

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on
Wednesday, 11 March 2020 at 10.00 a.m.

PRESENT: Councillor John Batchelor – Chairman
Councillor Brian Milnes – Vice-Chairman

Councillors: Anna Bradnam
Dr. Claire Daunton
Mark Howell
Judith Rippeth
Heather Williams
Dr. Martin Cahn
Peter Fane
Brian Milnes
Deborah Roberts
Nick Wright

Officers in attendance for all or part of the meeting:

Patrick Adams (Senior Democratic Services Officer), Julie Ayre (Planning Team Leader (East)), Fiona Bradley (Interim Team Leader, Development Management), Christopher Carter (Delivery Manager - Strategic Sites), Alistair Funge (Planning Enforcement Officer), Stephen Kelly (Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development), Sumaya Nakamya (Planning Officer), Stephen Reid (Senior Planning Lawyer), Michael Sexton (Senior Planning Officer), Luke Simpson (Senior Planning Officer) and Rebecca Ward (Principal Planning Officer)

Councillor Dr. Tumi Hawkins was in attendance, by invitation.

1. APOLOGIES

Councillors Sue Ellington and Pippa Heylings gave their Apologies for Absence. Councillor Mark Howell acted as substitute for Councillor Ellington. Councillor Claire Daunton acted as substitute for Councillor Heylings.

The Committee appointed Councillor Brian Milnes as Vice-Chairman of the Committee for this meeting by affirmation.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor John Batchelor declared a non-pecuniary interest as a local member for agenda item 10. He explained that he not taken part in the discussions on this item at the parish council and he came to this matter afresh.

Councillor Anna Bradnam declared a non-pecuniary interest as a local member for agenda items 7 and 8. She confirmed that she came to this matter afresh.

Councillor Mark Howell declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 6 as he knew one of the owners. He left the room whilst this item was discussed.

Councillor Judith Rippeth declared a non-pecuniary interest as a local member for agenda items 7 and 8. She confirmed that she came to this matter afresh.

Councillor Deborah Roberts declared a non-pecuniary interest as the local member for agenda item 6. She explained that this matter had been discussed at Fowlmere Parish Council, this was a new planning application and she came to this matter afresh.

Councillors John Batchelor, Bradnam, Cahn, Fane, Milnes, Rippeth, Roberts, Heather

Williams and Wright all declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 6, as they had discussed this site at their meeting on 13 November, but they were all considering this matter afresh.

3. RECORDED VOTING

Upon the proposal of Councillor Deborah Roberts, seconded by Councillor Judith Rippeth, the Committee unanimously agreed that all substantive votes at the current Planning Committee should be recorded by name and / or number and name.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Committee authorised the Chairman to sign, as a correct record, the minutes of the meeting held on 12 February 2020.

5. S/3777/19/VC - CALDECOTE (LAND EAST OF HIGHFIELDS ROAD, HIGHFIELDS CALDECOTE)

Members visited the site on 10 March 2020.

Phil Claridge (Objector), Mary Ann Claridge (Caldecote Parish Council) and Councillor Tumi Hawkins (Local Member) addressed the meeting.

The Case Officer explained that the wording “and drainage report 2018” had been added to paragraph v of the conditions.

Councillor Heather Williams proposed that this item be deferred to allow a meeting to take place between officers and the developer to ensure that a single consistent set of specifications regarding land drainage on the site could be agreed on. Councillor Brian Milnes seconded this proposal.

By eight votes in favour, one against and with two abstentions the Committee resolved to **DEFER** the application.

(Councillors Bradnam, Daunton, Fane, Howell, Milnes, Rippeth, Roberts and Heather Williams voted in favour. Councillor Wright voted against. Councillors John Batchelor and Cahn abstained.)

6. S/4002/19/VC - FOWLMERE (APPLE ACRE PARK, LONDON ROAD)

Councillor Deborah Roberts (Fowlmere Parish Council and Local Member) addressed the meeting.

