

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on
Wednesday, 1 July 2015 at 10.00 a.m.

PRESENT: Councillor Lynda Harford – Chairman
Councillor David Bard – Vice-Chairman

Councillors: Brian Burling Kevin Cuffley
Tumi Hawkins (substitute) Sebastian Kindersley
David McCraith (substitute) Des O'Brien
Deborah Roberts Tim Scott
Ben Shelton Robert Turner

Officers in attendance for all or part of the meeting:

Julie Ayre (Planning Team Leader (East)), Gary Duthie (Senior Lawyer), Andrew Fillmore (Principal Planning Officer), John Koch (Planning Team Leader (West)), Ian Senior (Democratic Services Officer), Paul Sexton (Principal Planning Officer (West)) and Charles Swain (Principal Planning Enforcement Officer)

Councillors Peter Johnson, Mick Martin, Charles Nightingale and Peter Topping were in attendance, by invitation.

1. APOLOGIES

Councillors Anna Bradnam and Pippa Corney sent Apologies for Absence. Their respective substitutes were Councillors Dr. Tumi Hawkins and David McCraith.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Declarations of interest were declared as follows:

Councillor Sebastian Kindersley Non-pecuniary interest in respect of Minutes 7, 8 and 9 (S/0586/15/FL, S/0585/15/FL and S/0725/15/FL) in Little Eversden as Cambridgeshire County Councillor for the Gamlingay Electoral Division, which includes the parish of Little Eversden.

Councillor David McCraith Non-pecuniary interest in respect of Minute 11 (S/0400/15/FL in Litlington as having attended Parish Council meetings at which this application had been discussed. Councillor McCraith had not contributed to those discussions and was considering the matter afresh.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Committee authorised the Chairman to sign the Minutes of the meeting held on 3 June 2015 as a correct record.

4. S/0276/15/OL - DUXFORD (8 GREENACRES)

Members attended a site visit on 30 June 2015.

Alastair Rae (objector), Colin Campbell (applicant's agent), Councillor Mick Martin (local Member) and Councillor Peter Topping (Member for the adjacent Ward of Whittlesford and Cambridgeshire County Councillor for the Electoral Division of Duxford) addressed the meeting. Mr. Rae criticised the proposal's lack of sustainability and its adverse impact on residents' amenity. He highlighted the potential effect on highway safety, and urged the Committee to take account of local knowledge. Mr. Campbell said that this proposal was sustainable in terms of employment and proximity to the railway line, and would help to address the shortfall in the five-year housing land supply, and provision of affordable housing. Councillor Martin described the constraints presented by St. Johns Street, and said the developers should investigate sites elsewhere, or alternative accesses to the proposed one. Councillor Topping referred to the increased volume of traffic on the A505 that would result from this development, and the loss of amenity for residents in St. Johns Street because of the proposed access. He called upon the Committee to defer making a decision pending the commissioning and reporting of an independent traffic survey.

Opening the debate, a Committee member described the proposal as a speculative application, with a contrived vehicular access that would adversely affect a quiet cul-de-sac.

In response to another Member, Dr. Finney, representing Cambridgeshire County Council as Local Highways Authority, said the traffic assessment carried out by his Authority had been thorough, and the impact on the local network had not been considered severe enough to justify raising an objection.

A third Member described the proposal as unsustainable in a Group Village such as Duxford.

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 the unsustainable nature of the proposal, and concerns relating to highway safety and adverse impact on the amenity of residents in Greenacres.

5. **S/0291/15/FL - GREAT SHELFORD (THE RAILWAY TAVERN, STATION ROAD)**

Members attended a site visit on 30 June 2015.

Mark Hodgson (applicant's agent) and Councillor Charles Nightingale (a local Member) addressed the meeting. Mr. Hodgson commended the proposal on a brownfield site, saying it would improve the appearance of the local area, and contribute towards the Council's five-year housing land supply. Councillor Nightingale referred to the extra traffic that the development would generate, and highlighted the adverse impact on the amenity of the neighbours.

Opening the Committee debate, Councillor Ben Shelton (another Local Member) accepted that the site was currently in need of enhancement, but said that the current application was inappropriate. He considered the density to be too high.

