

## South Cambridgeshire District Council

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on  
Wednesday, 10 April 2024 at 10.00 a.m.

PRESENT: Councillor Peter Fane – Chair

Councillors: Ariel Cahn  
Dr. Tumi Hawkins  
Peter Sandford  
Dr. Richard Williams  
Anna Bradnam

Bill Handley  
Dr Lisa Redrup  
Heather Williams  
Eileen Wilson

Officers in attendance for all or part of the meeting:

Vanessa Blane (Senior Planning Lawyer), Christopher Braybrooke (Principal Planning Compliance Manager), Katie Christodoulides (Principal Planner), Beth Clark (Planning Officer), John Cornell (Natural Environment Team Leader), Laurence Damary-Homan (Democratic Services Officer), Jane Green (Built and Natural Environment Manager), Tam Parry (Principal Transport Officer [Cambridgeshire County Council]), Jane Rodens (Area Development Manager), Rebecca Smith (Delivery Manager), Charlotte Spencer (Senior Planner), Claire Sproats (Scientific Officer [Contamination]), Daniel Weaver (Principal Ecologist) and Alice Young (Principal Planner).

Councillor Aidan Van de Weyer was in attendance remotely as local Member.

### 1. Chair's announcements

With the absence of the Chair, the Vice-Chair assumed the role of Chair for the meeting. Councillor Peter Fane, seconded by Councillor Anna Bradnam, proposed that Peter Sandford be appointed as Vice-Chair for the duration of the meeting. The Committee agreed to the proposal by affirmation. The Chair then made several brief housekeeping announcements.

### 2. Apologies

Apologies for Absence were received from Councillors Dr Martin Cahn and Geoff Harvey. Councillor Anna Bradnam was present as a substitute. Councillor Heather Williams sent apologies for lateness.

### 3. Declarations of Interest

With respect to Minute 5, Councillor Anna Bradnam declared that she was a member of Cambridge Natural History Society.

With respect to Minute 6, Councillor Dr Lisa Redrup declared that she was present at a Parish Council meeting where representatives of the applicant were present, but she did not discuss the application nor stay for the presentation on the application and was

coming to the matter afresh. Councillor Anna Bradnam declared that she knew one of the public speakers (Gillian Elwood, Clerk of Hauxton Parish Council) in a personal capacity but had not discussed the application. Councillor Heather Williams declared that she was a member of the GCP Assembly.

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

By affirmation, the Committee authorised the Chair to sign the Minutes of the meeting held on 13 March 2024 as a correct record.

#### **5. Update on Biodiversity Net Gain**

The Natural Environment Team Leader and the Principal Ecologist presented the report.

##### **Councillor Heather Williams joined the meeting**

Members discussed the report and asked officers a number of questions. With regards to the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) measures off-site, officers advised that sites where delivery could take place were not designated by the Local Planning Authority; instead, sites would come forward from private initiatives and secured through Section 106 (S106) agreements or conservation covenants. Officers informed the Committee that the hope was that a range of different types of habitat banks would come forward within the region to allow for the delivery of BNG measures and maximise their impact. Officers advised that range of different size habitat banks was desirable, and it was hoped that Parishes and local landowners would take it on themselves to provide land where BNG measures could be delivered within the Parishes in which development was occurring. The Committee was advised that the emerging Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) would identify sites and nature reserves where BNG measures could be delivered, and the emerging Local Plan policies would be influenced by and make reference to the LNRS. Major, high value sites designated for BNG delivery were likely to be given designated status, such as SSSI, following the 30-year monitoring period secured by the S106 agreement. Members were informed that green open spaces had biodiversity value, but achieving high quality habitats that could be maintained for 30 years would be difficult given the other uses open green spaces served, such as recreation space for residents, and as such they were not ideal sites to deliver BNG measures.

A question was raised regarding how developers could be prevented from removing biodiversity from a site prior to the submission of a planning application in order to minimise their BNG obligations. Officers informed the Committee that the Environment Act 2021 required the biodiversity baseline to be measured based on the state of a site prior to January 2020, meaning that if developers did remove trees and habitats they would still have to deliver BNG based on what was present on the site before 2020. Members were informed that officers could use historical aerial photographs and other sources of information to assess the biodiversity value of a site prior to January 2020, and that the legislation advised ecologists to be cautious in their estimations where habitats had been removed and err on the side of overestimating habitat value, rather than underestimate. The Committee was advised that where the evidence base was incomplete, sites would likely to be assessed as moderate or good value, rather than poor, and as such developers who removed habitats prior to submitting an application may well be obliged to provide more BNG measures than if they had left the site as it was. Members were assured that the legislation included mechanisms that would prevent the clearing of land in order to minimise BNG obligations.

