

## SCDC Delegation meeting 9 February 2026

### Agenda

- Time: 11am to 12:30pm
- Meeting held: via Teams 22

#### Attendees:

Anna Bradnam (Chair of Planning Committee), Cllr Peter Fane (Vice Chair of Planning Committee), Rebecca Smith (Delivery Manager) Luke Waddington

Main issues to consider:

- Relevant material planning considerations raising significant planning concerns
- Significant implications for adopted policy
- The nature, scale and complexity of the proposed development
- Planning history
- Degree of public involvement

### Development

25/04934/REM

Land parcel known as parcel 2.2A West Cambourne

Approval of reserved matters and discharge of planning conditions (5,8,16,20,21,22,23,25,27,28,29,32), and partial discharge of planning conditions (15 & 17) for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale following outline planning permission S/2903/14/OL, for 86 dwellings, including affordable housing, associated hard and soft landscaping and all ancillary works. (Note: Environmental Impact Assessment submitted under outline S/2903/14/OL)

### Reason for Inclusion

Town Council request

The application removes the commercial and affordable housing units from this land parcel (2.2A) for development later (with no indication of when it will be delivered?)

The phasing plan clearly shows that the commercial element is part of this land parcel as approved in the development phasing plan. The original planning application for the 2350 had an affordable housing delivery of 30% due to obligations for infrastructure which is now not being delivered which was already reduced from the required 40% due to viability. Leaving the commercial element out of the scheme and developing this parcel remotely of adjacent parcels leads to the creation of a community which is remote from the main built form, without facilities and isolated from the remaining community of Cambourne.

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

It is not in the spirit of the development; the Town Council has experience of the High Street and how difficult the delivery of that area has been.

The Town Council requests this application is reviewed by the planning committee so that residents and councillors can voice their concerns regarding delayed infrastructure.

## Discussion

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

The application is a reserved matters application for 86 dwellings.

The importance of the commercial element at parcel 2.2A is noted, with reference to the Design Code showing the provision of commercial space towards the southwest corner of the site. However, the area that would provide commercial units (with residential above) is not part of the current reserved matters application being outside of the red line boundary. Officers expect a separate application to come forward for the commercial area; there is no requirement for developer to bring the commercial area forward as part of parcel 2.2A in a single application. It was noted that officers are engaging with the developer in pre-applications discussions on the delivery of the commercial area.

The importance of delivering commercial units is noted, but it is not the subject of reserved matters application 25/04934/REM.

The application proposes the provision of 30% affordable housing within the application boundary, as required by Outline S106.

The density is in accordance with Design Code.

Other comments from Cambourne Town Council are noted and officers are working through points on drainage, ecology, design refinements, amenity and parking with developer prior to determination, with amendments (and re-consultation) anticipated.

### 2. Significant implications for adopted policy

None

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

The application is a major residential development in Cambourne West for parcel 2.2A and the erection of 86 dwellings (and associated works), but not one that presents complex planning issues, being a reserved matters parcel for a wider outline planning consent.

#### 4. Planning history

No relevant site-specific history, aside from outline consent.

Acknowledgement to wider Cambourne planning history and slow delivery of infrastructure / facilities.

#### 5. Degree of public involvement

No third-party comments

#### Conclusion

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, no relevant planning history, or any significant degree of public interest.

#### **Decision**

Do not refer to Planning Committee

## Development

25/04863/FUL

Land adjacent to SpringHouse, Church lane Sawston

Erection of a single self-build dwelling and associated infrastructure and works

## Reason for Inclusion

At least 5 objections - principle- green belt, conservation area, setting of listed building, historic park and garden, planning history of the site- dismissed appeal character- scale, form, materials, landscaping, neighbour amenity- noise

## Discussion

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

The planning application is a full planning application for the erection of a self-build dwelling. The site is outside of the development framework boundary, in the Green Belt and comprises an area of grassed paddock, but adjacent to existing residential development.

There is relevant planning history on the site for the development of a residential property and previously refused / withdrawn schemes (noted below), noting the recurring theme of inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

However, NPPF (2024) has since introduced 'Grey Belt' under paragraph 155; officers consider the development would meet the definition / requirements of para.155.

Further ecology and highway information has been provided to address technical concerns raised.

### 2. Significant implications for adopted policy

No significant implications given the introduction of Grey Belt under para.155 of the BPP, but site constraints including Green Belt, heritage assets and protected trees are noted.

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

Minor scheme for the erection of a single storey detached self-build property. Several constraints on / around the site, including being outside the development framework boundary, Green Belt, heritage assets, protected trees (TPOs), SSSI.

#### 4. Planning history

A previous application for the erection of a single self-build dwelling and associated infrastructure and works was withdrawn in April 2024 (ref. 24/00456/FUL)

An application from 2016, for a detached dwelling (ref. S/0487/16/FL) was refused on the grounds of inappropriate development in the Green Belt, heritage impact, important countryside frontage impact, and dismissed at appeal (although Green Belt only reason upheld)

An application from 2015, for a dwelling and detached garage (ref. S/0458/15/FL) was refused in April 2015 on the grounds of inappropriate development in the Green Belt, heritage impact, important countryside frontage impact.

NPPF para.155 and the introduction of Grey Belt has created a change in policy position to that previously considered under the key planning history noted above.

#### 5. Degree of public involvement

There have been 7 comments from third parties, all in objection, raising concerns relating to Green Belt (& Grey Belt), design, heritage, amenity/noise impacts. The Parish Council support the principle but raise design concerns.

#### Conclusion

Overall, following discussion, it was considered that given the constraints of the site and in particular its position within the Green Belt, the relevant planning history for residential development, and the level of local concerns, there are material considerations that would warrant the Committee's consideration of the application.

However, in itself the complexity of the proposed development was not considered to be significant (being a single dwelling), nor were there considered to be any implications for policy.

#### **Decision**

Refer to Planning Committee