

## South Cambridgeshire District Council

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on  
Wednesday, 14 September 2022 at 10.00 a.m.

PRESENT: Councillor Henry Batchelor – Chair  
Councillor Peter Fane – Vice-Chair

Councillors: Ariel Cahn Dr Martin Cahn  
Geoff Harvey Dr Tumi Hawkins  
William Jackson-Wood Peter Sandford  
Heather Williams Dr Richard Williams

Officers in attendance for all or part of the meeting:

Uzma Ali (Housing Development Officer), Dominic Bush (Planning Officer), Laurence Damary-Homan (Democratic Services Officer), Steve Fraser-Lim (Principal Planner), Michael Hammond (Principal Planner) Phil McIntosh (Interim Delivery Manager), Karen Pell-Coggins (Senior Planner), Richard Pitt (Principal Planning Lawyer), Tom Ruszala (Asset Information Definitive Maps Officer, Cambridgeshire County Council), John Shuttlewood (Principal Planning Enforcement Officer) and Amy Stocks (Senior Planner)

### 1. Chair's announcements

The Chair made a statement on the passing of Queen Elizabeth II and the Committee observed a two-minute silence. The Chair made several brief housekeeping announcements.

### 2. Apologies

Councillor Bill Handley sent Apologies for Absence.

### 3. Declarations of Interest

- With respect to Minute 5, Councillor Henry Batchelor declared that he was a Member of Cambridgeshire County Council
- With respect to Minute 7, Councillor Heather Williams declared that she was a member of the Greater Cambridge Partnership but would be making a decision as part of the Committee with no conflicting interest. Councillor Dr Martin Cahn declared that his wife was a member of the Histon and Impington Land Trust
- With respect to Minutes 9 and 10, Councillor Peter Sandford declared that the property in question was in his ward, but he had held no discussions on the application and would not be speaking as local Member
- With respect to Minutes 11 and 12, Councillor Dr Richard Williams declared that he was unsure if he knew the applicant but would withdraw from the Committee during the discussion of the applications to avoid any potential conflict of interest

### 4. Minutes of Previous Meeting

Councillor Heather Williams abstained from the vote on the approval of the Minutes as she

was not present at the meeting. By affirmation, the rest of the Committee authorised the Chair to sign the Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 10 August 2022 as correct record.

**5. S/4085/19/RM- PROW - Proposed Diversion of Public Footpath No. 10, Gamlingay**

Cambridgeshire County Council's Asset Information Definitive Maps Officer presented the report. Members asked questions on accessibility (dropped curbs and raised roads) and the status of the footpath on Definitive Maps- it was clarified that sections of the footpath that were part of the highways network would not be part of the Definitive Maps. The Committee was informed that the County Council would retain responsibility for the maintenance of the right of way.

By affirmation, the Committee **approved** the application

**6. 21/04524/S73 - Former Barrington Cement Works, Barrington**

The Principal Planner, Michael Hammond, presented the report and offered a number of updates regarding changes to conditions laid out in the report. These changes were:

- Condition 1- Approved plans no. 7, 8 and 9 were removed from the condition
- Condition 17- the wording was changed from "...pursuant to application reference S/4820/19/DC" to "S/4820/18/DC"
- Conditions 13, 18 and 19- references to "phasing plan BARR/22/02/001 Rev A" were changed to "BARR/22/02/001/ Rev C"
- Condition 23 was removed
- Two informatives relating to drainage, with one regarding ordinary watercourse consent and the other regarding pollution control, were added

The Committee questioned the wording in paragraph two of condition 19 and the use of prior to the occupation of the "111th dwelling". Members asked questions of clarity on what a "drop-in" application was and the status of other applications on the overall site and where informed that two overlapping permissions can be granted on the same site as long as they are not contradictory.

The Committee was addressed by the agent of the applicant, Liz Fitzgerald, who gave an explanation of why the application had been brought forward and what it set out to achieve, as well as providing context on the "drop-in" nature of the application and how it fit in to the larger site. The Committee noted that Councillor Aidan van de Weyer was supportive of the application as local Member.

In the debate, Members discussed the changes to the proposed development that the application brought. Discussions were held around the historical objections from some statutory consultees. The wording in condition 19 was discussed; the Committee requested, and approved by affirmation, a change of wording in condition 19; "Prior to the 111th dwelling within Phase 3..." was amended to state "Prior to the first occupation of any dwelling within Phase 3...". With the agreed change, Members signalled satisfaction with the application and understanding of the procedural nature of the application.

**Councillor Peter Fane was not present for the full duration of the discussion and subsequently abstained from the vote**

With one abstention (Councillor Peter Fane), the Committee **approved** the application by affirmation in accordance with the officer's recommendation laid out in the report from the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development and subject to the changes agreed

by the Committee.

**7. 20/04906/OUT- Agricultural Building and Land to the Rear of 38 Histon Road, Cottenham**

The Committee agreed, by affirmation, to the removal of condition 26. The Committee requested, and approved by affirmation, an additional condition stating The Principal Planner, Steve Fraser-Lim, presented the report and informed the Committee that officers proposed to remove condition 26 as they felt that condition 25 and the compliance to Building Regulations M4(2) were satisfactory. In response to a question, officers clarified the amount of the development that was in the green belt and outside of the Village Development Framework and offered explanation on how this impacted policy compliance. The Committee raised the Parish Council's statement on affordable housing provision in Cottenham and the Housing Development Officer provided an explanation of the assessed need and how the conclusions had been drawn.

The Committee was addressed by Councillor Tim Jones of Cottenham Parish Council who presented the views of the Parish Council and raised concerns over surface water, the proposed three storey building not being compliant with the Village Design Statement and access to the site. Members asked a number of questions of Councillor Jones regarding the concerns he raised. The Committee noted a written submission for Councillor John Loveluck as local Member.

In the debate, Members debated the balance between the need for affordable housing and the harm to the green belt that the proposed development would bring as required by policy S/8 of the Local Plan. The Committee accepted that the need for affordable housing had been proved, but some Members were concerned that the proposed site was not the most appropriate site in the village and thus the application was not compliant with policy H/11 of the Local Plan. Opinion was divided as to if the balance required to meet the criteria for a Social Housing Rural Exception Site was met. Concerns were also raised by some Members over the proposed housing density and whether the proposal was compliant with policy H/8 of the Local Plan, although it was noted that this consideration, like others, would be dealt with at the Reserved Matters stage. Water drainage, both surface and foul, was a point of concern for the Committee but Members stated that the comments of the Internal Drainage Board on surface water drainage meant that surface water concerns were not a viable reason for refusal and the comments of Anglian Water prevented foul water drainage concerns from being a reason for refusal. The Committee raised concerns over the proposed access road not being up to the adoptable standards required by the Highways authority and felt that, as an unadopted road would lead to management costs being the responsibility of residents, this was unacceptable in a Social Housing Rural Exception site. The Committee requested, and approved by affirmation, an additional condition stating "notwithstanding the details set out in drawing number 22938\_08\_020\_01, details of the access road and pedestrian crossing shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the local planning authority. The details shall then be implemented in accordance with the agreed details. Reason: In the interest of pedestrian and highway safety in accordance with policies HQ/1 and TI/2 of the Local Plan". The Committee delegated authority to officers to draft the final wording and approve it in conjunction with the Chair and Vice-Chair. The Committee also agreed to the removal of condition 26, as recommended by officers, by affirmation.

**Councillor Geoff Harvey was not present for the full duration of the discussion and subsequently abstained from the vote**

By 5 votes to 4 (Councillors Ariel Cahn, Peter Sandford, Heather Williams and Dr Richard

Williams), with one abstention, the Committee **approved** the application subject to the conditions laid out in the report from the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development and the changes to conditions made by the Committee.

**8. 22/00116/FUL - Car Park, Walkling Way, Milton**

The Senior Planner, Amy Stocks, presented the report and provided an update on a change to the wording of condition 2 which stated:

“The works hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

- Walkling Way Cycle Store Location Plan – dated 08/11/2021
- Walkling Way Cycle Store – dated 08/11/2021
- Walkling Way Site Location Map – dated 08/11/2021
- N17 BDS Shelter 10 Space Customer Drawing – dated 25/07/2022
- BDS Shelter Swinging Gates – dated 25/07/2022

Reason: In the interests of good planning and for the avoidance of doubt.”

The Senior Planner clarified the orientation of the shelter and that the bin storage that was taking place on site was not in a designated area.

The Committee was addressed by Gabriel Bienzobas, on behalf of Milton Cycle Campaign, who supported the application but raised some concerns on some of the proposed materials and raised concerns around visibility at the cycle store. Councillor Judith Rippeth addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee requested, and approved by affirmation, the inclusion of a requirement for reflective materials to be used into condition 3 and an informative on providing lighting around the cycle store. The changes to the wording of condition 2 were agreed by affirmation

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

**9. 22/01670/HFUL - 4 Braebank Barns, Elsworth Road, Conington, Caxton**

The Planning Officer presented the report. The Committee was informed that the dimensions listed in paragraph 3.2 were correct.

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

**10. 22/02365/LBC - 4 Braebank Barns, Elsworth Road, Conington, Caxton**

The Planning Officer presented the report and clarified that there were no objections regarding heritage and conservation.

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

**11. 22/00931/HFUL - 26 Maris Green, Great Shelford**

**In line with his Declaration of Interest, Councillor Dr Richard Williams withdrew from the Committee**

The Senior Planner, Karen Pell-Coggins, presented the report. The Committee was addressed by Councillor Greg Price of Great Shelford Parish Council who informed the Committee that the Parish Council was supportive of the application but would like to see the tree that was proposed to be removed replanted elsewhere. Councillors Peter Fane and William Jackson-Wood stated that, as local Members, they were supportive of the application.

In the debate, Members questioned if the replacement of the tree could be conditioned and officers advised that, due to the poor quality of the tree, there was no requirement for replacement and such a condition would be inappropriate. In response to a question, officers clarified that there was no overhanging into the neighbouring boundary.

The Committee **approved** the application by affirmation 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 did not vote on the application.

**12. 22/00932/LBC - 26 Maris Green, Great Shelford**

The Senior Planner, Karen Pell-Coggins, presented the report. In response to a question, officers advised that it would not be appropriate to reuse the heritage materials due to their poor condition.

The Committee **approved** the application by affirmation 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 did not vote on the application.

**13. Enforcement Report**

**Councillor Dr Richard Williams rejoined the Committee**

The Principal Planning Enforcement Officer presented the report, offered updates on staffing within the Enforcement team and requested that Members steer the Parish Councils in their ward towards the new Enforcement website. An update on Smithy Fen was provided and Members requested a briefing on developments on the site.

The Committee **noted** the report.

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

The Interim Delivery Manager presented the report and offered explanation on what a "turned away" decision meant.

The Committee **noted** the report.

---

**The Meeting ended at 3.15 p.m.**

---