Declarations of interest

Councillor Mark Howell declared a non-pecuniary interest as he knew one of the owners. He left the room whilst this item was discussed and did not vote. Councillors John Batchelor, Bradnam, Cahn, Fane, Milnes, Rippeth, Roberts, Heather Williams and Wright all declared a non-pecuniary interest, as they had discussed this site at their meeting on 13 November, but they were all considering this matter afresh.

Minor correction

The Case Officer explained that paragraph 88 of the report should be corrected to state that the Highways authority have objected to the application but have not commented on the one-way system. It was unclear what the Highways Authority's objection related to.

Committee steer in November

The Senior Planning Lawyer reminded the Committee that it had discussed this matter at its meeting on 13 November 2019, where it had endorsed the officers' proposed position in respect of the applicant's appeal, to support area D and refuse area A. He advised on the importance of consistency and said that if the Committee were minded to refuse they should provide clear reasons for taking a decision that was contrary to the guidance the Committee members provided in November.

Application before Committee

The Senior Planning Lawyer advised the Committee that regardless of the current planning appeal, a decision was required on this application. It was noted that if this application was approved, the appeal would become irrelevant as to area D.

Certificate of change of use

The Case Officer explained that the Council had already granted a certificate of change of use and this allowed permanence residency.

Number of units

The Case Officer advised that up to 5 units were permitted in any case and so if agreed there would be no increase in the number of residents. If the application were approved, mobile homes (as well as touring caravans) would be allowed all year round on the site.

Members of the Committee made the following points:

- The application proposed no increase to permanent residents on site.
- The application would allow mobile homes on this site.
- A certificate of change of use had been granted to allow permanent residence.
- The certificate of change of use was for touring caravans, not mobile homes.
- Static mobile homes, for use all year round, would not benefit tourism.
- The Highways Agency had objected to this.
- The planning inspector in the appeal of 21 months ago highlighted the conflict with the Council's policies as it was outside the village framework.

Reason for objection

Committee members proposed that the application should be refused as the development was outside the village framework and so was contrary to the Council's existing policies and there was no substantial reason to disregard the policy. The Strategic Sites Manager explained that the officer advice was that as the certificate of change of use permitted permanent residence and in his view this outweighed the policy conflict.

With three votes in favour, five against and two abstentions the Committee resolved to **REFUSE** the application on the grounds that it was contrary to policy S7, development outside the village framework.

(Councillors John Batchelor, Cahn and Fane voted in favour. Councillor Bradnam, Daunton, Roberts, Heather Williams and Wright voted against. Councillor Milnes and Rippeth abstained.)

7. S/4615/18/OL - LANDBEACH (LAND TO THE WEST OF CAMBRIDGE RESEARCH PARK, BEACH DRIVE)

Members visited the site on 10 March 2020.

Andy Riley (applicant's agent) addressed the meeting.

The Case Officer explained that a correction needed to be made to paragraph 54 of the report, which stated that the Cambridge Retail Park (CRP) might make a financial contribution, when it had been agreed that the CRP would carry out the work. It was noted that this matter was detailed correctly in the conditions.

The following points were noted:

- The applicant was required to mitigate car use. It was noted that deliveries to warehouses would make fewer journeys than employees, so were easier to offset.
- The provision of storage was inconsistent with the site's status as a Retail Park, but was already allowed under existing conditions.
- Issue of building height would be referred to a Design Enabling Panel. It was suggested that the height of storage units should be restricted.
- The challenge of not adding traffic to the A10 was noted and it was hoped that cycle links could be improved.

By ten votes in favour and one abstention the Committee resolved to **AGREE** to add a legal condition on the height of storage units to be no higher than 7 metres, with the exact words of the condition to be agreed with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee.

(Councillors John Batchelor, Bradnam, Cahn, Daunton, Fane, Howell, Milnes, Roberts, Heather Williams and Wright voted in favour. Councillor Rippeth abstained.)

By nine votes in favour and one vote against the Committee resolved to **AGREE** the application.

