

Delegation meeting 2nd June 2026

Delegation Panel meeting - Minutes

- Date: 2nd June 2026
- Time: 11am to 12:30pm
- Meeting held: via Teams

Attendees: Cllr Anna Bradnam (Chair of Planning Committee), Cllr James Rixon (Vice Chair of Planning Committee), Rebecca Smith (Delivery Manager), Dominic Bush (Senior Planning Officer), Charlotte Peet (Senior Planning Officer), Phoebe Carter (Senior Planning Officer), and Dean Scriver (Principal Planning Officer).

Apologies: -

Minutes approved by date: Cllr Anna Bradnam 05.06.2026

26/00612/FUL training centre Aerodrome Service Station 38 Royston Road Duxford

Installation of two jet washes and associated works.

Reason for Inclusion

The application has more than 5 objections from residents.

Called in by ward cllr

Discussion

Cllr Richard Williams attended the meeting and summarised his concerns relating to highway safety and parking, along with residential amenity impacts in particular noise.

1. Relevant material planning considerations raising significant planning concerns.

The application is full planning application for the installation of two jet washes, along with other associated works, within existing car parking bays on the site. The site is adjacent to residential properties to the north and east, with access from the A505, and the aerodrome to the south. In 2024 planning permission was granted for the redevelopment of the site for its existing use, as part of this original application jet washes were proposed however were removed from the proposal during the assessment of the application because of concerns over residential amenity impacts, resulting from the noise impact assessment submitted. Objections have been received

from the Environmental Health Officer and the Local Highways authority on significant planning issues of highways safety, residential amenity, loss of parking, noise impacts. These are considered to be significant concerns relating to material planning considerations and are considered to raise sufficient concern to warrant a committee determination, if the proposal is recommended for approval.

2. Significant implications for adopted policy.

The concerns raised regarding highways safety and potential impacts on residential amenity would raise policy implications.

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.

It was noted that as part of the redevelopment of the site the proposed jet washes were removed following concerns regarding residential amenity.

5. Degree of public involvement.

10 objections have been received from third parties locally raising concerns amongst others regarding the highway safety, loss of car parking, water scarcity / run off and noise impacts. Objections have also been received from the Parish Council also raising concerns regarding impacts on residential amenity and the loss of car parking.

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 if the proposal were to be recommended for approval, and the level of public involvement was considered to be significant. If recommended for approval there were considered to be implications for policy and relevant planning history on the site.

Decision

Refer to planning committee if recommendation is for approval.

26/00698/FUL Brooklands farm Caxton End Bourn

Change of use to residential, conversion and alteration of existing buildings (including partial demolition) to form 5 dwellings, provision of garden, parking and bin storage areas

Reason for Inclusion

The application has more than 5 objections

Discussion

1. Relevant material planning considerations raising significant planning concerns.

The application is a full planning application for conversion / alteration (including partial demolition) of existing buildings to form 5 dwellings. The site is outside of the development framework, with the conservation area boundary to the south of the site. No objections have been received from technical consultees. The existing business use ceased operation a number of years ago, and this application follows two previously withdrawn applications and a refused application for a larger number of units. The previous reasons for refusal related to access, amenity and flood risk. Principle of development, character, amenity, highway safety, flooding, ecology and sustainability issues are considered to be the main material planning considerations; considering the amended proposal 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.

This application follows two previously withdrawn applications and a refused application for a larger number of units. The previous reasons for refusal related to access, amenity and flood risk. The access has been amended, a flood risk assessment submitted and the number of units reduced. There have been no objections from technical consultees.

5. Degree of public involvement.

5 objections have been received from third parties locally raising concerns mainly relating to character, heritage impacts, density, highway safety / access . parking, amenity and flooding. An objection has also been received from the Parish Council on the grounds of the loss of employment, housing density and unsustainable location.

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 but it was not considered sufficient to warrant committee consideration.

Decision

Do not refer to planning committee.

24/03808/OUT land to the rear of 29 Schole Road Willingham

Outline application for the erection of up to 4 no. self build/custom build dwellings with all matters reserved

Reason for Inclusion

Parish referral

Willingham Parish Council recommend refusal of the application.

The Council would reiterate its previous objections being:-

- The development is well outside the village envelope
- Access to the development is via a bridleway and unfinished road
- The development would be back land development
- The development would intrude into open countryside.

The Council would further add:-

- The Parish Council were not aware of the need for any more self-build properties in the village
- It was disingenuous of the Planning Statement to refer to other developments in the village
- If the application was to be approved, it would be difficult to prevent other developments on Schole Road extending further back into the open Countryside
- The Parish Council noted the mis-quoted comments from the ecology officer reports within the addendum.

The Parish Council would further re-iterate, if the officer was minded to approve the application, that it is referred to the Planning Committee.

