Parish Council Meeting Minutes

Great & Little Chishill Parish Council
Meeting Minutes, 20th August 2026

Present: Cllr Simon Dring (Vice Chair), Cllr John Ridge, Cllr Suzanne Fowler
Members of the public: 27 residents of Great Chishill
Minutes: A Lorenz, Parish Clerk

Meeting started: 19.35
Meeting ended: 20.05

Meeting Agenda

1	**19.30**	**Apologies for Absence**
2	**19:32**	**To receive any declaration of pecuniary and non-pecuniary interest of Councillors**
3	**19:35**	**Public Participation** *To allow up to 10 minutes for any members of the public and Councillors declaring a pecuniary and non-pecuniary interest to address the meeting in relation to the business to be transacted at that meeting*
4	**19:45**	**Planning Application [26/02626/OUT] – To consider and agree the parish council's consultee comment**

DRAFT

1 Apologies for Absence

Cllr Charles Hall, Cllr Jenny Isted

In the absence of Cllr Hall (Council Chair), Cllr Dring chaired the meeting in his capacity as Vice Chair of the Parish Council.

2 To receive any Declaration of pecuniary and non-pecuniary Interest of Councillors

None received.

>> The Clerk clarified that none of the councillors present are directly impacted by the planning application on the agenda. They are acting as parish representatives in this matter, not in a personal capacity.

3 Public Participation

Several speakers shared their concerns regarding the negative impact of the proposed development with fellow parishioners. The following points were raised with regard to 26/02626/OUT:

Parish Council Meeting Minutes

1. Negative impact of 8 large dwellings with potentially several cars per household on Hall Lane. The road is a village 'hotspot' with regard to speeding and safety; additional car traffic will exacerbate the situation.
2. Adverse effect on surface water management, especially given that the existing culvert taking water away from land off Hall Lane towards the bottom of May Street is already prone to flooding during periods of heavy rainfall.
3. Existing sewage infrastructure may not be able to cope with the output from 8 large dwellings.
4. Adverse effect on wildlife and biodiversity in Great Chishill.
5. The proposed dwellings (4-5 bedrooms houses) contradict feedback from a local consultation conducted for the near-identical predecessor application. Parishioner responses had indicated a strong preference for mixed development with significant opportunity for downsizing as a precondition for considering the scenario of local development at all.

Parishioners also expressed frustration with the consultation process:

- the planning process was asking them to re-iterate local opposition to a previously denied and substantially unchanged application;
- the timing of 20/02626/OUT diminished opportunity for local input (school holidays, short comment deadline, periodic unavailability of the planning website).

Several parishioners wondered whether there were connections to a larger South Cambridgeshire District drive for more housing.

>> Cllr Dring reported to the meeting that District Councillor James Hobro had outlined the District strategy for housing development to the May 2026 Annual Meeting of the Parish. Housing development is to be focussed on development at larger sites such as Northstowe and close to the A505; there is no District provision that promotes development in small rural communities in the South of the County.

>> The Clerk offered to collect and forward public comments on the planning application to the pertinent case officer, in case any parishioners experienced difficulties in accessing the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning website. Emails to be sent to the Clerk by lunchtime on Friday 21st August.

Cllr Dring asked for an informal show of hands to gauge whether there was any support for 26/02626/OUT among the 27 members of the public attending the meeting. All attendees were opposed to the planning application.

Cllr Dring formally closed the public participation after this.

DRAFT

Parish Council Meeting Minutes

4 Planning Application [26/02626/OUT] – To consider and agree the parish council's consultee comment.

The parish council resolved to adopt the following **consultee comment** on application 26/02626/OUT [to be submitted by the Clerk on the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning after the end of the meeting]:

Great & Little Chishill Parish Council objects to planning application **26/02626/OUT**

The Parish Council has carefully compared application 26/02626/OUT with the 2024 predecessor application 24/04191/OUT for the same site, which was refused at District level and denied on appeal.

Overall, the Parish Council is not persuaded that there has been any substantial change in this new planning application which warrants overriding the still-valid local objections to the proposed development.

