

# Delegation meeting 16<sup>th</sup> June 2026

## Delegation Panel meeting - Minutes

- Date: 16th 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), Laurence Moore (Senior Planning Officer).

**Apologies:** -

**Minutes approved by date:** Cllr Anna Bradnam (Chair of Planning Committee)  
26.06.2026

## 26/01516/FUL – Land North of 61 Church Street Gamlingay

*Demolition of existing barn and the erection of a dwelling, conversion and extension of barn to form a dwelling, and associated landscaping and access works.*

### Reason for Inclusion

The application has more than 5 objections from residents.

Requested by ward cllr – level of public interest

### Discussion

1. Relevant material planning considerations raising significant planning concerns.

The application is full planning application for the demolition of an existing barn, and erection of a new dwelling along with the conversion of another barn on the site to a residential dwelling. The application site is situated to the rear of Church Farmhouse (61 Church Street). Church Farmhouse is listed at grade II and is of 16th century origins with later additions. One of the barns to the rear is considered curtilage listed and this has planning permission for conversion into a dwelling.

The site is within the Gamlingay Conservation Area and on edge of the village and within the Development Framework

In 2024 planning permission was refused for a similar proposal on a number of grounds including harm to the listed building / conservation area, lack of intervisibility splays, amenity impacts on neighbouring properties and non compliance with GAM 8 of the neighbourhood plan. The scheme has been amended since this decision to reduce the

amount of hardstanding, and a swept path analysis has been provided to demonstrate a car entering and exiting the site. The application also proposes to widen the footpath on either side of the access in Church Street to achieve the required intervisibility splays. Objections have been received from the Conservation officer, and Ecology officer, but no objections have been raised by any other consultees, including the local highways authority.

There are considered to be concerns relating to material planning considerations including harm to listed building and impact on amenity of neighbours, but 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 previous planning application and reasons for refusal were noted.

## 5. Degree of public involvement.

12 objections have been received from third parties locally raising concerns amongst others regarding the loss of available on street parking (as a result of widening the footpath), highway safety concerns, impact on amenity of neighbours, impact of the listed buildings, construction impacts and lack of detailed refuse collection arrangements. No recommendation has been made by the parish council however they have raised comments regarding the neighbour comments received, concerns about highways safety and supporting the conservation officer comments. The Parish Council also note that the revisions to the scheme have improved the massing, request a TPO on the site and also GAM8 contributions to improve active travel.

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.

## **26/01222/OUT Land To The East Of 11 The Drift Little Gransden**

*Outline Application for the Erection of 1no Self-Build dwelling with all matters reserved except access.*

### **Reason for Inclusion**

The application has more than 5 objections

### **Discussion**

1. Relevant material planning considerations raising significant planning concerns.

The application is an outline planning application for 1 self build property with all matters reserved except for access. The site is outside of, but adjacent to, the development framework boundary, it is accessed via The Drift which is a private road. The site lies within flood zone 1, and is identified as in an area of very low surface water risk.

No technical consultees have objected to the proposal, subject to the imposition of some conditions / informatives. 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.

The permission in principle previously granted on the site for 2 self build dwellings was noted.

5. Degree of public involvement.

5 objections have been received from third parties, all relating to drainage concerns. The drainage officer has not raised any objections, and supports the proposal subject to a number of conditions.

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.