



#### 4. Minutes of Previous Meeting

By affirmation, the Committee authorised the Chair to sign the Minutes of the Meeting held on 9 December 2021 as correct record.

#### 5. 21/02265/FUL - Land East Of Highfields Road, Highfields Caldecote

The Principal Planner informed the Committee of a number of updates. The recommendation (para. 340 of the report) and some of the subsequent conditions (c, e, f, g, t, w and bb) were updated. This was to refine the wording of conditions to provide greater clarity and link to sections of the report. The recommendation, if the Committee was minded to approve, was altered to include “final wording of conditions to be agreed with the Chair and Vice-Chair”. The Principal Planner informed the Committee that a representative from the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), Harry Pickford, was on hand to answer questions on drainage and then presented the report.

The Committee was addressed by an opposing resident, Mary-Ann Claridge, who stated that the application was against policy and highlighted issues that were detailed in the report. The agent of the applicant, Andy Moffat, spoke in support of the application and answered a number of Member’s questions. These covered:

- Building heights and contrast with the Village Design Guide
- The landscape buffer and green space
- Consultation with the Parish Council
- Energy
- Public Transport
- Water

The Committee was also addressed by Phil Claridge who spoke on behalf of Caldecote Parish Council. Councillor Dr Tumi Hawkins did not speak as the local Member and chose to save her comments for the debate.

In the debate, the Principal Planner informed the Committee that the Village Design Guide (VDG) had been adopted in 2020 and was therefore a material Planning consideration, despite Phase 1 of the development being granted approval prior to the adoption of the VDG. The Members stated that the VDG should be given more weight than the Phase 1 development in the Planning balance. The Principal Planner also offered clarity on the heights and density of buildings in the proposed development and informed the Committee that the application complied with space standards policy. Members also debated:

- The levels of affordable housing
- The lack of bridleway provision- the Principal Planner informed the Committee that the bridleway would be part of a section 73 application that would be brought to the next meeting of the Committee. However, the Chair noted the objection from the Maps Officer and the Principal Planner stated that, as bridleway provision was conditioned in the Outline application for the whole site, the Committee could give weight to the lack of bridleway provision
- Drainage- the representative from the LLFA offered context on the drainage scheme and the Committee discussed flood risk and surcharge. The Chair noted that officers had no objection to the drainage scheme but stated that it was down to the discretion of the Committee as to how much weight this was given.
- Biodiversity- the off-siting of biodiversity gain (financial contribution to Lower Valley Farm scheme) was noted, but Members expressed disappointment that no biodiversity gain could be found on site
- Infill, overdevelopment and impact on character and amenity- Members felt that the application was not infilling in the village and that, due to the density of housing, the

development could lead to overdevelopment. Members also felt that it would have a negative impact on the character of the village and damage visual amenity as it appeared that the development would lead to a suburban feel to the area, in contrast with the rural nature of the village. In particular, Apartment Block C of the proposed development was highlighted as being unacceptable. It was also noted that 74 new homes would greatly increase the population of the village and that the proportional increase was unacceptable.

- Landscape buffer- Members felt that the landscape buffer was too small and unacceptable for the development; concerns on the impact on local biodiversity were raised amongst others. Members also expressed disappointment that the drainage ditch on the periphery of the site was incorporated into the landscape buffer and felt that it was inappropriate.

Members thanked the Principal Planner for the level of clarity and detail in the report. Concern was expressed by Members that the harm of the development outweighed the benefits. The Committee also noted that the Local Plan had been adopted and the requirements for the 5-year housing supply had been satisfied, therefore refusal of the application on material Planning grounds would be acceptable.

The Chair summarised the reasons for refusal, if the Committee were minded to refuse. These were:

- Location of the site laying outside of the development framework boundary of the village (contrary to policies S/2, S/6, S/7 and S/10 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan)
- The scale, mass, form and proportions of Apartment Block C (contrary to policy HQ/1 of the Local Plan and paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021)
- Harm to the character of the area (contrary to policy HQ/1 of the Local Plan and paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021)
- The loss of hedgerow and landscaping on the southern border of the site (contrary to policy HQ/1 of the Local Plan, paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 and the Caldecote Village Design Guide)
- The failure to provide a new bridleway in accordance with conditions in the Outline Planning consent and policy TI/2 of the Local Plan

By 10 votes to 1 (Councillor Peter Fane), the Committee **refused** the application, contrary to the officer's recommendation laid out in the report. The Committee granted delegated authority to officers, in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair, to write official wording of the reasons for refusal.

## 6. **21/03039/FUL - Bancroft Farm, Church Lane, Little Abington**

The Principal Planner presented the report with no updates. The Committee was addressed by a resident, Isobel Smith, in opposition of the application. When questioned on paragraph 124, the resident stated that heritage harm had not been reduced to an acceptable level. Two agents of the applicant, Simon Gooderham and Jon Jennings, shared a representation and addressed the Committee. The agents responded to questions on:

- The need for the inclusion of the commercial unit
- Drainage
- The removal of trees on the site- the agents informed the Committee that the removal of trees was proposed in accordance with advice from arboriculturists

Councillor Dr Richard Smith addressed the Committee on behalf of Little Abington Parish Council and responded to further questions on the trees. Councillor John Batchelor addressed the Committee as local Member and responded to questions on the impact of the development on the trees, the massing of buildings on site and the impact on

drainage. Councillor Batchelor also informed the Committee that Plot 1 had an impact on the Protected Village Amenity Area (PVAA) and that Plot 6 was problematic due to its impact on heritage conservation. The Chair, Councillor Henry Batchelor, chose not to speak as local Member and saved his comments for the debate.

