

## **SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on  
Wednesday, 2 November 2016 at 10.30 a.m.

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

**Councillors:** Anna Bradnam  
Pippa Corney  
David McCraith  
Deborah Roberts  
Robert Turner  
Brian Burling  
Sebastian Kindersley  
Des O'Brien  
Tim Scott  
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), Thorfinn Caithness (Principal Planning Officer), John Koch (Planning Team Leader (West)), Stephen Reid (Senior Planning Lawyer), Ian Senior (Democratic Services Officer), James Stone (Principal Planning Officer), Charles Swain (Principal Planning Enforcement Officer) and David Thompson (Principal Planning Officer)

Councillors Nigel Cathcart, Sue Ellington, Mark Howell and Nick Wright were in attendance, by invitation.

### **1. APOLOGIES**

Councillor John Batchelor sent Apologies for Absence. His substitute was Councillor Aidan Van de Weyer.

### **2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Sebastian Kindersley declared a non-pecuniary interest in Minute 9 (S/1766/16/FL - Robinson Court, Grays Road, Gamlingay). He had attended several meetings about this application, including with South Cambridgeshire District Council and Gamlingay Parish Council, but was now considering the matter afresh.

Councillor David McCraith declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of Minutes 6, 7 and 8 (S/1745/16/OL - Land East of Spring Lane, Bassingbourn: S/1566/16/OL - Land to the West of the Cemetery, North of The Causeway, Bassingbourn: S/2123/15/FL - 15 Old North Road, Bassingbourn). He had attended several meetings about these applications but was now considering the three matters afresh.

### **3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Committee authorised the Chairman to sign, as a correct record, the minutes of the meeting held on 5 October 2016, subject to the following:

#### **Minute 3 – Declarations of Interest**

After "...6 July 2016..." replace the comma with a full stop and replace the words "... but then left the Chamber and did not take part in the debate leading up to the application's deferral. He was now considering the matter afresh." with the words "...At a subsequent meeting with key stakeholders (Parish Council, developers and local Members). Councillor

Robert Turner thanked everyone for attending, and hoped for a satisfactory outcome. He then left that meeting before the discussion started, and was now considering the matter afresh.”

The text should therefore state as follows:

“Councillor Robert Turner declared a non-pecuniary interest in Minute no.5 (S/3181/15/FL - Land to the North of Pampisford Road, Great Abington). He had made a statement about the application when it was first presented to Committee at its meeting on 6 July 2016. At a subsequent meeting with key stakeholders (Parish Council, developers and local Members). Councillor Robert Turner thanked everyone for attending, and hoped for a satisfactory outcome. He then left that meeting before the discussion started, and was now considering the matter afresh.”

**4. S/2647/15/OL - PAPWORTH EVERARD (LAND TO THE EAST OF OLD PINEWOOD WAY AND RIDGEWAY)**

Members visited the site on 1 November 2016.

Robert Butcher (objector), Paul Belton (applicant’s agent), Councillor Peter Cruse (Papworth everard Parish Council) and Councillors Mark Howell and Nick Wright (local Members) addressed the meeting.

Mr Butcher’s concerns related to

- Current and future traffic congestion, and the impact on the Caxton Gibbet roundabout
- Implications of the relocation of Papworth Hospital to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus

Mr Belton told the Committee that, in addition to the usual consultation process, the proposal had been the subject of a pre-application review, and had been considered by the Design Enabling Panel.

Councillor Peter Cruse said that the Parish Council’s principal concern related to education provision.

Councillor Nick Wright focussed on the presumption in the National Planning Policy Framework in favour of sustainable development, and questioned the sustainability of the proposal in terms of employment: the only jobs created would be in constructing the dwellings, and the village’s major employer – Papworth Hospital – was due to relocate in 2018. He argued that the development did not promote transport, and there was no guarantee that the promised cycle path improvements would take place.

Councillor Mark Howell strongly objected on the grounds of traffic congestion and impact on the availability of car parking. He said that, years ago, South Cambridgeshire District Council had deemed the site inappropriate for Affordable Housing. He regretted the pressure being applied to Papworth Everard.