The application also fails to fulfil the parameters of several planning policies, notably S/6, S/11, T1/1 and NH/2.

The views of village residents on application 26/02626/OUT have been taken into consideration in formulating the Parish Council consultee comment.

The Parish Council's main objections are:

1 Impact on the rural character of the village

The site targeted by application 26/02626/OUT is a meadow which has been in agricultural use for a very long time. As a piece of countryside within the village (but outside the village planning envelope) it is valued by local residents for its rich wildlife and its tranquil visual aspect. Local opposition to the loss of this cherished grazed meadow remains strong.

In the **Planning Statement** the applicant argues that Policy **S/11** permits developments of up to 8 dwellings on rural sites. This only applies if the development were to bring discernible benefits to the village by sustainable recycling of a brownfield site.

The site is neither a brownfield site, nor are there any discernible benefits to the village of Great Chishill.

Policy **NH/2** permits development when it 'respects, retains or enhances' the character and distinctiveness of the local landscape. There is no evidence that the proposed development fits these parameters.

2 Impact on local surface water management

Displacement of water in a newly built-up area could adversely affect properties further downhill, and the road surface of Hall Lane. Water run-off from this plot drains through a culvert at the bottom of May Street, which already floods regularly during heavy rainfall, a problem which will only be exacerbated by the additional run-off caused by this development.

3 Impact on local transport

Great Chishill is short on local amenities and notoriously short on public transport options. Policy **T1/1,** which the applicant references, provides for developments to be located and designed 'to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and promote sustainable travel.' Policy **S/6** also requires development in rural areas to be consistent with the 'the level of local service provision and the quality of public transport access to Cambridge or a market town.'

Due to the poor quality of public transport, residents of Great Chishill are highly dependent on cars for accessing work, schools and shops. Infrequent bus connections to Cambridge and Saffron Walden take 1.5 hrs and 1 hr of travel respectively, and are not viable for most village residents and their school-age children. There is no bus connection to Royston at all.

Adding 8 houses with potentially 2 cars each per household to Great Chishill is not consistent with the level of local service provision in accordance with policies T1/1 and S/6.

The **Transport Statement** submitted with application 26/02626/OUT makes unrealistic claims about the percentage of journeys that could be undertaken within Great Chishill and to neighbouring villages on foot or by bicycle. The widespread absence of pavements even within the village and the nature of the countryside roads in the area (narrow, badly maintained, hilly) make walking and cycling dangerous. For the sake of personal safety, even relatively short journeys in and around Great Chishill are usually undertaken by car.

This is especially true of Hall Lane, which has neither traffic management nor street lighting in place. Mitigation at County Highways level is not a realistic prospect. Correspondence from parishioners indicates that crossing the road to the main social hub of the village, the Village Hall (site of a local nursery and many

DRAFT

community clubs) and adjacent playing field, can already be a hazardous undertaking on foot, particularly for older residents.

The **Access and Design Statement** and **Transport Statement** do not show or make reference to the access road serving the playing fields, playground and Village Hall. This creates a misleading impression of the traffic environment in which the proposed development would be situated.

The Parish Council has strong reservations about the additional load that would be placed on Hall Lane by 8 large houses generating multiple journeys per day each.

4 Lack of demonstrable need for local self-builds

The Parish Council is not persuaded by the applicant's argument that a 'need for self-builds' is so urgent that it should trump all other policy and environmental considerations.

The **Self and Custom Housebuilding Statement** claims that there are 27 registrants in SG8 on a Custom Build Homes register. This equates to less than 1 registration per village covered by the SG8 postcode and has no bearing on whether there is a demand for this specific site. No such local demand for the type of dwelling proposed has surfaced in prior consultation with local residents. The Parish Council is of the opinion that the applicant has not demonstrated any credible, data-based need.

DRAFT

These minutes have been approved as a true account of the Parish Council meeting held on 20th August 2026.

Signature: Date:

Simon Dring, Vice Chair of the Parish Council