

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.