Rob Lewis (Cambridgeshire County Council, Education Department) addressed the Committee about school capacity and transport constraints.

Committee members raised concerns about

- The speculative nature of the application

- Sustainability
- Location of the access point off the Ridgeway
- Papworth Everard's status as a Minor Rural Centre
- The lack of new employment opportunities
- A bus subsidy that could not be guaranteed beyond a certain point in time

In the light of recent Appeal decisions relating to the Council's inability to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply, and upon the Chairman's casting vote, the Planning 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 the obligations referred to in the Heads of Terms attached as Appendix 3 to the report from the Head of Development Management; and
2. The Conditions and Informatives set out in an update report from the Head of Development Management, published on 28 October 2016 as part of a supplement to the main agenda.

#### **5. S/1605/16/OL - SWAVESEY (LAND TO THE R/O 130 MIDDLE WATCH)**

Members visited the site on 1 November 2016.

Colin Brown (applicant's agent), Councillor Will Wright (Swavesey Parish Council) and Councillor Sue Ellington (local Member) addressed the meeting.

Mr. Brown commended the application to Members, highlighting its sustainability, provision of affordable housing (including four bungalows), and contribution infrastructure and facilities.

Councillor Wright said that Swavesey Parish Council objected to the proposal for the following reasons:

- The site had not been identified for development by the emerging Local Plan
- Infrastructure was at capacity
- Cumulative impact resulting in a 35% increase in the size of the village
- The potential for "rat running"
- Flood risk
- Maintenance issues in perpetuity
- Payment for street lights
- Pressure on local education
- Impact on the Doctors surgery

Councillor Ellington reminded Members that Swavesey was a linear village with very few facilities. It was expanding disproportionately. The concept of 'community' was an important one. Clarification was needed from Cambridgeshire County Council as Local Highways Authority concerning the access.

Rob Lewis, Cambridgeshire County Council Education Department, indicated that there was sufficient capacity at the primary school in the short- and medium term.

Dr. Jon Finney, Cambridgeshire County Council as Local Highways Authority, confirmed that the staggered junction was within the accepted criteria.

Committee Members made the following points:

- A proposal (which the applicant's agent undertook to consider) for a Safer Routes to School path in the north west corner of the site
- There was a lack of new employment opportunities
- Village status
- This was a speculative application
- Impact on the local land drainage network, the cost of upgrading it, and who would pay for that upgrade
- Cumulative impact
- sustainability

The Committee **refused** the application, contrary to the recommendation in the report from the Head of Development Management. Members agreed the reason for refusal as being that, notwithstanding the proposal in the emerging Local Plan to upgrade Swavesey to a Minor Rural Settlement, there were significant infrastructure capacity issues (such as educational, drainage, highway and medical) because of cumulative development within the village, giving rise to concerns about sustainability;

## 6. S/1745/16/OL - BASSINGBOURN (LAND EAST OF SPRING LANE)

Members visited the site on 1 November 2016.

Mr. Everett (objector), David Bainbridge (applicant's agent), Councillor Mike Hallett (Bassingbourn Parish Council) and cllr Nigel Cathcart (a local Member) addressed the meeting.

Mr. Everett questioned the proposal's sustainability, and highlighted a number of possible errors in the application. His main objections related to flood risk and traffic. He pointed out that the site was outside the village framework.

Mr. Bainbridge commended the application to Members, asserting that the development was deliverable.

Councillor Hallett said that the proposal would be more appropriate on the edge of Cambridge. The Parish Council was concerned at the risk of surface water flooding. The Parish Council did not consider the proposal to be sustainable.

Councillor Cathcart described the application as speculative, and expressed concern at the proposal to upgrade the village to a Minor Rural Centre. The High Street was at capacity in terms of traffic. There were few employment opportunities in Bassingbourn, and the village was not on a transport corridor.

Speaking as a local Member, Councillor David McCraith regretted the lack of extra jobs, and described the proposal as unsustainable.

During further debate, it was noted that the application was not policy compliant in terms of density.

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

3. the prior completion of a Legal Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 securing the obligations referred to in the Heads of Terms attached as Appendix 1 to the report from the Head of Development Management; and

4. the Conditions and Informatives referred to therein.