Members enquired as to if the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service could become

a lead in taking on conservation covenants as a responsible body. The Committee was advised that Local Planning Authorities were nigh on automatically eligible to become responsible bodies and it was likely feasible with respect to DEFRA accepting an application, but that further internal discussions on how the new BNG responsibilities were to be balanced and managed by the Local Planning Authority were required prior to submitting application for responsible body status.

Members enquired as to if a failure to meet 10% BNG would result in a refusal of a planning application, or referral to the Planning Committee for a decision. The Committee was informed that BNG was a material consideration that carried weight in the planning balance and if 10% BNG was not met it could amount to a reason for refusal, but an application could be approved without BNG if other material benefits outweighed the harm of non-delivery of BNG. Officers advised that failure to meet BNG requirements would not automatically result in an application being referred to the Planning Committee, but Members were informed that Mandatory BNG was a validation requirement for eligible applications. New software acquired by the Local Planning Authority automatically checked for issues within the submitted metric, and checked for issues that could be a cause to invalidate the application. Where the mandatory minimum of 10% was not met, Ecology Officers would recommend refusal .

Members were informed that BNG requirements could be satisfied through the enhancement of existing habitats within the redline boundary of a site or in adjacent habitat areas. The Committee was informed that the translocation of trees would be assessed as part of the BNG requirements for a development, but debate within the field of ecology was ongoing on how the impact of translocation would be measured. Members were advised that there were limits on the size and maturity of trees that could viably be relocated, and where trees were removed and replace with younger trees, planting of new larger and more mature trees would score higher on the DEFRA metric than smaller, younger trees.

The Chair encouraged Members to submit further questions on the changes to BNG requirements in writing to officers and advised that, given the topic was continuously evolving, further updates would be delivered to Members as and when appropriate. The Committee **noted** the report.

## 6. **23/03080/OUT - Former Waste Water Treatment Facility, Cambridge Road, Hauxton**

The Principal Planner, Katie Christodoulides presented the report and advised the Committee of the following changes to the proposed conditions:

- 14 (d) was amended amended to replace “constructed and completed in accordance with the approved details” with “submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- An additional sentence was inserted into condition 14, following (d), which read “The walking and cycling infrastructure shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved details within 1 year of first occupation of first building.”
- In condition 47, the wording “Minimum of two rapid electric vehicle charge points, or two fast electric vehicle charge points (min 24kw capacity) should rapid charge points not be technically feasible” was replaced with “Minimum

of 165 slow electric vehicle charge points and 30 fast electric vehicle charge points”.

Members asked a number of questions of clarification on various topics, to which officers provided response:

#### Water supply and usage

In response to Member questions on water supply, usage and the objection from the Environment Agency (EA), officers provided the following point of clarity:

- Water supply and the comments of the EA were material considerations for the Committee.
- The proposed scheme had greater water efficiency and lower projected water use than the fallback position of the extant permission for a residential development on the site. The extant permission (outline) was granted prior to the publication of the EA’s recent concerns over water abstraction in Greater Cambridge. The Committee was advised that the reserved matters application for the extant permission was a live application.
- The site had not been in use for a number of years and, as such, had not been consuming water.

#### Contamination

Members asked questions with regard to contamination, remediation and the comments of the UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA). Officers provided the following responses:

- Previous information on contamination on the site, compiled over a number of years, had been considered by officers. This included the details submitted in the application for the residential permission granted in 2016 and further detail submitted since then.
- Conditions 18 and 19 required new information on contamination to be submitted, alongside a remediation strategy.
- The concerns of the UKHSA were to be addressed in the discharge of conditions process, through the submission of final information and proposals regarding contamination and remediation.
- No remediation works on the site had commenced.
- Conditions 20, 21 and 51 also related to contamination matters, including monitoring. The time limit condition (1) had been amended to extend the time limit to 5 years in order to allow for remediation works to be undertaken, followed by a period of monitoring, prior to the commencement

of construction works.