Another Member described the proposal as sustainable.

The Senior Lawyer reminded the Committee that extant planning policy, and previous Appeal decisions, were both material planning considerations.

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 the adverse impact on the residents of neighbouring properties and on the character of the surrounding area.

6. S/1050/15/FL - LANDBEACH (55 HIGH STREET)

Members attended a site visit on 30 June 2015.

Justin Bainton (applicant's agent) and Councillor Peter Johnson (a local Member) addressed the meeting. Mr Bainton commended the proposal as high quality and in keeping with the immediate area. It did not have an adverse impact on the Grade II Listed Building at 53 High Street. Councillor Johnson expressed his support for the proposal, saying any precedent had already been set.

The Committee **approved** the application contrary to the recommendation in the report from the Planning and New Communities Director. Members agreed the reasons for approval as being that the proposal was in keeping with the character and appearance of the area, and did nothing to cause harm to the Conservation Area, or the setting of the adjacent Grade II Listed Building known as 53 High Street.

7. S/0586/15/FL - LITTLE EVERSDEN (PLOT 1, 23 HIGH STREET)

Joy Newman and, at the Chairman's discretion, Steve Bidwell (both objectors) addressed the meeting, relating their comments not just to this planning application but also to S/0585/15/FL and S/0725/15/FL. Joy Newman questioned the positioning of the properties on Plots 1 and 2 in relation to the street scene. She raised a concern about privacy. Mr. Bidwell expressed concern about backland development.

Opening the debate, one Member noted the option of requiring obscure glazing of the (secondary) window in the front elevation to Bedroom 1. However, the real issue was the proposed height of the building, and the overbearing sense this would give.

Councillor Sebastian Kindersley informed the Committee that, while he had attended the Parish Council meeting at which this item, and the related two items, had been considered, he had left the meeting before any discussion of the items took place. He said that, if obscure glazing were needed, it surely indicated that the amenity of longstanding residents would be affected

In response to a Member's question, the Case Officer confirmed that none of the trees on site benefitted from Tree Preservation Orders.

The Committee **approved** the application, subject to the Conditions referred to in the report from the Planning and New Communities Director, and an extra Condition requiring obscure glazing of the window in the front elevation to Bedroom 1.

8. S/0585/15/FL - LITTLE EVERSDEN (PLOT 2, 23 HIGH STREET)

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

9. S/0725/15/FL - LITTLE EVERSDEN (23 HIGH STREET)

The Committee, by virtue of the Chairman's casting vote, **approved** the application subject to the Conditions set out in the report from the Planning and New Communities Director; and to an extra Condition requiring the re-use of building materials, where possible.

10. S/0565/15/FL - GREAT CHISHILL (6 NEW ROAD)

Members attended a site visit on 30 June 2015.

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 the unsustainable nature of the site outside the village framework, and the principle of backland development being out of keeping with the surrounding area.

11. S/0400/15/FL - LITLINGTON (HIGHFIELD FARM, ROYSTON ROAD)

Andrew Tusa (objector) and Ian Collins (applicant's agent) addressed the meeting, Mr. Tusa took the view that the proposed development was too industrial for the location, and argued that targets for renewable energy had already been met locally. On behalf of the applicant, Ian Collins commended the application, saying it would not have an adverse visual impact on the area, and would have a negligible impact on the number of traffic movements.

The Committee noted the significant level of concern from local residents, particularly in terms of air quality. A Member called for a traffic management plan and an effective monitoring scheme, and the Committee noted the possibility of future expansion of the development. Another Member said the local authorities covering the areas, in which the applicant already operated, should be contacted to see whether they had encountered any problems.

The Committee gave officers **delegated powers to approve** the application, subject to

1. The Council's Environmental Health Officer being satisfied that meteorological data source used by the applicant is appropriate
2. Satisfactory comments being received from the other local authorities in whose areas the applicant already has facilities
3. The Conditions referred to in the report from the Planning and New Communities Director
4. Extra Conditions requiring monitoring, and that the number of containerised power generation sets should not be increased from eight without the submission and approval of a new planning application.

12. ENFORCEMENT REPORT

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

13. 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 1.12 p.m.
