



Chairman of an organisation who was a tenant of a neighbouring property and he would withdraw from the Committee when the application was heard. Councillor Sue Ellington declared a non-pecuniary interest as she was a trustee of Care Network who were a neighbour to the site of the application.

- With respect to Minute 9, Councillor Geoff Harvey declared that he would withdraw from the Committee to speak as local Member in support of the application.

- With respect to Minute 10, Councillor Richard Stobart declared that he had expressed an opinion on the application and, following legal advice, he would withdraw from the Committee to speak as local Member and express a view. A blanket declaration was made by a number of Members who knew the Parish Council's representative, former District Councillor Douglas de Lacey, but this had no bearing on the decision making process of the Committee.

#### **4. Minutes of Previous Meeting**

By affirmation, the Committee authorised the Chair to sign the Minutes of the meetings held on Wednesday 29 June 2022 and Wednesday 13 July 2022 as correct record.

#### **5. 21/04088/FUL - Former Barrington Cement Works, Haslingfield Road, Barrington**

The Principal Planning Officer, Michael Hammond, presented the report. Updates were offered regarding corrections to drawings referenced in condition two and an amendment to the officer's recommendation to remove the wording "the Planning Committee's future resolution regarding application 21/04524/S73". Members asked questions of clarity regarding the clustering of affordable homes on the site.

The Committee was addressed by the agent of the applicant, Liz Fitzgerald, who explained the changes to the scheme that led to the submission of the application and stated that changes had been made in response to consultations and to further align with the wider scheme for development in Barrington. Members asked questions on:

- The loss of green space
- Parking and garage provision
- Changes to accommodation provision
- The motivation behind the changes

Councillor Aidan van de Weyer addressed the Committee as local Member and stated that the changes to the proposed development were reasonable and that he supported the application. Councillor van de Weyer informed the Committee that he felt the loss of green space was reasonable due to the close proximity of a large informal green space and that the S106 contributions were positive.

In the debate, Members stated that they were pleased to see the removal of the tall building from the plans. The increase in affordable housing provision was commended, but some Members felt that there was a lack of provision of homes suitable for first time buyers. Concerns were raised over the size of garages, as well as the layout of the site- in particular over car parking and turning space. Sustainability design was discussed and the Committee expressed a desire to see further sustainability measures but agreed that the application was policy compliant. Members stated that there were shortcomings in the application but there were not material reasons for refusal.

The Committee also discussed the removal of the reference to the S73 application. By

affirmation, the Committee agreed to the amendment of the officer's recommendation by removal of the wording "the Planning Committee's future resolution regarding application 21/04524/S73".

By affirmation, the Committee **approved** the application subject to the conditions, the completion of a S106 agreement and in accordance with the amended officer's recommendation laid out in the report from the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development.

**The Chair, Councillor Henry Batchelor, withdrew from the Committee in-line with his declaration of interest. The Vice-Chair, Councillor Peter Fane, assumed the position of the Chair and Councillor Geoff Harvey took the place of the Vice-Chair with the affirmation of the Committee.**

## **6. S/3975/18/FL - Rectory Farm, Middle Street Thriplow**

The Senior Planning Officer, Karen Pell-Coggins, presented the report with no updates. The Committee asked questions of clarity on the number of properties outside of the Village Development Framework, space standards in converted buildings, the distance of Plot 4 from the neighbouring property and the concerns raised by Thriplow Parish Council.

The Committee was addressed by the agent of the applicant, Rob Hopwood, and the applicant, Simon Somerville-Large. The Committee asked questions of the agent and the applicant, covering:

- The viability assessment
- The condition of the Tithe barn and how much of the original structure would remain
- The cost of the restoration works and how this would be funded by the development of new properties.

Councillor Dr Richard Williams spoke as local Member and informed the Committee that residents who may have spoken on the application were away and unable to make representations; he summarised the local concerns. Councillor Dr Williams described the decision as difficult due to the positive principles of development and the impact on neighbour amenity.

In the debate, Members discussed the proximity of buildings to neighbouring properties and the impact on neighbour amenity. The Committee agreed that the proposal was a good way to ensure the conservation of a historic building and that the other developments would improve the area but noted the Parish Council's concerns of development occurring outside of the Village Development Framework. Members sought clarity on how it could be ensured that the works to preserve the Tithe barn were prioritised. The Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development advised that a condition could be added to secure the prioritisation of the works on the historic barn.