- Condition 8 required details of piling to be submitted. The discharge process of this condition could start once the details of the remediation strategy had been submitted.

#### Other matters

- Officers advised that the existing crossing was to be retained to allow for pedestrians to cross the A10 and access the village of Hauxton.
- With regard to the access to the site, the Principal Transport Officer (Cambridgeshire County Council) advised that the proposed access and related conditions were considered acceptable to the Highways Development Management team and that the access proposed was better in terms of highways impact than the approved access proposal in the extant permission for residential development on the site. Members were informed that a toucan crossing was to be implemented across the access to the site.
- The Committee was informed that access to the sports field would be maintained during development, as would the existing parking arrangements for the sports field.
- With regard to cycle parking, officers advised that the condition 39 was removed from the recommendation as condition 15 covered cycle parking but, in response to Member comment, the requirement for a minimum of 306 covered and secured cycle parking spaces (set out in condition 39 in the report) could be incorporated into condition 15.

The Committee was addressed by Rob Sadler on behalf of the applicants. Members commended the applicant for the engagement with Hauxton Parish Council and the local community in the pre-application stage and beyond; the applicants' representative informed the Committee that engagement would continue as the development moved forward. The applicants' representative provided responses to a number of Member questions (with support from the applicant's contamination consultant for technical matters):

- The ancillary training space was to be delivered to provide a physical space to provide training in life sciences, in partnership with Form the Future. The physical training space was always intended to be 185 square meters in footprint, and it was not to be delivered within the amenity building. The

commitment to training was envisioned to be long term.

- The delivery of the greenway was to be completed in early phases of development. Given that the greenway was to run through the centre of the site, the applicant was open to providing a temporary route around the outskirts of the site.
- No objection had been raised from the EA regarding water usage for the reserved matters application for the extant permission, but objection had been raised with regard to the outline application before the Committee. The applicant had undertaken work to ensure the water consumption of the proposed development would be lower than that required by the extant residential permission.
- The movement of contamination from the site through to the River Cam was assessed as part of the risk assessment and the risk assessment included human health risks, amongst other risks. Monitoring and further risk assessments were to be undertaken.
- A piling risk assessment would be submitted at the reserved matters stage.
- The applicant was happy to commit to the provision of a minimum of 306 cycle parking spaces.

The Committee was also addressed by representatives of Hauxton Parish Council, Gillian Elwood (Parish Clerk) and Councillor Pondori Kurade, who supported the application. In response to Member questions, the Parish Council's representatives advised that the sports ground would be owned by Hauxton Parish Council and that the development would have no impact on the sports ground itself. Further response was given, clarifying that the amenity building would be owned and managed by the developer with access granted to both the local community and business park users; Members were informed that an agreement regarding the amenity building was in place between the developer and Hauxton Parish Council, which the Parish Council were satisfied with. The Committee was also informed that the developer had been actively working with the Parish Council with regards to the proposed development and that the Parish Council was to be given the opportunity to have input in the final design of the amenity building.

Councillors Dr Lisa Redrup and Ariel Cahn opened the debate as local Members. They commended the community engagement conducted by the applicant and, whilst reservations were held over water supply issues, noted the comments of officers on the reduction of water demand from the extant permission. Both local Members recognised that some harms would arise from the development but felt that the benefits, notably to the local community, carried significant weight. Councillor Dr Lisa Redrup requested that conditions be amended to require the applicant to provide a temporary cycle route around the periphery of the site, which the applicant's representative had stated would be acceptable during his representation and responses to Member questions. The Committee agreed that there were a number of benefits to the application. The strong community engagement by the applicants, resulting in a scheme that carried significant community

benefits, was commended. Members felt that the scale and heights of the proposal, whilst having an impact on the greenbelt, was sympathetic to surroundings of the site and Members felt that the views provided and the site visit gave evidence to overcome the objection from the Landscape Officer. Comment was made that materials would be significant in ensuring that impact on the greenbelt was as minimal as possible. Given that the land had been previously developed and the site was now dilapidated, Members felt the proposal would be an improve the site and benefit the community.

