

# Delegation meeting 21st April 2026

## Delegation Panel meeting - Minutes

- Date: 21 April 2026
- Time: 11am to 12:30pm
- Meeting held: via Teams

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

**Apologies:** -

**Minutes approved by date:** Cllr Anna Bradnam (Chair of Planning Committee)  
22.04.2026

## 26/00415/OUT - Land off Horseheath Road Linton

*Outline application for the development of up to 100 residential dwellings along with associated infrastructure including provision of new site access, internal access roads, parking, drainage, public open space, landscaping and biodiversity enhancements and other associated works with all matters reserved except for the primary point of access onto Horseheath Road.*

### Reason for Inclusion

Parish Council request

*Linton Parish Council have objected to the application, on the following basis (summarised):*

- *outside the settlement boundary, detached from development along Horseheath Road*
- *village is minor rural centre and infrastructure cannot cope*
- *surface water flooding risk (following flood event July 2021)*
- *landscape impacts (HEELA)*
- *traffic impacts and monitoring methodology and rat running likley*
- *separate from village services and amenities*
- *water supply is inadequate*

Application has also received objections from third parties.

## Discussion

Cllr Henry Batchelor -

I'd like to support the request for the Linton item to be referred to the planning committee but only if the officer recommendation is to approve. If it's to refuse then I'd be content for the decision to be delegated to officers.

Cllr John Batchelor - I agree with the Linton Parish Councils argument for refusal. On the question of going to committee, it is clear that the developer is anticipating a refusal and will appeal the decision, I suspect the main grounds for appeal will be a challenge to our 5 year land supply figure. It may strengthen our hand at appeal for the application to have been through committee. I am happy to be guided by the officer view on this.

### 1. Relevant material planning considerations raising significant planning concerns.

The application is an outline planning application for up to 100 residential dwellings, with all matters reserved except for the primary point of access. The site is outside of the development framework boundary. The site is adjacent to residential properties located to the west of the site, a development that was allowed on appeal at a point when South Cambs was unable to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply. Access is proposed for Horseheath Road. The principle of development, drainage, surface water flooding, landscape character impacts, settlement hierarchy and highways impacts are considered to be the main material planning considerations; given the nature of this outline application they are considered to raise sufficient concern to warrant a committee determination.

### 2. Significant implications for adopted policy.

The site is located outside of the development framework, and up to 100 residential units are proposed. The development frameworks define where policies for the built-up areas of settlements give way to policies for the countryside. This is necessary to ensure that the countryside is protected from gradual encroachment on the edges of villages and to help guard against incremental growth in unsustainable locations. As such Policy S/7 of the Local Plan is considered significant in determining this proposal.

### 3. The nature, scale and complexity of the proposed development.

The nature, scale and complexity of the proposed development is significant outside of the development framework adjacent to a minor rural centre.

#### 4. Planning history.

No relevant planning history on the site, however it was noted that the residential development to the west of the site was outside of the development framework but approved on appeal, at a time when the council was unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply.

#### 5. Degree of public involvement.

16 objections have been received from third parties locally raising concerns amongst others regarding the principle of development, lack of facilities / services in Linton, highways concerns, character and appearance, ecology / biodiversity / tree impacts, flood risk, loss of agricultural land, archaeological impact and heritage impacts.

Overall, following discussion, a number of material considerations were considered to have arisen that would give rise to significant planning concerns warranting the committee's consideration, and the complexity of the proposed development was also considered to be significant. There were considered to be implications for policy and relevant planning history on the adjacent site; and although it was acknowledged that there was a level of local concern it was considered the matters raised by the objectors and the Parish Council were considered material to a committee consideration.

## **Decision**

Refer to planning committee.

## **25/04867/TDC – 10B Church Street Gt Shelford**

*Technical Details Consent for the erection of 1 dwelling pursuant to the grant of Permission in Principle under 24/00513/PIP*

### **Reason for Inclusion**

The application has more than 5 objections

### **Discussion**

1. Relevant material planning considerations raising significant planning concerns.

The application is a technical details application for a single storey dwelling, following the granting of permission in principle at appeal. The use, amount and location of the development has already been approved, this application relate to the technical details of the proposal – such as design. The proposal incorporates cycle and bin storage but no cycle parking, meets technical space standards for internal spaces and incorporates external amenity space. The materials proposed have been amended following comments from the conservation officer.

No objections have been received from technical consultees. Design, character, amenity, highways and parking and flooding, biodiversity and sustainability are considered to be the main material planning considerations; given the nature of this technical details application they are not considered to raise sufficient concern to warrant a committee determination.

2. Significant implications for adopted policy.

No significant implications noted.

3. The nature, scale and complexity of the proposed development.

The nature and complexity of the proposed development is not in itself significant.

4. Planning history.

The permission in principle already granted on the site for 1 residential dwelling was considered relevant.

5. Degree of public involvement.

10 objections have been received from third parties locally raising concerns mainly relating to the principle of the development, rather than relating to the technical details proposed. However some concerns were raised relating to visual impact / character, amenity, landscape design and standard of amenity space.

Overall, following discussion, no material considerations were considered to have arisen that would give rise to significant planning concerns warranting the committee's consideration, and the complexity of the proposed development was not considered to be significant. There were no implications for policy; and although it was acknowledged that there was a level of local concern it was not considered sufficient to warrant committee consideration.

## **Decision**

Do not refer to planning committee.

## **26/00951/FUL – Former Hypro Building Station Road Longstanton**

*Demolition of existing buildings, construction of new Class E retail foodstore, creation of new vehicular and pedestrian access, blocking up of existing access, formation of car park, new footpath and linkages, hard and soft landscaping, and all associated works.*

### **Reason for Inclusion**

Officer referral

Application is a major development within a strategic site allocation

### **Discussion**

Cllr Natalie Warren-Green - DO NOT REFER to planning committee.

1. Relevant material planning considerations raising significant planning concerns.

The application is for demolition of an existing Class E building and erection of a new class E retail foodstore. The site is surrounded by residential development forming part of Northstowe strategic allocation, as well as the new community building to the south east. The access into the site is proposed to be amended, and existing hedgerows removed. New landscaping is proposed through the site, with car parking in the centre of the site (incorporating EV charging) along with cycle parking and a pedestrian footpath through to Northstowe parcel 3b.

No objections have been received from archaeology, waste, sustainability, environmental health, the Environment Agency nor Anglian Water. Other technical consultees have requested some additional information, in relation to landscaping, ecology, highways and design. Given the nature of this application there are not considered to be material planning considerations that raise sufficient concerns to warrant a committee determination.

2. Significant implications for adopted policy.

No significant implications noted.

3. The nature, scale and complexity of the proposed development.

The nature and complexity of the proposed development is not in itself significant.

4. Planning history.

None relevant to the proposed development.

#### 5. Degree of public involvement.

Northstowe Town Council have commented in support of the proposal; 34 comments in support have also been received from third parties, only 2 objections have been received,

Overall, following discussion, no material considerations were considered to have arisen that would give rise to significant planning concerns warranting the committee's consideration, and the complexity of the proposed development was not considered to be significant. There were no implications for policy; and it was acknowledged that there was a low level of local concern it was not considered sufficient to warrant committee consideration.

### **Decision**

Do not refer to planning committee.