

Delegation meeting 26 August 2025

Date: 26 August 2025

Time: 11.00 – 13:00

Meeting held: via Teams

Attendees: Cllr Anna Bradnam (Chair of Planning Committee), Cllr Peter Fane (Vice Chair of Planning Committee), Rebecca Smith (Delivery Manager), Tom Chenery (Senior Planning Officer), Tom Gray (Principal Planning Officer)

Apologies:

Minutes approved by: Cllr Anna Bradnam 29.08.2025

25/02286/FUL – 41 Back Road Linton

Erection of 3 No. dwellings with altered highway and pedestrian access.

Reason for Call-in Request:

Parish requested: LPC strongly object to the pedestrian access onto Coles Lane.

The height of the elevations leaving the property via the proposed pedestrian access is excessive. There is no pavement on this side of the road which would result in risk to pedestrian safety exiting directly onto the carriageway.

Coles Lane is used daily as an overflow parking for the Medical Centre and parents/carers of the Infant school.

Cars are parked along the left-hand side of the one-way road, opposite the proposed pedestrian access point to the property, therefore traffic naturally migrates to the righthand lane. Coles Lane is on a regular bus route, due to the narrowness of the road buses pass the proposed entrance with less than half a metre clearance to the bank where the pedestrian access is proposed.

LPC highly recommend that Highways conduct a site visit, in particular during school pick up/drop off times, to assess the associated (and avoidable) risks with a pedestrian access onto Coles Lane.

LPC question whether there is sufficient space for onsite parking.

The distance between the 2 properties at the top of the site is minimal, semi-detached properties may be better suited to the space available. With windows only on the north and south of these properties there would be a reduction of natural light into the living space.

The property located at the lower end of the site would overlook to 2 properties at the top of the site.

The biodiversity calculation does not include the Beech trees and ancient orchard that were previously removed circa 2021.

The Copper Beech was designated as category A in the assessment on the previous application for this site, the latest report reclassifies the tree as a category B. The change in category is concerning as it reflects inadequate maintenance.

Key Considerations:

The Case Officer (TC) introduced the application outlining the details of the planning application, as well as the existing context of the site and surrounding area, together with details of the site designations and planning history. The planning application is a full application for the erection of 3 dwellings, following the demolition of an existing dwelling. The site is in existing residential use, located outside of the development framework, and does not fall within a conservation area. The parish council have objected to the proposal on the grounds of pedestrian safety, insufficient parking on site, amenity concerns within the site, and concerns over the BNG calculation.

The case officer advised that since the original submission the proposed second pedestrian access has been removed, this was an additional access to the existing pedestrian access on the site. By removing this secondary access any concerns over the loss of hedging around the site have also fallen away.

It was noted by the case officer that there have been 1 objection to the proposal from the local residents raising concerns regarding pedestrian / highway safety, loss of trees and the removal of hedging. The case officer clarified that the Beech Tree referred to by the Parish Council is a category B tree, and is not proposed to be removed. At the time of the meeting, the Council's Ecology Officers had raised objections by reason of over development, relating to the loss of the garage, however this garage is being retained. No objections have been received from any other internal or external specialists that have been consulted as part of the assessment of the proposal, including the tree officer and the local highways authority.

The Parish Council's objection was noted, along with the objection received from the third party consultee. The nature, scale and complexity of the proposed development is not in itself significant, nor did the proposal raise significant implications for planning policy. It was acknowledged that there was limited public interest in the proposal and no relevant planning history raising concerns. Consequently, in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee, the Delivery Manager considered, on balance, the proposal should not be referred to the planning committee.

Decision

Do not refer to Planning Committee

25/01358/FUL – Land West of Church End Arrington

Retrospective change of use of land to leisure and tourism (sui generis) use to support the highland cow petting farm enterprise, and the siting of 4no temporary buildings, 1no portable horse trailer bar and 6no afternoon tea pods and the provision of hardstanding..

