

## Delegation meeting - Minutes

- **Date:** 3 August 2021
- **Time:** 11am to 12:30pm
- **Meeting held:** via Teams
- **Attendees:** Chris Carter (CC), Cllr Henry Batchelor (HB), Julie Ayre (JA), Dean Scrivener (DS)
- **Notes and actions:** Jemma Smith

**Minutes approved by:** Cllr Henry Batchelor (Vice Chair of Planning Committee – Consultee) on 11 August 2021, Chris Carter (Delivery Manager – Strategic Sites) on 11 August 2021

**S/0559/17/OL Waterbeach Barracks and Airfield - Application to discharge Condition 31 of outline planning permission. Condition 31 Public Transport Interchange - Condition 31 requires the submission, approval and implementation of a scheme for a public transport interchange, to include vehicle parking and covered and secure cycle parking prior to the occupation of the first dwellings at the development.**

### Reason for call-in request

Waterbeach Parish Council recommends refusal of this application. Clarification is needed on the bus services proposed. What is proposal going forward when the housing numbers increase above 1600? The Council would like to be aware of the minimum service level agreement for the service to ascertain the increase of vehicles through the village. The proposed service from 7 am to 7 pm is not adequate for early and late-night train users. The Council feels that this is a premature application with inadequate consultation.

### Key considerations

The comments of the Parish Council were noted by the group. The group was advised that the context for this condition related to requirements for interim public transport

options to be made available for the first occupants of the new town (key phase 1). That these would be interim pending the future phases of the remainder of the new town and that they would have to accord with the requirements of the legal agreement.

The comments of the Parish Council were found to be material to the consideration of the condition at hand insofar as they relate to the requirements of the condition. However, these concerns were not considered to be significant given the requirements and specification for the travel hub which were set out in the S106 legal agreement which accompanies the outline planning permission.

The proposal was not found to raise significant implications for adopted policy, nor to be of a nature, scale or complexity to indicate that it should be referred to committee for these reasons. The planning history whilst relevant was not found to justify a committee decision for this matter.

## **Decision**

Delegated decision – see above.

## **21/00876/FUL Grasshopper Park Fisheries, The Lodge, Ely Road, Landbeach - Replacement Dwelling**

### **Reason for call-in request**

Road safety concerns, visibility is poor with the access at the A10, impact upon the 6 residencies to the north, a similar application to the north was refused and therefore if this was approved decision making is not consistent

### **Key considerations**

This application was previously considered at the delegation meeting of 22 June 2021. At that meeting it was agreed that the combination of the Parish Council concerns, and an objection on highway safety grounds from the County Council, justified the application being referred to the planning committee for decision. The Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service is a strategic partnership between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council. The application was returned to the delegation meeting today following a change in circumstances of the application. The County Council as



**GREATER CAMBRIDGE**  
SHARED PLANNING

highway authority no longer maintains an objection to the proposal. The application was therefore reconsidered by the group.

The comments of the Parish Council were again noted. Those comments were found to contain material planning considerations in the form of concerns regarding highway safety. However, in the context of a proposal for a single replacement dwelling, and in the absence of any other objection, these were not found to be significant to now justify referral to the planning committee.

The proposal was not found to raise significant implications for adopted policy, nor to be of a nature, scale or complexity to indicate that it should be referred to committee for these reasons. The planning history was also not determinative and it was noted that there were no objections from the public.

In summary, it was considered that referring the application to committee for decision was no longer justified, having regard to all of the above.

## **Decision**

Delegated decision. See above