The Committee agreed, by affirmation, to the addition of a condition to ensure the phased implementation of the Listed Tithe Barn, with delegated authority to finalise the wording granted to officers in conjunction with the Chair and Vice-Chair. The condition stated:

"Prior to the commencement of the development details of a scheme for the phased implementation of the works to the Listed The Barn shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local planning Authority. The development shall be carried out only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: The application involves development of new homes in the countryside contrary

to policy S/7 and S/10 of the local plan and is acceptable only on the basis of the additional homes enabling the restoration and retention of the Listed Building.”

By affirmation, the Committee **approved** the application in accordance with the officer’s recommendation, subject to the additional condition and the conditions laid out in the report from the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development.

## **7. S/3976/18/LB - Rectory Farm, Middle Street Thriplow**

The Senior Planning Officer, Karen Pell-Coggins presented the application. The public speakers, Rob Hopwood (agent) and Simon Somerville-Large (applicant), were given the opportunity to speak again, as they had in Minute 6, but stated that their previous statement had covered the points that they wished to share with the Committee. The applicant responded to a Member question on if the repairs to the barn would be prioritised in the development and assured the Committee that it was in the developers’ interest to start works on the barn as soon as possible and that the barn would be their priority. Councillor Dr Richard Williams, as local Member, stated that he was pleased with the additional condition added in Minute 6 and felt there was nothing more to add.

In the debate, Councillor Bill Handley, seconded by Councillor Peter Fane, proposed that the Committee move to a vote. The Committee agreed to the motion by affirmation.

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

**Councillor Henry Batchelor rejoined the Committee as the Chair. Councillor Peter Fane returned to the position of Vice-Chair and Councillor Geoff Harvey resumed his role as a Member of the Committee. Councillor Dr Richard Williams withdrew from the Committee in-line with his declaration of interest.**

## **8. 21/03438/FUL - Land At 147 St Neots Road, Hardwick**

The Senior Planning Officer, Nick Westlake, presented the report and clarified the reasons for the call in. The Senior Planning Officer provided updates on some measurements laid out in the report and on the lack of response from some consultees. Members asked questions of clarity on:

- Access to the site and the Construction Management Plan
- Parking provision
- The call in
- Impact on highways

The Committee was addressed by the applicant, Chris Dyason, who offered an overview of the application. Members asked questions on engagement with the Parish Council, the objections raised and energy provision to the site.

In the debate, Members raised concerns about parking provision, the impact on highways and the Parish Council’s objection. The Committee stated that it was important to ensure that conditions on biodiversity net gain and implementation of energy infrastructure were implemented. Some Members felt that the design, including the building heights, was inappropriate for the village, whereas others felt the design was satisfactory due to the mixed nature of built form in the area.

By 6 votes to 2 (Councillors Sue Ellington and Dr Tumi Hawkins), the Committee

**approved** the application subject to the conditions, and in accordance with the officer's recommendation, laid out in the report from the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development.

**Councillor Dr Richard Williams returned to the Committee. Councillor Geoff Harvey withdrew as a Member of the Committee, in-line with his declaration of interest, to speak as local Member.**

**9. S/3626/19/LB - 61 Streetly End, West Wickham**

The Senior Planning Officer, Tom Chenery, presented the report with no updates and informed the Committee that the application was called in by Councillor Geoff Harvey. Members enquired as to why the applicant had not submitted more information post-2020.

The applicant, Rob Giles, addressed the Committee and offered a summary of the application. The applicant answered questions of clarity on the data relevant to the application and what had been submitted to the Planning Service. Councillor Geoff Harvey, as the local Member who had called in the application, spoke in support of the application and made statements on the low impact of the application on the character of the already substantially altered building and the balance of heritage conservation and climate change mitigation. Councillor Harvey noted that though the NPPF obliged the Committee to 'give great weight' to heritage conservation, it did not preclude also giving 'great weight' to climate change mitigation and the committee should so do in view of the climate emergency. He said considering the huge volume of the global atmosphere, it was flawed logic in the report to allow this to dilute-out the public benefit to being 'not discernible' and that the energy conservation benefits of the proposal outweighed the suggested negative impact on the heritage asset. Councillor Harvey responded to a question on a motion passed by Council in September 2021 which addressed the importance of climate change considerations when assessing the balance between the conservation of heritage assets and the public benefit of reducing carbon emissions."