Discussion

Cllr James Hutchcraft submitted a statement to the panel to be considered as part of their discussion supporting the recommendation made by the parish council, and raising the following concerns

- **Opposition to development outside the village boundary:** The proposal is strongly opposed as it lies outside the settlement envelope, risking long-term

harm to the village's rural character, ecological value, and sustainability, while setting a precedent for further expansion.

- **Concerns about backland development impacts:** Issues include poor and potentially unsafe access (via a bridleway/unfinished road), negative effects on neighbouring properties (privacy loss, overbearing presence), and increased flood risk due to loss of permeable land.
- **“self-build” justification:** The inclusion of “self-build” is seen as a tactic to gain approval without real evidence of local need, with similar past applications showing minimal changes apart from this label.

1. Relevant material planning considerations raising significant planning concerns.

The application is an outline planning application for up to 4 self / custom build properties with all matters reserved in the curtilage of the existing residential dwelling at 29 Schole Road. The site is outside of, but adjacent to, the development framework boundary, it is accessed via Schole Road which is a single track public bridleway. Planning permission has recently been granted on the adjacent site for 8 residential dwellings fronting Schole Road. The site lies outside of floodzone 2 and 3, with a small section lying within surface water flooding 1:1000.

No objections have been received from drainage, environmental health, the LHA, Ramblers Association nor Definitive Maps Team. Other technical consultees have requested some additional information / conditions. 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, the site is located outside of the development framework, but there is an identified self build need.

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.

The Parish Council have objected to the proposal, supported by the ward cllr, together with one letter of support received from third parties.,

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 but it was not considered sufficient to warrant committee consideration.

Decision

Do not refer to planning committee.

25/04556/FUL land at station Road Willingham

Change of use of land for the stationing of caravans for residential purposes, and the erection of dayrooms and laying of hardstanding ancillary to that use.

Reason for Inclusion

Number of representations received

Parish referral

Willingham Parish Council recommend refusal of the application and reiterate the comments previously raised. The Parish Council raise the following additional points:-

The Parish Council had received data evidence that traffic frequently proceeds at speeds in considerable excess of 30 MPH on Station Road. The Council were therefore concerned for the safety of additional traffic which turned in and out of the site. (see attached document)

The Parish Council were concerned regarding the impact on the view of the village the proposal would have, for those travelling through the village.

The proposal reduces the definitive 'gap' between Longstanton/Northstowe/Willingham, which was something the Parish Council were keen to retain.

The Parish Council had concerns that the proposed site could be detrimental to local amenities.

The application provided little to no consideration to pedestrians and cyclists who frequently use the pathways at the entrance to the proposal site. The Council were aware that this pathway was frequently used by a number of children to get to various schools.

The Parish Council were aware of the possibility of an alternative access to the site and question whether this would be more appropriate.

Should the officer be minded to approve the application, the Council would request that it is considered by the Committee

Discussion

Cllr James Hutchcraft submitted a statement to the panel to be considered as part of their discussion supporting the recommendation made by the parish council, and raising the following concerns

- **Strong opposition and concerns over use:** The application is opposed by the Parish Council due to doubts it is for genuine personal residential use, with

suspicion it may be a commercial operation lacking sufficient justification or evidence of need.

- **Planning policy and location issues:** The site lies outside the village boundary and within an important green gap between settlements, with concerns about countryside encroachment, visual harm, and lack of demonstrated need given existing sites nearby.
- **Safety, infrastructure, and community impact concerns:** Significant issues include highway safety risks (speeding traffic, vulnerable pedestrians and cyclists), inaccuracies in the application suggesting possible overdevelopment, pressure on local services, and strong local resident opposition

1. Relevant material planning considerations raising significant planning concerns.

The application is an full planning application for the change of use for residential purposes, stationing of caravans and erection of dayrooms with ancillary associated works. The site lies outside of the development framework, with open agricultural fields to the rear. There are outbuildings currently located to the front of the site. The application proposes 2 mobile homes, 2 day rooms and siting of 2 touring caravans. No objections have been received from any technical consultees

Given the nature of this application, if recommended for approval there are considered to be material planning considerations that raise sufficient concerns to warrant a committee determination.

2. Significant implications for adopted policy.

The material considerations raised by the local ward member and the parish council would raise policy implications.

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.

The Parish Council have objected to the proposal, supported by the ward cllr, together with 103 comments from 79 third parties raising objections to the proposal.

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 if the proposal were to be recommended for approval, and the level of public involvement was considered to be significant. If recommended for approval there were considered to be implications for policy.

Decision

Refer to planning committee if recommended for approval.