**7. S/1566/16/OL - BASSINGBOURN (LAND TO THE WEST OF THE CEMETRY, NORTH OF THE CAUSEWAY())**

Members visited the site on 1 November 2016.

Freya Turtle (applicant's agent) commended the application, describing it as policy compliant and deliverable in the short term. Councillor Mike Hallett (Bassingbourn Parish Council) said that the proposal was not sustainable in this location and was more appropriate to the edge of Cambridge. Councillors Nigel Cathcart and David McCraith (local Members) were concerned about the lack of local job opportunities, the unsustainable nature of the proposal, and its impact on the green separation between Bassingbourn and Kneesworth.

Committee members shared concerns about employment and the loss of green separation, notwithstanding that green separation did not have the same legal standing as Green Belt.

The Committee **refused** the application contrary to the recommendation in the report from the Head of Development Management. Members agreed the reason for refusal as being the proposal's unsustainability resulting from the cumulative adverse impact of development in Bassingbourn.

**8. S/2123/15/FL - BASSINGBOURN (15 OLD NORTH ROAD)**

Members visited the site on 1 November 2016.

Councillor Mike Hallett (Bassingbourn Parish Council) addressed the meeting. He expressed concerns about the "inappropriate" number of dwellings per hectare, the small nature of the gardens attached to each house, and the adverse impact on people's quality of life. Councillor Nigel Cathcart (a local Member), described the proposal as over-development that would generate car parking issues. He urged the Committee either to retain the old buildings currently on site, or to replace them in a sensitive manner. Speaking in his capacity as the other local Member, Councillor David McCraith said that each property should have its own designated parking spaces.

The Planning Lawyer said that officers were in the process of deciding whether the appropriate ownership certificate had been provided.

Following further debate, the Committee **approved** the application subject to

1. The Conditions and Informatives set out in the report from the Head of Development Management; and
2. Additional Conditions requiring that a plan be submitted and approved showing dedicated car parking spaces for each of the five properties, and that those car parking spaces be made available three months before occupation of the first dwelling.

**9. S/1766/16/FL - GAMLINGAY (ROBINSON COURT, GRAYS ROAD)**

Members visited the site on 1 November 2016.

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

5. The prior completion of a Legal Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 securing the obligations referred to in the Heads of Terms attached as an Appendix to the report from the Head of Development Management;
6. The Conditions and Informatives set out in the report from the Head of Development Management; and
7. An additional Condition requiring the placement of bollards (or similar suitable street furniture) to protect the grassed area in front of numbers 36, 38 and 40 Grays Road.

**10. S/1482/16/FL - GIRTON (69 ST VINCENTS CLOSE)**

The Committee **approved** the application subject to the Conditions and Informatives set out in the report from the Head of Development Management.

**11. S/0121/16/FL - WILLINGHAM (THE OAKS, MEADOW ROAD)**

Members visited the site on 1 November 2016.

The Committee noted that this application had been **withdrawn** from the agenda.

**12. S/1197/16/FL - GRANTCHESTER (THE OLD DAIRY, MANOR FARM, MILL WAY)**

Councillor Maggie Challis (Grantchester Parish Council) had registered to speak but, due to reasons beyond her control, was unable to attend the meeting. Instead, a statement was read out on her behalf. The Parish Council's principal concern was for the conservation of this valuable and unique location. It said that the building of a studio in the garden of the Old Dairy would upset the coherence and integrity that makes this whole site unique. Such development offered no public benefit, and potentially set a precedent for future building on the site. The Parish Council opposed any developments within the Grantchester conservation area, and which would disturb the historic layout and integrity of the site.

Richard Brimblecombe (applicant's agent) was in attendance to clarify issues raised by Members.

The Committee **approved** the application subject to the Conditions and Informative set out in the report.

**13. S/1198/16/LB - GRANTCHESTER (THE OLD DAIRY, MANOR FARM, MILL WAY)**

The Committee **approved** the application subject to the Conditions and Informative set out in the report.

**14. ENFORCEMENT REPORT**

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

**15. 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 4.30 p.m.**

---