Many Members felt that the responses from officers regarding contamination were satisfactory and that conditions adequately addressed the matter, whilst some felt that not enough information on contamination had been presented and the outstanding concerns of the UKHSA needed to be addressed prior to outline consent being given. Water resources were discussed, and many Members felt that the improvement on water efficiency when compared to the extant permission carried significant weight and noted the responses of officers on the matter. Others felt that the fallback position was not guaranteed to be implemented and, as such, the improvement on water efficiency carried less weight. Comment was made that water supply issues were of serious concern, but it did not amount to a reason for refusal of the application and, if it was used to justify a refusal, would likely be overturned at appeal; instead, it was suggested that a high-level response to water concerns was required. Further information on the need for lab space was requested and officers advised that paragraphs 9.45-9.58 detailed why significant weight had been given to the delivery of lab and R&D space in the officer's recommendation.

The Delivery Manager summarised the officer's recommendation and amendments made by the Update Reports. The changes to conditions raised at the start of the Minute were revisited, and the amendments requested by Members were clarified:

- Condition 14 was to be amended to require a temporary cycle path to be provided as early as possible. This matter was also to be picked up in the site-wide phasing plan.
- Condition 15 was to be amended to require the delivery a minimum of 306 covered and secured cycle parking spaces, with capacity for additional cycle parking to be provided if required.

Councillor Dr Tumi Hawkins, seconded by Councillor Peter Sandford, proposed that the amendments to conditions be accepted and the Committee agreed by affirmation.

By 8 votes (Councillors Peter Fane, Peter Sandford, Ariel Cahn, Bill Handley, Dr Tumi Hawkins, Dr Lisa Redrup, Heather Williams and Eileen Wilson) to 1 (Councillor Dr Richard Williams, with 1 abstention (Councillor Anna Bradnam), the Committee **approved** the application in accordance with the officer's recommendation. The approval was subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement and subject to the conditions and informatives laid out in the report from the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development and amended in the Update Reports and by the Committee. Officers were delegated authority to make minor amendments to the conditions and Heads of Terms.

The application required referral to the Secretary of State for consultation for 21 days, for the Secretary of State to determine whether he wishes to call the application in for his own determination.

The application was referred under paragraph 4(a) of the Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2024, being development which consists of or includes

inappropriate development on land allocated as Green Belt in an adopted local plan, unitary development plan or development plan document and which consists of or includes the provision of a building or buildings where the floor space to be created by the development is 1,000 square metres or more.

## **7. 23/03654/FUL - Cambridge South, West Way, Sawston**

The Principal Planner, Alice Young, presented the report. Officers provided a number of points of clarity in response to Member questions:

- The provision of solar panels on the roofs of the structures would be the same across the phases.
- The application was presented to Committee as the land had been allocated for residential development under Policy H/1(a) of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 (Local Plan). As such, the application was a departure application.
- There was an extant consent in place for the site that allowed for some industrial usages, including class B8 (storage and distribution), and some of the floorspace in the buildings would be used for storage and distribution. The principle for class B8 use had been established in the extant consent.
- The proposed development would result in some new HGV movements, but the wider business park already had some areas of class B8 usage and HGV movements already occurred. The site was a significant distance from nearby residents and Cambridgeshire County Council's Transport Officers had assessed the impact of HGV movements arising from the proposed development and held no objection.
- Officers were of the view that the proposed cycle storage location would be compliant with Policy TI/3 of the Local Plan and full details of cycle storage was to be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority in order to discharge condition 8.

Members discussed the type of cycle storage to be used and some comments were raised that two-tier cycle parking was challenging for some to use. Following comments from officers on the details of the proposed cycle storage, Members noted officer comments on the compliance with Policy TI/3 and that further details were to be submitted at a later date, as well as noting informative 13 which related to the type of cycle storage to be used.

The Committee was addressed by the agent of the applicant, Roland Lee, who responded to a Member question and advised that the applicant had not received any representations from the occupants of the dwelling to the north of the site. The Principal Planner advised that the Planning Service had received correspondence from the dwelling and that this



was referenced in the report.