26/01620/FUL - Former Practice Ground of Girton Golf Club Oakington Road

Erection of 15 No. affordable dwellings comprising 6 No. 2 bed two-storey dwellings, 4 No. 1-bed two-storey dwellings, 1 No. 3-bed two-storey dwelling, and 4 No. 2-bed bungalows with associated public open space provision, landscaping, accesses to Oakington Road and associated works.

Reason for Inclusion

Number of objections received

Ward Cllr call in

Discussion

Cllr Richard Stobart attended the meeting and submitted a statement raising the following concerns

- Support for affordable housing but concerns over site suitability: While the proposal meets a clear local need for smaller, affordable homes, the chosen site raises significant concerns.
- Flood risk issues: The location near Beck Brook has a history of flooding, and the development may increase risk by reducing natural drainage, requiring more detailed assessment of impacts on surrounding areas.
- Road safety and access challenges: The site connects to a dangerous stretch of road with poor visibility, speeding traffic, limited pedestrian crossing options, and congestion near a school, raising serious safety concerns for vehicles and vulnerable users

1. Relevant material planning considerations raising significant planning concerns.

The application is a full planning application for 15 affordable dwellings together with associated public open space and landscaping on the northern side of Girton. The site is outside of the development framework boundary, in the green belt, but adjacent to a rural exceptions site. The main material considerations highlighted were the principle of development (rural exception site), green belt, character and appearance, flood risk, highway safety, parking provision, biodiversity and impact on residential amenity.

Technical consultees have raised some concerns regarding the lack of pedestrian movement to Girton, flood risk, lack of tracking information for refuse vehicles, ecological information needed and design. Given the nature of this application there are considered to be material planning considerations that raise sufficient concerns to warrant a committee determination.

2. Significant implications for adopted policy.

The site is located outside of the development framework, in the green belt, but the proposal is for rural exception site.

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

The site is located outside of the development framework, in the green belt, but the proposal is for rural exception site and as such is considered to be sufficiently complex to warrant a committee decision.

4. Planning history.

None relevant to the proposed development.

5. Degree of public involvement.

The Parish Council have objected to the proposal, supported by the ward cllr, together with 13 letter of objection received from third parties.,

Overall, following discussion, material considerations were considered to have arisen that would give rise to significant planning concerns warranting the committee's consideration, and there may be implications for policy. The complexity of the proposed development was considered to be significant.; and it was acknowledged that there was a significant level of local concern sufficient to warrant committee consideration.

Decision

Refer to planning committee.

26/00451/S73 - Church Lane, Little Abington

Vary the approved plans and boundary treatments

Reason for Inclusion

Number of objections received

Discussion

Cllr Henry Batchelor submitted comments stating:

I do have some sympathy with the request to go to committee. The original application was decided at committee and subsequently approved at appeal. The changes being asked for are contrary to that appeal decision so I'd be inclined to support the request to refer to committee, if the officers recommendation is to approve.

1. Relevant material planning considerations raising significant planning concerns.

The application is a s73 application to vary boundary treatments to plots, along with some minor fenestration changes and internal layout changes. The amendments propose the relocation of a parking space for plot 6, adding some low railings to stop cars parking on grass verges, fenestration changes and reinstatement of landscaping on the eastern boundary. The parent planning permission was granted on appeal in 2023 following a committee refusal.

No objections have been received from technical consultees; given the minor nature of this application there are not considered to be any 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.

The parent planning permission was granted on appeal in 2023 following a committee refusal.

5. Degree of public involvement.

No comments have been received from the parish council , 5 letters of objection have been received from 4 third parties.

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 and it was not considered sufficient to warrant committee consideration.

Decision

Do not refer to planning committee.

25/04728/FUL Former Comfort Café Fourwentways Roundabout, Newmarket Road Little Abington

Demolition of existing buildings/hardstanding and erection of commercial building

Reason for Inclusion

Officer referral - The application is a departure from the Local Plan, however technically it falls under Policy NH/9 (redevelopment of previously developed land) and it is Green Belt by definition

Discussion

Cllr Henry Batchelor submitted comments stating:

I don't have any reason to ask for this to be referred to the committee, I'd be content with an officer decision on this one.

1. Relevant material planning considerations raising significant planning concerns.

The application is a full application for the demolition of the existing buildings and hardstanding and erection of a new commercial building. The site is located outside of the development framework in the green belt. The existing buildings on site was last used in 2011, the application proposes redevelopment of the site for a flexible mixed use comprising of class E uses and some B8. There is mature landscaping around the perimeter of the site, with new planting proposed and an external amenity area. The access is proposed to be widened, and shows sufficient space / width for vehicle tracking, including HGVs.

No objections have been received from technical consultees; given the nature of this application there are not considered to be any 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.

5. Degree of public involvement.

No comments have been received from the parish council , no letters of objection have been received from third parties.

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 no local concern sufficient to warrant committee consideration.

Decision

Do not refer to planning committee.