Reason for Call-in Request:

Number of objections

Parish requested – This parish council is a statutory consultee to represent local interests in the planning process and has taken a positive approach to this application, in line with the national planning policy framework guidelines to review material considerations only.

We object to the change of use of the land from agricultural to leisure and tourism, now we have had more information and as a retrospective planning application can see the flaws in the business operating, have listened to the impact on local residents and are concerned about insufficient parking and share highways concerns with customers walking to the location. If the planning authority is minded to agree planning permission - we request the following conditions are implemented due to the amount of concern and discussion there has been in this small village over the matters.

- Nature conservation is a priority in rural areas; despite claims in the application documents that the area was previously developed, this entire field, including the application area, has been left free of development for decades until the business owner did road construction under permitted development and thus got permission for an agricultural roadway last year. Thus, biodiversity should not be overlooked. There are inaccuracies in the submission. Some of the main ones are as follows: -
- Satellite image was used to determine if woodland has been reduced and concluded it has not. This is not the case.
- The planning statement says the area is Larch trees and the prelim eco says Elm.
- Documents state that the woodland has not been impacted and will be retained, with no trees requiring removal but the pods have already been placed in the woodland damaging the understory vegetation. It was also cleared to make way for the pods removing dead woods etc which are in themselves habitats.
- It states there is no watercourse on or connected to the site. this is incorrect, a water course is within 70m of the site. the application site is higher and any runoff from here goes directly to the water course.
- Its states the land use will not result in the removal of any natural habitats. This may be true at time of survey but change of use will allow growth on site without control.
- It does not touch on the road placed under permitted development disturbing habitats.

We would like a condition added for a full biodiversity report and landscape plan to be provided to record the actual field site habitats accurately as a whole and a plan to conserve nature on the field.

- A parking management strategy to fully address Parking and highway safety. The additional information had a revised management strategy. Our concerns are that, as a retrospective application, we have had the ability to see how this strategy is not working. We concur with highways comments fully and would expect their concerns

to be address in full before any consideration of granting permission.

- This currently unlawful activity has already been subject to considerable debate within this council and the local community. The field/site was part of a bigger agricultural concern and as such is now landlocked following its sale with only a right of access over a shared dwelling driveway off Church End. The travel plan is reliant on the use of a third-party provision at the Hardwicke Arms which is not part of this application nor a guaranteed long-term lease.

Church End is an unclassified, no through way, an uneven single track with no passing places, which IS the Clopton Way historic public footpath with no pedestrian footway nor lighting (and should remain so as part of its setting).

Production of a planning traffic and parking management policy to address sustainable access and travel methods to site. This would be difficult to achieve as Arrington is a rural village of only 402 residents, 7 miles north of Royston, 5 miles north of Meldreth village, 11.5 miles west of Cambridge and 14 miles southeast of St Neots, the nearest towns with good public transport. Most of these are greater distances than the 5 miles a cyclist is expected to easily handle for commuting. There are also no cycle paths to Arrington and cycling the A1198, A603 and A428 are dangerous activities. The good travel links highlighted in the planning statement can only refer to road. There is limited public transport as pointed out in the travel plan, three buses per day, morning and evening only to match commuter times and thus this site's location only encourages private vehicle use. Many of the villagers use their cars to get around the village due to the lack of cycle lanes and safe footpaths.

The CDA travel plan and technical notes are a desk study with inaccuracies, and they contradict some of the planning statement. Given this we suggest it is unreliable.

There is a big concern that the parking provision at Hardwicke Arms Hotel is not under direct control of the applicant, which is presumably why this is not in the red and blue lines and thus not part of this application.

Our concern is that there is a heavy reliance on parking provisions that is permanently not in the direct control of the applicant, not guaranteed for the subsequent owners of the site who may not have access to the Hardwicke Arms Hotel. This creates an issue with enforceability of the traffic management plan at which point the already stressed parking situation around the church end could escalate. We therefore ask that a parking management strategy be conditioned to ensure that there is a strategy on going for the site regardless of ownership or any future commercial changes at Hardwicke Arms Hotel.