In the debate, Members noted that the principle of development on the site had been accepted and that the application was presented to Committee due to the nature of the development as a departure application. Comment was made on the third-party concerns raised regarding harm to residential amenity, but officers advised that the separation distance between the site and the dwelling to the north was over 90m and that there was extant permission for similar usage on the site. Members agreed that, following the comments of officers and what had been seen on the site visit, there was no harm to residential amenity and that there were no reasons to refuse the application.

By unanimous vote, the Committee **approved** the application in accordance officer's recommendation, and subject to the conditions and completion of a Section 106 agreement, as laid out in the report from the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development, with authority delegated to officers to make minor amendments to the conditions and Heads of Terms.

## **8. 23/02966/OUT - Land Off Leaden Hill, Orwell**

The Senior Planner presented the report. Officers responded to a number of questions from Members and clarified:

- That the application from the developer for an outline consent for the principle of 9 self-build dwellings on the site, followed by individual applications for the construction of each dwelling on the site, was common practice for an application for a self-build site.
- That given that the land had been used as a paddock and the site was small, the loss of Grade 2 agricultural harm had been assessed as low harm by officers, but it was up to the Committee to decide the weighting of the consideration.
- The location of the appeal site referenced in paragraph 8.32 of the report and the distance to services in the village, comparing it with the site for the proposal in front of the Committee.
- That the hedge referenced in condition 24 was in the applicant's control and that the applicant had agreed to the condition.
- The location of nos. 22-26 Leaden Hill.
- That the trees on site were not under any protection orders. Condition 16 set out the requirement for the submission of details regarding hard and soft landscaping which could require the trees to be retained, but until those details were secured the trees could be removed at any time.
- That the application was exempt from Biodiversity Net Gain requirements, as per the legislation.

- That the hedges to the sides of the site required enhancement in order to properly screen the development and that this would be dealt with by the landscaping condition (16).
- That the appeal decisions were based on the individual circumstances of each case. The Chair commented that it was up to Members to decide what weight they gave the appeal decisions in assessing the balance of the application.
- That there were 18 dwellings served by the Leaden Hill road, which was a private road and the Local Planning Authority could not control measures implemented on the private road as it was outside of the control of the Highways Authority.
- That as the road was a private road, no conditions regarding the movements of waste vehicles could be implemented into consent for the application.

#### **Councillor Dr Lisa Redrup left the meeting**

The Committee was addressed by an objector, Sam Cottrill on behalf of Leaden Hill residents who, in response to a Member question, stated that he recognised the need for self-build properties in the District but that he and other residents of Leaden Hill felt that the harms of the proposal outweighed the benefit, citing harm to the green belt and development outside of the village development framework (VDF). The agent of the applicant, Peter McKeown, addressed the Committee and responded to Member questions. The agent informed the Committee that the applicant had not engaged in consultation with Orwell Parish Council and consultation with owners of the private road had only involved conversations with one of the adjoining residents with regards to access, as well as the owner of the application site. The Committee was informed that the site was unregistered land and, as such, the applicant had advertised in Cambridge News to request owners of the land to come forward and that the redline boundary of the application ran to the public highway. Members were informed that the advert in Cambridge News was put in place to follow procedure for Certificate C ownership, the details of which were submitted to and validated by the Local Planning Authority.

A Member query was raised as to if a deferral could be made in order to allow for consultation with local residents and the Parish Council; the Senior Planning Lawyer advised that these were not reasonable grounds for deferral. Officers advised that the Local Planning Authority had undertaken full consultation as required and had put up a site notice, as well as consulted the neighbours to the site.

The Committee was addressed by the local Member, Councillor Aidan Van de Weyer, who objected to the application. In response to a Member question, the local Member advised that whilst he recognised that the need for self-build plots in the District carried significant weight as a consideration and that some of the harms arising from impact on the landscape could be mitigated, the encroachment into the countryside was a harm that was not outweighed by the benefits of the scheme in his view.

In the debate, comment was made that the lack of consultation by the applicant was disappointing. Members commented that the application would not be recommended for approval without the benefit of the delivery of self-build plots, even if the proposal was for a rural exception site. The Committee discussed the balance between the benefits of providing self-build plots, as well as the other benefits delivered through the Section 106 Agreement and the lack of objections for statutory consultees outside of the Landscape Officer, and the harms arising from the proposal. Members cited a number of harms:

- Encroachment into the green belt.
- Unsustainable development outside of the VDF.
- Harm to the character of the village of Orwell and the open countryside.
- Loss of Grade 2 agricultural land.

