

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on
Wednesday, 3 August 2016 at 10.30 a.m.

PRESENT: Councillor David Bard – Chairman
Councillor Kevin Cuffley – Vice-Chairman

Councillors:	Anna Bradnam	Brian Burling
	Pippa Corney	Sebastian Kindersley
	Charles Nightingale	Des O'Brien
	(substitute)	
	Deborah Roberts	Tim Scott
	Robert Turner	Aidan Van de Weyer (substitute)

Officers in attendance for all or part of the meeting:

Julie Ayre (Planning Team Leader (East)), Julie Baird (Head of Development Management), John Koch (Planning Team Leader (West)), Lydia Pravin (Planning Officer), Stephen Reid (Senior Planning Lawyer), Ian Senior (Democratic Services Officer), Charles Swain (Principal Planning Enforcement Officer), David Thompson (Principal Planning Officer), Alison Twyford (Senior Planning Officer) and William Tysterman (Planning Project Officer)

Councillors Roger Hall, Alex Riley and Bunty Waters were in attendance, by invitation.

1. APOLOGIES

Councillors John Batchelor and David McCraith sent Apologies for Absence. Councillors Aidan Van de Weyer and Charles Nightingale were their respective substitutes.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Tim Scott declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in Minute 7 (S/1136/16/FL in Comberton) because he was the landowner. Councillor Scott withdrew from the Chamber, took no part in the debate and did not vote.

Councillor Robert Turner declared a non-pecuniary interest in Minute 5 (S/0851/16/FL in Bar Hill). Councillor Turner had visited the site privately last year, but offered no comment about it. He informed a Planning Officer about the visit, and was considering the matter afresh.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Committee authorised the Chairman to sign, as a correct record, the minutes of the meeting held on 6 July 2016.

4. S/2456/15/OL - WILLINGHAM (LAND OFF, HADEN WAY)

Members visited the site on 2 August 2016.

Sinead Turnbull (applicant's agent) attended the meeting to answer any questions. There were no questions.

Committee members made the following points

- It should be a requirement that 50% to 100% of the affordable housing should be offered, in the first instance, to those with a connection with Willingham, and then cascaded out
- Concern about the cumulative effect of development in the village
- The lack of meaningful sustainability
- Disappointment at the absence of footpath links between adjoining developments

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

1. The prior completion of a Legal Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 securing
 - a. Enhancements of nearby bus shelters and the footpath link between the development and local facilities
 - b. Financial contributions intended to address capacity issues at the doctors surgery and primary school
 - c. The provision of 40% affordable housing (100% of which will be for those with a local connection with Willingham and then subject to the standard cascade provision)
 - d. Public open space and equipped areas of play
 - e. A financial contribution towards off-site community facilities
 as detailed in the Heads of Terms attached as Appendix 1 to the report from the Head of Development Management; and

2. The Conditions and Informatives referred to in the said report.

5. **S/0851/16/FL - BAR HILL (HALLMARK HOTEL, LAND SOUTH SIDE OF HUNTINGDON ROAD)**

Members visited the site on 2 August 2016.

Matthew Roe (applicant's agent), and Councillors Roger Hall and Bunty Waters (local Members) addressed the meeting. Matthew Roe highlighted the proposal's holistic approach, and its high quality nature. He said that the proposal would protect Bar Hill's character, and provide traffic calming along the sole route into the village. In reply to a question, Mr Roe was unwilling to commit his client to an uplift clause, but said that, should the development remain unbuilt in three years time, there would be a good argument for revisiting the question of viability. Councillor Hall referred to the unique character of Bar Hill, claiming that the proposal was unsustainable. He expressed concern that the existing bund was not being retained in its entirety. The proposed traffic crossing might be perceived as unsafe, and therefore have the effect of increasing traffic as parents opted to drive their children to school. Uncertainty about car parking provision could lead to an increase in on-street parking. Councillor Waters expressed dismay at the proposal for two blocks of flats at the entrance to Bar Hill as this would spoil the village's character. Would the affordable housing be for local people? What arrangements would there be for maintaining the play area?

