

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on
Wednesday, 3 September 2014 at 10.30 a.m.

PRESENT: Councillor Lynda Harford – Chairman
Councillor Brian Burling – Vice-Chairman

Councillors:	Anna Bradnam	Pippa Corney
	Kevin Cuffley	Tumi Hawkins
	Caroline Hunt	Sebastian Kindersley
	David McCraith	Deborah Roberts
	Tim Scott	Robert Turner

Officers in attendance for all or part of the meeting:

Julie Ayre (Planning Team Leader (East)), Nigel Blazeby (Development Control Manager), Gary Duthie (Senior Lawyer), Alistair Funge (Planning Enforcement Officer), Karen Pell-Coggins (Senior Planning Assistant), Ian Senior (Democratic Services Officer), Paul Sexton (Principal Planning Officer (West)) and Dan Smith (Planning Officer)

Councillors James Hockney and Peter Johnson were in attendance, by invitation.

1. APOLOGIES

Councillor Ben Shelton sent Apologies for Absence.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Committee authorised the Chairman to sign, as a correct record, the Minutes of the meeting held on 6 August 2014.

4. S/0558/14/OL- WATERBEACH (BANNOLD ROAD)

Matt Hare (applicant's agent) and Councillors James Hockney and Peter Johnson (local Members) addressed the meeting.

The local Members highlighted the following concerns:

- The loss of what was intended to be a "green buffer zone" between the village of Waterbeach and the proposed new town
- Surface- and foul water drainage issues, which needed to be resolved before any development took place
- The site's location outside the village framework
- Adverse impact on the rural character and landscaping of the area

The Committee noted that Anglian Water had advised that the local drainage system was currently at full capacity, but that the proposal included a Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS).

Members made the following comments:

- The proposed site was a sensitive one and, should the Local Planning Authority (LPA) bow to pressure in this instance, it would eventually lead to coalescence between Waterbeach village and the proposed New Town.
- The proposal failed to comply with the LPA's policy requiring a density of 40 dwellings per hectare
- The proposal would cause visual harm
- The Committee should concentrate on planning factors and should not be distracted by the question of the five-year housing land supply shortfall identified recently by a planning inspector in allowing two appeals on sites adjacent to this one
- This was a speculative application that should be considered in terms of quality, and its implications for Waterbeach village.
- The danger of setting a precedent
- SUDS was not guaranteed to work in this location
- There must be absolute clarity and certainty about future maintenance of the proposed drainage system
- Cumulative effect
- An Appeal was likely to be upheld

The Development Control Manager reminded Members that their arguments in the current case surrounding visual impact and green separation had both been rehearsed at recent Appeals relating to adjacent sites, and had both been lost. He noted that the proposed reasons for refusal – visual impact and the density being too low – appeared to contradict each other.

The Committee **refused** the Application contrary to the recommendation in the report from the Planning and New Communities Director. Members agreed the reasons for refusal as being that:

1. the proposed number of dwellings per hectare was too low, contrary to Policy;
2. the visual impact upon the open nature of land south of Bannold Road was unacceptable; and
3. the development will result in the loss of land that could form a separation between the village of Waterbeach and the proposed new Settlement to the north.

5. S/1300/14/FL - WATERBEACH (6 CHAPEL STREET)

Margarita Sesca (applicant's agent) and Councillors James Hockney and Peter Johnson (local Members) addressed the meeting.

The Committee noted concern about car parking, and its potential impact on the viability of local shops. Members also considered the impact of the proposed building on the Conservation Area.

The Committee **approved** the application, subject to the Conditions referred to in the report from the Planning and New Communities Director.

6. S/1128/14/FL - HARDWICK (27 ST NEOTS ROAD)

Colin Smith (applicant's agent) addressed the meeting. The Case Officer read out a letter from the occupier of no. 29 St. Neots Road, Hardwick.

Members visited the site on 3 September 2014.

The Committee gave officers **delegated powers to approve** the application, subject to officers being satisfied that the proposed development will not have a materially adverse impact on the occupiers of No.29 St Neots Road, by reason of loss of sunlight, and to the Conditions referred to in the report from the Planning and New Communities Director.

7. ENFORCEMENT REPORT

The Committee **received and noted** an Update on enforcement action.

8. APPEALS AGAINST PLANNING DECISIONS AND ENFORCEMENT ACTION

The Committee **received and noted** a report on Appeals against planning decisions and enforcement action.

The Meeting ended at 11.59 a.m.