(Councillors John Batchelor, Bradnam, Cahn, Daunton, Howell, Milnes, Rippeth Roberts, Heather Williams and Wright voted in favour. Councillors Fane voted against.)

Councillor Mark Howell left the meeting

8. S/4744/19/FL - WATERBEACH (LAND TO EAST OF CODY ROAD AND NORTH OF BANNOLD ROAD)

Members visited the site on 10 March 2020.

The Case Officer explained that the site was outside the Waterbeach development site, which meant that it was a departure decision as it was outside the Local Plan. It was noted that separate consent would be required by the Internal Drainage Board. With regards to sustainability, the officer explained that the application was within the current guidance of producing 10% renewable energy.

Members of the Committee:

- Expressed concern regarding the promotion of bio-diversity on a comparatively small site.
- Expressed concern was regarding drainage and the contamination of standing water.
- Suggested that existing infrastructure was already under strain, which would be made worse by allowing extra development outside the agreed Local Plan.
- Asserted that the application was contrary to policy S/7 which restricted development within the countryside.
- Suggested that solar panels should be put on the roof of the new units.

- Noted that the Council has a five year land supply and a local plan.
- Asserted that the application was outside the village framework and so should be rejected.
- Asserted that the application was contrary to policy S/11 exception sites.
- Asserted that the application would result in a loss of green space without any obvious benefits to the parishes residents.
- Asserted that there were no exceptional circumstances to agree application outside the village framework.
- Suggested that if more affordable units were promised this could be used as a justification to build on green space.
- Expressed concerns were expressed regarding the quality of the housing design.

With 0 votes in favour, nine against and one abstention the Committee resolved to **REFUSE** the application, as it was contrary to policy S/7.

(Councillors John Batchelor, Cahn, Daunton, Fane, Milnes, Rippeth, Roberts, Heather Williams and Wright voted against. Councillor Bradnam abstained.)

9. S/2896/19/FL - DUXFORD (IMPERIAL WAR MUSEUM, ROYSTON ROAD)

The Committee noted that the applicant had **WITHDRAWN** this item.

10. S/1719/19/FL - LINTON (17 GREEN LANE)

Enid Bald (Linton Parish Council) addressed the meeting.

The Case Officer explained that this application only referred to the fence and not the canopy. It was noted that the proposed 1.8 metre high construction was made of a 1 metre fence and 80cm trellis.

The Committee unanimously voted to **AGREE** the application.

(Councillors John Batchelor, Bradnam, Cahn, Daunton, Fane, Milnes, Rippeth, Roberts, Heather Williams and Wright voted in favour.)

11. REVIEW OF PLANNING COMMITTEES

The Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development presented this report on the review of the Planning Committee arrangements, which sought to improve the quality, consistency, and understanding of the committee process in Greater Cambridge. He made the following points:

- The objective was not to force alignment, but to see when consistency could be introduced.
- The Council was under no obligation to accept the recommendations of the Planning Advisory Service.
- Increasing the amount of consultation planned would mean the consultation would take longer and be more expensive.

It was agreed that all Committee members should be given the opportunity to respond to the Planning Advisory Service, instead of just a sample of councillors as proposed in the report. It was also agreed that all parish councils should be given the opportunity to provide their views on the current planning process, instead of having a small forum.

Committee members made the following suggestions:

- The Council could learn from other planning committees from other local authorities.
- Any questionnaires should allow detailed answers and not just yes/no responses.

It was hoped that a new report could be taken to the next meeting of the Committee

The Committee

AGREED The scope of PAS Peer review, based on the comments above.

12. ENFORCEMENT REPORT

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

The Delivery Manager (Strategic Sites) explained that direct action had been successful at 9a Bridge Street, Whaddon and an appeal had been allowed at Burwash Manor Barns and so the enforcement was quashed.

13. APPEALS AGAINST PLANNING DECISIONS AND ENFORCEMENT ACTION

The Committee **noted** the report.

The Meeting ended at 2.35 p.m.