Whilst Members recognised the value of the proposal by virtue delivering self-build plots, many felt that an additional 9 self-build plots, whilst having some impact, would not have a major impact on the deficit of plots in the District and did not justify the harms arising from the proposal. Some Members felt that the benefit of delivering 9 self-build plots carried enough weight to warrant an approval. Members who did not view the proposal as acceptable commented that they understood why officers had recommended that the application be approved, but felt that the harms of the proposal outweighed the benefits and that the similar appeal decisions justified this perspective.

By 8 votes (Councillors Peter Fane, Peter Sandford, Anna Bradnam, Ariel Cahn, Bill Handley, Heather Williams, Dr Richard Williams and Eileen Wilson) to 1 (Councillor Dr Tumi Hawkins), the Committee **refused** the application, contrary to the officer's recommendation laid out in the report from the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development. By affirmation, the Committee agreed to the following reasons for refusal:

1. The proposal forms residential development outside of a development framework boundary that does not fall within any of the exceptions cited by Policy S/7, nor would the development be supported in principle by other policies in the Local Plan. The development would therefore result in encroachment into the open countryside and a form of unsustainable development that is not compatible with its location.

The fact that the proposed dwellings would be self-build dwellings would not be of sufficient benefit of itself in helping to meet identified need for self and custom build properties to override the presumption against the principle of residential development on the site or to warrant a decision other than in accordance with the adopted development plan policies.

The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies S/2, S/3, S/6, S/7, S/10 and TI/2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 that seek to prioritise the development of new homes as part of a spatial and sustainable development strategy that protects the countryside from encroachment and to help guard against incremental growth in unsustainable locations.

2. The proposed development would result in significant encroachment of built form into the open countryside which would be harmful to the character of the countryside and the rural transition from the village. The proposal would therefore

result in significant harm to the existing character of the open rural landscape, village development character and village edge and would conflict with Policies S/7, HQ/1 and NH/2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

3. The proposed development would result in the irreversible loss of Grade 2 agricultural land which is considered to be best most versatile land. The land is not allocated for development within the Local Plan and the need for self-build does not override the need to protect the agricultural value of the land. Subsequently the proposal would be contrary to Policy NH/3 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

## 9. **24/00652/HFUL - 3 Acorn Lane, Cambourne**

The Planning Officer presented the report and provided the Committee an update, informing them that Cambourne Town Council had expressed support for the application. In response to Member questions, officers clarified that the proposal would not result in harm arising from overlooking as the rear dormer would be overlooking the shared parking area. Officers also clarified that the application was being reported to Committee as it came from a relation to an officer of the Council, otherwise the proposal would have been decided upon under the scheme of delegation.

Councillor Anna Bradnam, seconded by Councillor Heather Williams, proposed that the Committee move to the decision and the Committee agreed by affirmation.

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

## 10. **Compliance Report**

The Principal Planning Compliance Manager presented the report and responded to Member questions. With regards to staffing within the Compliance Team, the Committee was informed that the vacancy within the team was due to a secondment of a member of the Team to the Strategic sites team which was due to end shortly. Temporary cover had been in place, but this had ended in March, however the secondment had been extended until the end of April. Regarding the assignment of priorities to historical cases, Members were advised that for the Compliance Team to give meaningful information a full analysis was required and that the Principal Planning Compliance Manager felt that anecdotal information could be provided but that this was not a preferable solution. Members felt that information on outstanding historical priority A cases would be useful, including average time taken to address and close a case. Members were informed that the intention was to include information in future reports on the time taken to visit a site following the submission of a case, alongside the priority assigned to cases.

The Principal Planning Compliance manager offered advice on a specific matter in Elsworth, and advised that discussions over compliance matters on traveller sites within the District could be held outside of public session.

The Committee **noted** the report.

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

The Delivery Manager introduced the report and, in response to Member questions, clarified what was meant by “statement due” and also advised that the Local Planning Authority was awaiting information from the Planning Inspectorate on what type of appeal would be held for the Grassy Corner Caravan Park, Chesterton case.

The Committee **noted** the report.

---

**The Meeting ended at 4.20 p.m.**

---

This page is left blank intentionally.