- We would expect that if the application was minded to be granted any management plan breach would void the permission, thus business expansion and visitors would necessitate expansion of the parking strategy or the site be limited to a number of visitors.

- A water drainage solution for site amenities and building's location on existing hard standing. The hard standing was created under permitted development when this petting farm arrived just prior to this application being made. The existing/proposed structures are temporary and removable but not agricultural in nature and should not be mistaken as permitted development to complete engineering works to place foul drainage. The addition of a septic tank we believe is not suitable due to tankers

having to access the site by a single rural lane. Currently a tanker travels Church End to empty these adding to the traffic and natural world concerns above. Chemicals are not in keeping with nature and creating large tanker visits to the area. The right answer for this site would be a bio disk.

Given these concerns the parish council request a condition in relation to drainage so that the drainage facilities can be consulted and dealt with at a discharge of condition application

- Consideration to loss of neighbour amenity should be given to the two houses that the site backs onto and which use the shared access. These two houses were self-build developments finished circa 2021, one house has just been placed on the market. Their garden and extra land to the rear is overlooked by the quoted 57 patrons per day to get to and away from the application site.
- Public footpath access to be reinstated. Public footpath 4 is currently closed to anyone who does not wish to get close to habituated cattle in the field, which the owner says he does not allow his clients to do without supervision but allows the public to do at some risk. It runs through the field, and although the owner has several times promised to open a permissive path at the top of the application area, ensuring there is safe access away from roaming cows, he has so far not done this, instead directing walkers down to footpath 6 at the field bottom. This removes access for many people to one of the two traditional footpaths across the area.
- To implement a condition that the site limits the number of users to an appropriate amount at any one time given the constraints of the site.

The Parish Council does request that the application be referred to the District Council Planning Committee

Planning reasons:

Note: Where a Parish Councils requests that an application is determined by Planning Committee there is real value and importance in Parish Council representatives attending Planning Committee to support their comments. Please note that the Parish Council can be represented at Planning Committee by any of its Councillors or the Parish Clerk (with the approval of their Parish Council).

Key Considerations:

The Case Officer (TG) introduced the application outlining the details of the planning application, as well as the existing context of the site and surrounding area, together with details of the site designations and planning history. The planning application is a full application to retain the use and development on site which has been in operation for some time. Prior approval was granted for an agricultural access and internal access track recently on the site.

The site is located partly within but mainly adjacent to the development framework, a public right of way runs through the site, with a second public right of way crossing the very western corner of the site. The access track into the site goes between two houses on Church End. Parking for the use is proposed at the Hardwick Arms/ the Tea Room, with pedestrian access to the site some 650m walk across to A1198, then along a mix of footpaths and shared surfaces to the site.

It was noted by the case officer that there have been 14 objections from third party consultees, 40 letters of support and 2 neutral comments on the proposal. In terms of the internal and external technical specialists that have been consulted as part of

the assessment of the proposal the local highways authority, ecology officer and tree officer have objected to the proposal. The environmental health officer, archaeology officer, conservation officer and public rights of way officer have not raised any objections.

The Parish Council's concerns can be summarised as relating to:

- Parking and highway safety
- Nature conservation
- Drainage
- Neighbour amenity
- Public footpath access

The objections from third party consultees can be summarised as relating to:

- Traffic and parking
- Pedestrian safety
- Ecology and biodiversity
- Heritage and landscape impact
- Residential amenity

The panel considered that the nature, scale and complexity of the proposed development is not in itself considered to be significant, however the proposal did raise significant planning concerns. It was also acknowledged that there was significant public interest in the proposal from third parties in objection and support. Consequently, in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee, the Delivery Manager considered, on balance, the proposal should be referred to the planning committee.

Decision

Refer to Planning Committee