Committee members made the following comments:

- The development would greatly change the entrance to Bar Hill
- It would damage the village's character of having four distinct areas (this proposal includes residential, recreation and commercial in a single package)
- Concern about the landmark nature of the two blocks of flats
- Inadequate affordable housing provision
- Bulk and size made the proposal out-of-keeping with the surrounding area
- The design is unacceptable

- The proposal was overbearing and unacceptable in a rural setting

With referenc to Members' interest in imposing an uplift clause, the Planning Lawyer said that, while there was no policy basis for insisting on such a clause, precedants did exist. He suggested that the application be referred back to Committee should the developer was unwilling to negotiate an uplift clause.

The Committee **refused** the application contrary to the recommendation in the report from the Head of Development Management. Members agreed the reasons for refusal as being

1. That the proposal, by virtue of its bulk, height, massing and overbearing nature, was out of character with the local area, and that the overall design was contrary to Policy DP/2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework 2007; and
2. the need for affordable housing in this location is considered to outweigh the benefits of a high specification design.

6. S/1040/16/FL - LONGSTANTON (LAND TO THE REAR OF EXISTING HAULAGE YARD AND NO.5 STATION ROAD)

Members visited the site on 2 August 2016.

Catherine Bailey (objector), Andy Payton (on behalf of the applicant) and Councillor Alex Riley (local Member) addressed the meeting. Catherine Bailey spoke about pollution from fumes and noise, in particular low frequency noise. She said that the proposed acoustic fencing along the rear western boundary of No. 5 Station Road should be extended for 60 metres along the southern boundary of the site to protect neighbour amenity. Landscaping should be enhanced. Catherine Bailey referred to the Council's Long-term vision relating to quality of life. Andy Payton said that the proposed expansion of the business would create 25 new jobs and no viable alternative site existed in Cambridgeshire. He explained that 65% of lorries left the site on Monday morning and only returned on Friday afternoon. Mr Payton was keen to do everything possible to address the concerns of neighbours, while nevertheless avoiding any significant adverse impact on the business as a result. Councillor Alex Riley said the most important thing was to protect residents, for example by restricting the hours of operation, stopping the practice of leaving engines running on stationary vehicles, and adopting effective noise mitigation measures.

Following discussion centred around the need to protect neighbours' amenity, and desire to establish a local liaison group, the Committee

1. **approved** the application subject to the Conditions and Informatives set out in the report from the Head of Development Management, amended as follows
 - a. by adding to the Condition requiring details of the acoustic fencing along the rear western boundary of No. 5 Station Road, a requirement that such fencing must also extend for 60 metres along the southern boundary of the site to ensure that the amenity of adjoining neighbours is protected; and
 - b. by adding to the landscaping Condition the need to provide landscaping details to protect the existing tree belt.
2. **suggested** that the Developers and other interested parties, including the local Member, might consider the establishment of a Local Liaison Group to monitor

noise disturbance and other issues.

7. S/1136/16/FL - COMBERTON (LAND AT MANOR FARM, GREEN END)

Members visited the site on 2 August 2016.

The Case Officer read out a statement from Councillor Tim Scott. The statement referred to:

- The height of the tower being determined by the coverage required
- The provision of 2G, 3G and 4G signals in Comberton
- The opportunity for future mast sharing
- Health and Safety concerns having been addressed
- The viability of the proposal

Jill Feldman (objector) addressed the meeting. She referred to:

- Health risks
- South Cambridgeshire District Council's long-term vision, including the pledge to ensure that residents enjoy a superb quality of life in an exceptionally beautiful, rural and green environment
- The questionable need for such a tower at this location, if at all
- Questionable coverage details as supplied with the application.
- The tower as a "blot on the landscape" and "a sledgehammer with which to crack a nut".

Following some discussion about the need for such a high tower, and confirmation that the tower was completely new, the Committee **approved** the application subject to the Conditions referred to in the report from the Head of Development Management.

8. S/1079/16/FL - GIRTON (45 ST VINCENTS CLOSE)

The Committee **approved** the application subject to the Conditions referred to in the report from the Head of Development Management.

9. ENFORCEMENT REPORT

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

10. 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 12.52 p.m.