In the debate, Members noted that there had been previous works on the building and, due to historical alterations, the harm to the heritage asset from the replacement of windows would be minimal. The Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development informed the Committee that the legislation is consistent for all listed buildings but it was up to the Committee to decide if the public benefit outweighed the harm to the heritage asset. Members expressed support for the application and referenced various local policies that validated the weight that was being given to the carbon emission reductions as public benefit.

By affirmation the Committee **approved** the application contrary to the officer's recommendation laid out in the report from the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development. The Committee agreed to delegate the final wording of conditions for the development to officers, in conjunction with the Chair and Vice-Chair, in the interests of good planning and for the avoidance of any doubt around the permission.

**Councillor Geoff Harvey rejoined the Committee. Councillor Richard Stobart withdrew from the Committee, in-line with his declaration of interest, to speak as local Member.**

**10. 21/04742/HFUL - 2 Duck End, Girton**

The Planning Officer, John McAteer, presented the report with no updates and informed the Committee that the application had been called in by Councillor Corinne Garvie.

The Committee was addressed by a public objector, Juliette Atkinson, who was representing the view of a number of residents. The Committee asked the objector a number of questions on the concerns she raised, including:

- Light pollution arising from the development
- Damage to a historically protected hedge
- The heights of the development
- When the works were undertaken.

The agent of the applicant, Gerald Hornsby-Odoi, spoke in support of the application. Councillor Douglas de Lacey of Girton Parish Council spoke on behalf of the Parish Council who objected to the application. Members asked questions on if a complaint had been raised when the works were being undertaken and the understanding of the Parish Council on what was covered by permitted development rights and which parts of the works required Planning permission. Councillors Corinne Garvie and Richard Stobart spoke in opposition to the application as local Members and highlighted the negative impact the development had on Duck End which was described as a valuable asset to the village.

In the debate, Members stated that the development had a negative impact on both neighbouring Listed buildings and the character of the surrounding area. The Committee discussed the parts of the development that fell within permitted development rights and the alterations that required Planning permission, concluding that the development was harmful and contrary to policy. The Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development informed the Committee that the applicant had requested a deferral but advised that as the works had been completed a decision should be made. Members agreed with this advice and stated that harm was present due to the completion of the development and action needed to be taken as soon as possible. The Committee agreed that a deferral was not appropriate.

The Committee unanimously voted to **refuse** the application, in accordance with the officer's recommendation, on the basis of the reasons for refusal laid in the report from the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development.

### **Councillor Richard Stobart rejoined the Committee**

#### **11. 22/01332/HFUL - 34 Hereward Close, Impington**

The Area Development Manager, Jane Rodens, presented the report and offered clarity on the proposed materials to be used in the development. A question on paragraph 10.13 of the report was asked by the Committee and the Area Development Manager clarified that the impact on light would be minimal.

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

#### **12. Enforcement Report**

The Principal Planning Enforcement Officer offered a summary of the report and presented an update on staffing in the Enforcement team. The Committee was informed of a new Enforcement website on which residents could access the Enforcement register and log Enforcement submissions; the Principal Planning Enforcement Officer stated that the website needed to be publicised and Members supported this. Members were updated on progress at Smithy Fen and the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development informed the Committee that a more detailed report on the case would be presented the

following month.

The Committee **noted** the report.

**13. Planning Appeal (3287502) - Land to the North and South of Bartlow Road**

The Area Development Manager, Michael Sexton, presented the update report. The Committee discussed the case and how the Council would proceed. Further discussion focused on future applications and how the Committee should deal with concerns around the advice of technical expert consultees.

**14. Appeals against Planning Decisions and Enforcement Action**

The Committee was given the opportunity to ask questions on the contents of the report. A question was asked on an appeal (20/03394/FUL – 2 High Street, Harston) that had a decision of “turned away”; the Committee asked for clarity on what this meant which was provided by the Area Development Manager, Michael Sexton, who also provided details on the case in question. Members stated that they were pleased with the performance on appeals.

The Committee **noted** the report.

---

**The Meeting ended at 4.35 p.m.**

---