

Delegation meeting 5 September 2025

Delegation Panel meeting - Minutes

- Date: 5 September 2025
- Time: 10am to 11am
- Meeting held: via Teams

Attendees: Cllr Anna Bradnam (Chair of Planning Committee), Cllr Peter Fane (Vice Chair of Planning Committee), Rebecca Smith (Delivery Manager), Phoebe Carter (Senior Planning Officer)

Apologies: -

Minutes approved by date: Cllr Anna Bradnam 12.09.2025

25/02814/S73 – Land North and East of Ramphill Farm Rampton Road Cottenham

S73 to vary conditions 11 (Hard and soft Landscaping) and 12 (Hard and soft Landscaping) of Outline planning permission S/2876/16/OL (Outline Planning Application for residential development comprising 154 dwellings including matters of access with all other matters reserved) to regularise the levels across the Public Open Space and Playing Field area by delivering the entirety of the Playing Pitch Area at the same level (to create a flat playing surface) at 14.000 AOD.

Reason for Inclusion

Parish called in - CPC strongly recommends refusal on the following grounds. If Officer minded to approve then we would like the application to go to Committee.

- Adverse Impact on Privacy and Security - The proposed variation would raise site levels significantly, particularly with the addition of a mound around the edge of the site, resulting in overlooking into the private rear gardens of existing neighbouring dwellings along Rampton Road. This would cause an unacceptable loss of privacy and a perception of being overlooked. The raised levels would

The Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service is a strategic partnership between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council

also undermine the sense of security of neighbouring residents by creating elevated vantage points directly into their gardens.

- **Unacceptable Surface Water Run-Off** - By departing from the original lower site levels which featured a gentle slope, the development would increase surface water run-off onto adjacent land, including neighbouring properties, allotments and the recreation ground (which is has LGS designation). This risk of waterlogging and damage to these community assets is contrary to NPPF guidance which requires development not to increase flood risk elsewhere. Given the poor drainage of the soil type the land the development is built on this is a considerable concern.
- **Negative Impact on Accessibility and Inclusive Design** - The introduction of a steeply sloped mound around the site boundaries would significantly hinder access to the adjoining open space, particularly for wheelchair users, mobility scooter users, and people with limited mobility. This conflicts with Local Plan Policies which requires inclusive and accessible environments, and with the aims of the Equality Act 2010 to ensure equal access to public facilities.
- **Departure from Approved Scheme / Original Intent** - The original application was approved with lower site levels precisely to mitigate impacts on neighbours and surrounding land. The variation now sought would materially alter those safeguards, resulting in an unacceptable form of development. This is not in the spirit or intent of the original permission and would conflict with the Council's duty to ensure development is of high quality and respects local amenity.
- **Lack of Justification** - No robust technical or planning justification has been provided for the removal or alteration of the relevant condition(s). Furthermore there is no detail provided as to the standard that the land will be left in.

Discussion

The Case Officer (PC) 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 case officer also outlined in detail the concerns raised by the parish council. This application is to vary two conditions on a previously approved permission to allow for a level playing surface within the playing field. Under the approved permission the playing field land varied across the site by about 0.35m (from 13.65 AOD to 14.0m AOD), this application proposes to raise the lower end of the playing area by 0.35m to match the upper end and create a level playing surface. The proposal would also create a sloping edge around the playing pitch, for example from the boundary with the houses along Rampton Road where the land level was approved at between 13.65m to 14.0m AOD, this land level is proposed to be reduced by approximately 1m on the boundary, with the level playing area at 14m AOD being located some 13m from the boundary.

It was noted by the case officer that there have been no objections received from third party consultees and 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 lead local flood authority or the internal drainage board who have both confirmed there are no surface water flood risk or drainage implications from the proposal. The Council's landscape officer has asked some additional information to confirm that there is sufficient space on the level playing area for the number of pitches already approved.

The proposal incorporates an access onto the level playing field which has been assessed by the Council's access officer who has confirmed that it is acceptable for all users.

It was noted this provided ramped access from the associated development to the northwest, but not from the direction of the sports pavilion to the east, from which users might approach the pitch.

The Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service is a strategic partnership between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council

The Parish Council's objection was noted as part of the discussion. 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 no public interest in the proposal from neighbouring residents 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