

## Karen Pell-Coggins

---

**From:** Karen Pell-Coggins  
**Sent:** 20 June 2022 16:14  
**To:** Matthew Shellum  
**Cc:** Asitha Ranatunga; James Fisher  
**Subject:** Great Shelford Inquiry

Dear Matthew,

I refer to Putative Reason for Refusal 6 as set out in the Council's Statement of Case.

Following the submission of recent information in relation to the developer contributions sought as part of the development, it is noted that the appellant does not consider that the contributions sought with regards to outdoor space, allotments, burial grounds and indoor sports provision to be necessary to make the development acceptable and not directly related to the development.

The Council accepts that the level of contributions are more proportionate to the impact of the development where an occupation rate of 1.34 persons per unit figure is used. Adopting this approach generates a total population of 52 across the development.

In such circumstances, excluding the affordable housing commuted sum and monitoring contribution, the contributions sought by the Council as part of any section 106 planning obligation is as follows.

Infrastructure type	Policy	Contribution sought by the LPA	Use of contribution
Outdoor sports	SC/7	£24,403.33	towards either the Great Shelford Sports Centre or the new sports centre
Allotments and Community Orchards	SC/7	£3,900	towards the improvement of the allotments and community orchards
Indoor Community Space	SC/6	£11,079.12	towards improvements to the community space
Green Infrastructure	NH/6	£18,096	towards the creation of new green infrastructure
Burial Provision	SC/4	£8,190	towards the provision of additional burial provision
Indoor Sports	SC/4	£9,178	towards improving indoor sports provision
Swimming	SC/4	£10,226	towards improving swimming provision

The total contribution of £85,072.45 equates to £2,181.34 per dwelling.

However, all of the above contributions are deemed necessary for the development to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which enable and support healthy lifestyles through the provision of safe and accessible green infrastructure, sports facilities, allotments etc.

The Council does not accept that the sums sought do not meet the CIL tests. On the basis that the CIL tests are met, the Inspector will be invited to dismiss the proposal on the grounds that it would create an unsustainable form of development, contrary to the development plan.

As we have been unable to reach a consensus on such matters a full and detailed CIL compliance statement, elaborating on the Section 106 consultation response, will be prepared accordingly.

The above reason for refusal should subsequently be amended to read as follows (changes set out in red):

-

The proposed development, by reason of the potential lack of developer contributions towards open **space including allotments and community orchards, indoor sports** and burial sites, is not considered to sufficiently mitigate the impact of the development upon local infrastructure. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies SC/7, **SC/4** and TI/8 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 which seeks to ensure adequate infrastructure to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

Thanks

Kind Regards

**Karen Pell-Coggins** | Senior Planning Officer



**GREATER CAMBRIDGE**  
SHARED PLANNING

t: 07704 018456 | e: [karen.pell-coggins@greatercambridgeplanning.org](mailto:karen.pell-coggins@greatercambridgeplanning.org)  
<https://www.scambs.gov.uk/planning/>  
<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/planning>

Greater Cambridge Shared Planning: a strategic partnership between Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils