an Outline application in respect of the balance, simultaneously in May 2016. Construction work should commence by the end of 2016.
- Access would be provided for pedestrians, cars and emergency vehicles.
- Councillor Peter Johnson, a local Member unable to attend the presentation in person, had indicated by e-mail that he had concerns relating to drainage. The Chairman read out the following from Councillor Johnson:

"...They [Persimmon Homes] have indicated they would like to use the roadside

ditch in Bannold Road for surface water but I have concerns and so does the WLIDB [Waterbeach Level Internal Drainage Board] that this is not a satisfactory arrangement, the ditch has not been maintained and would not cope with the flow from a development of this size. The pipe carrying surface water from Cam Locks and the latest Cody Road development is still the responsibility of Morris Homes as Anglian Water have never adopted this, so if Persimmon wanted to use this they would have to approach Morris homes to see if 1, they would allow them to join up, and 2, is there enough capacity in the pipe for these extra houses. If none of these cases are suitable then how do they propose to move the surface water from their development to the drainage unit further down Bannold Road. Also the water treatment plant is over capacity and we have recently had problems when the sewage came up in residents gardens after only one inch of rain so you can imagine the extra burden more houses will put on this. Some answers to this will be most appreciated. I would be there but as I have said I have a meeting with Network Rail to try and sort out our car parking issues at Waterbeach station.”

Persimmon Homes confirmed that they would not be outpouring to the ditch. Anglian Water had provided a point of connection to the main sewerage system. Discharge rates had been agreed. A Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS) would be put in place. Persimmon Homes confirmed that they would be making appropriate drainage arrangements without having to negotiate connections or flow rates with adjacent developers.

Councillor Brian Williams attended the Presentation on behalf of Waterbeach Parish Council. He said that any development on site beyond the 90 dwellings allowed on Appeal would amount to overdevelopment and, therefore, unsustainable. Councillor Williams said that Waterbeach had a poor bus service, and a crowded train service. He was disappointed that the proposal from Persimmon Homes did not include any social housing. He asked whether Persimmon Homes could be persuaded to contribute a financial sum towards road safety improvements in the village. The vehicular access connecting the site with Bannold Road was considered inappropriately located. Councillor Williams urged Persimmon Homes to listen to Waterbeach Parish Council.

2. APOLOGIES

Councillor Ben Shelton sent Apologies for Absence. Councillor David McCraith was his substitute.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

In respect of Minute 5 (S/2068/15/OL – Gamlingay), Councillor Sebastian Kindersley declared a non-pecuniary interest having attended meetings with the Parish Council and applicants. He reminded those present that his position as District Councillor for Gamlingay and Cambridgeshire County Councillor for the Gamlingay Electoral Division might be perceived as influencing his comments on the Section 106 Heads of Terms, but he gave an assurance that he was approaching the matter afresh.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Committee authorised the Chairman to sign, as a correct record, the minutes of the meeting held on 6 April 2016.

5. S/2068/15/OL -GAMLINGAY, (LAND AT GREEN END INDUSTRIAL ESTATE)

Kathryn Slater (applicant's agent), Councillor Sarah Groom accompanied by Kirsten

Rayner (Gamlingay Parish Council) and Councillor Bridget Smith (a local Member) addressed the meeting. The agent summarised the application, highlighting the absence of objections from statutory consultees, and only three objections from local residents. The developer would contribute £750,000 to the local community. Councillor Groom said that the development would generate increased demand for pre-school places, and the facility in the Methodist Chapel would need about £350,000 spent on it if it were to cope. In addition, some £200,000 was needed to provide extra open space for sport, including a potential new site for the bowling green. Councillor Smith said that Gamlingay needed houses, but not at any cost. She said that it was important to protect the employment element of this proposal. Councillor Smith had supported the allocation of this site in the emerging Local Plan, but only as a mixed development. The current application offered no guarantee that the businesses would remain on site. She urged the Committee not to approve the application in its current form unless fully compliant with the Local Plan. Loss of employment opportunities had to be mitigated, and pre-school provision must be assured.

The Committee considered the application at length, focusing on

- The site's fitness for purpose
- The need for operating hours in the industrial part of the site to be realistic, and appropriate to the needs of the businesses there
- The need for upgraded community facilities
- The adequacy or otherwise of Section 106 financial contributions
- Pressures on the village
- Affordable housing must be for local people in perpetuity

Some members expressed misgivings about the proposal.

The Planning Lawyer said that officers would look at the Section 106 Obligations on the basis of provision rather than Quantum in order to ensure compliance with Community Infrastructure Levy requirements. They would do so in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Planning Committee, and with local Members.

By 11 votes to nil (with Councillor Deborah Roberts abstaining), the Committee gave officers **delegated powers to approve** the application, subject to

1. The prior completion of a Legal Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990
 - a. based on the Heads of Terms set out in the update report from the Planning and New Communities Director;
 - b. preserving in perpetuity the Class B2 employment use of the 25% of the Industrial Estate not destined to be developed for housing;
 - c. securing the affordable housing in a manner consistent with that at Station Road, Gamlingay – for local people, with cascade outwards only once the housing waiting list in Gamlingay had been eliminated;
2. consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council, as Local Education Authority and in conjunction with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Planning Committee and the local Councillors for Gamlingay, in connection with the provision, but not quantum, of additional early years accommodation for inclusion as a Planning Obligation;

3. the application being reported back to Committee for determination should negotiations with Cambridgeshire County Council under Point 2 above be unsuccessful; and
4. the Conditions set out in the update report from the Planning and New Communities Director.

6. S/3182/15/FL - HARSTON, (57 LONDON ROAD)

Mr Brunwin (objector), Josh Palmer (applicant's agent) and Councillor Janet Lockwood (local Member) meeting. Mr Brunwin said that the proposed new dwelling on Plot 2 would be overbearing and would adversely affect his greenhouse and trees by blocking natural light. He said that amenity would further be affected by virtue of part of his property being overlooked by the new dwelling on Plot 2. Mr Palmer said that the proposed development had sought to have a positive impact through careful discussion with planning and urban design officers. Councillor Lockwood said that the proposed development was out of keeping with much of Harston, and would have an adverse impact on Mr Brunwin's amenity.

Councillor David McCraith said he could see no reason to refuse the application, and Councillors Sebastian Kindersley and Deborah Roberts agreed.

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

The Meeting ended at 12.25 p.m.