In the debate, the Committee discussed:

- The tree line and the impact of the proposed development on the character of the vista.
- Impact on the character of the village- Members felt that the application did not either enhance or preserve the area as required by policy; in particular, Plot 6 was problematic due to its siting and orientation
- Heritage harm and the balance with public benefit
- Plot 6 and encroachment onto the PVAA- the Chair stated that, between the ambiguity of the encroachment and the lack of objection from the Conservation officer, the impact on the PVAA was not a reason for refusal

The Committee agreed, if it were minded to refuse, that the reason for refusal was the siting, scale and massing of the proposed development. It was agreed that it would have a negative impact on the rural character of the village and the conservation area, the views of the Grade II Listed Church (this harm was not outweighed by the benefits of the application) and that the development would not enhance or preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area. Policies S/7, HQ/1 and NH/14 of the Local Plan 2018 were cited.

By 8 votes to 2 (Councillors Dr Martin Cahn and Peter Fane), with one abstention (Councillor Dr Tumi Hawkins), the Committee **refused** the application contrary to the officer's recommendation laid out in the report. The Committee granted delegated authority to officers, in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair, to write official wording of the reasons for refusal.

## **7. 20/03765/S106A - The Former Cement Works And Quarry, Haslingfield Road, Barrington**

The Principal Planner presented the report and, during the presentation, displayed the following text on screen:

“Deed of Variation – Key Extract

Paragraph 31 of the Committee Report sets out a summary of the contribution towards the provision of a Community Facilities.

Barrington Parish Council has requested that there be provision for reasonable transfer of funds between elements of the Community Facilities. This has been provided within paragraph 2.36 of the Deed of Variation which states:

Paragraph 2 of Schedule 5 of the Section 106 Agreement shall be deleted in its entirety and replaced with a new paragraph 2 of Schedule 5 as follows:

### **2. Recreational Facilities Area and Village Facilities**

#### **Transfer of Land**

2.1 The Owner shall on the date of this Deed complete the transfer of the freehold interest of the Recreational Facilities Area with the Parish Council.

Allocation of Community Facilities Contribution, Public Recreation Contributions and Community Fee

2.2 The Parish Council may in their reasonable discretion reallocate part of the monies from the Community Facilities Contributions and the Public Recreation Contributions for the construction and equipment of the Village Hall Sports Pavilion Football Pitch, Two Single Layer Tarmac Tennis Courts and Associated Car Park provided always that the Village Hall, Sports Pavilion, Football Pitch, Two Single Layer Tarmac Tennis Courts and Associated Car Park are each constructed and delivered in accordance with the terms of this Agreement.”

The Principal Planner also stated that paragraph 30 of the report had been amended to require payment prior to the occupation of the 50th dwelling, rather than the 101st. The agent of the applicant, Alice Kirkland, addressed the Committee. Councillors Henry Batchelor and Dr Claire Daunton declared an interest on the application as they were both members of the County Council who would have been recipients of some of the funding from the application. The Principal Planner, in response to a question, clarified the numbers cited in paragraph 22 and highlighted paragraph 23. The agent suggested that part of the sum total in paragraph 22 may have included the cost of the works on site- in particular the footpath. A question was raised on the use of occupation of the 100th or 101st dwelling; the Senior Planning Lawyer offered explanation and stated that reference to the 100th dwelling used the phrase “following” and informed the Committee that “prior to the occupation of the 101st dwelling” had been introduced to reduce ambiguity and ensure that the payments were received at the appropriate time. Councillor Aidan Van de Weyer addressed the Committee as local Member in support of the application. The local Member clarified that, as per his recollection, the funding discrepancy was due to works on the footpath (in-line with the comments made by the agent of the applicant) and the Senior Planning Lawyer informed the Committee that indexation of figures would run from the original application rather than the application being heard at the time.

In the debate, Members noted the overwhelming support for the application and expressed satisfaction that it would bring the development forward, not reduce any funding and that the application was pragmatic. A question was raised on the healthcare contributions and the Principal Planner confirmed that payments were being made to improve the Harston surgery and referenced paragraph 41 for clarity.

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

---

**Councillor Heather Williams  
left, and took no further part  
in, the meeting**

---

## 8. Enforcement Report

The Principal Planning Enforcement Officer presented the report and offered updates on the Smithy Fen, Redhill Close (Great Shelford- this was not included in the report), Pleasant View (Ely Road) and The Swan (Fowlmere) cases. Members made comment on the updates and raised a query on the Cottage Farm Nursery case.

The Committee **noted** the report.

## 9. Appeals against Planning Decisions and Enforcement Action

The Delivery Manager presented the report and offered an outline of the Sawston appeal and the Over appeal. Members discussed the appeals and officers offered response. The

Principal Planner made a presentation on the Stapleford appeal and answered Members' questions.

The Committee **noted** the report.

---

**The Meeting ended at 2.50 p.m.**

---