

## SCDC Delegation meeting 5 May 2026

### Agenda

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

### Attendees:

Anna Bradnam (Chair of Planning Committee), Jane Rodens (Team Leader)  
Charlotte Spencer, Tom Chenery, Sumaya Nakamya, Melissa Reynolds, Madaline-Mihaela Ghita, Amy Stocks, Elizabeth Glover

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

### **26/00765/REM - Land off Leaden Hill Orwell**

Reserved matters application for details of the appearance, landscaping, layout, scale and associated parking and infrastructure of Plot 7 pursuant to Conditions 1 and 2 of Outline application ref: 23/02966/OUT, including details to discharge Condition 14 (Part G Water Calculation)

## Reason for Inclusion

Number of objections - The application has more than 5 objections

## Discussion

Reserved matters for plot 7 of the original all application. There is an objection from the PC (Parish Council) on the application, but they have not called it in.

Objections received on the application which include - plot passports, height of the dwelling and the impact on the trees, traffic management plan.

There are 9 plots on the site that have been approved under appeal, plot 9 has been granted reserved matters that has been approved under a delegated approval.

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

This application is for a chalet bungalow style dwelling and is going to be lower than plot 9 (as shown on the plans). The plot passports were not agreed as part of this application as they are not approved by the inspector and therefore cannot be considered as part of the application. The trees and the TMP have been considered at the outline and the custom self build has been secured under S106.

*Relevant material planning considerations raising significant planning concerns*

Design this is going to be lower than plot 9 and acceptable in the area, the other matters have been considered under the outline application or not applied because of the appeal.

*Significant implications for adopted policy*

Concerns that this is not self build as custom build has been marketed for. The Self and custom build is in the S106 which is part of the outline planning permission.

*The nature, scale and complexity of the proposed development*

This is one dwelling out of the 9 houses that have been given outline planning permission.

*Planning history*

There is an outline granted on the site for the 9 dwellings.

*Degree of public involvement*

Nothing new that has been raised from the Outline and the plot passports cannot be considered.

## Decision

Do not refer to Planning Committee

## Development

### **26/00969/TDC – Land South Of Sandfield Bungalow Fen Drayton**

Technical details consent application for erection of 2no. detached dwellings pursuant to permission in principle 25/00562/PIP

## Reason for Inclusion

Parish requested - PC is not satisfied that the planning department is following the LSA document'

## Discussion

This is for the technical details following a PIP (permission in principle) application. There are other properties in the area that have been allowed permission (next to the site).

This application is not following the LSA document, this is the TDC (Technical details consent) from a PIP application that was approved by PINS. Therefore the principle of the development has been established outside of the LSA. This is as self build was given great weight in the determination of the appeal.

The dwelling adjacent to this site, was permitted under the LSA document and used the foot print of the glass houses that have been demolished.

### Relevant material planning considerations raising significant planning concerns

Design for the application, both of the houses are going to be the same in appearance and the same as the permitted development

### Significant implications for adopted policy

Established under the appeal

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

The application is only for 2 houses

### Planning history

Been dealt with by PINS and has permission

### Degree of public involvement

Only the Parish council on the application and their concern about the LSA has been established through the principle of the development allowed by PINS

## Decision

Do not refer to Planning Committee

## Development

### **25/04859/FUL – Manor Farm Church Street Thriplow**

New potato store to serve existing Savoursmiths crisp factory along with retrospective permission for the siting of Store A approved under 24/04829/FUL along with access and associated infrastructure.

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

## Reason for Inclusion

Number of objections

the application has more than 5 objections

## Discussion

There is an email from Cllr R Williams on the application prior to the meeting, it has been read before the meeting by those involved.

The main concerns from the 19 letters of objection are Green belt, industrial intensification, residential amenity, Highway safety, ecology, and procedural issues of the application.

PC main areas of concern are, odds with the Neighbourhood plan, impact on landscape and views in the area, traffic, openness and rural character of the area, biodiversity, residential amenity, inappropriate parking, store A that has already been built and the gap between the bridleway and Store A.

Cllr R Williams, inappropriate development in the Green Belt, impact on the bridleway as well.

Confirmed by the case officer that there is a bridleway, it is in the green belt, there are some surface water flooding on the maps within the site.

Store A has been built, it was supposed to be in a different location and is not in accordance with the original plans, so it is being regularised in this plan and then a new factory being built. There are trees to be removed, but this is currently being confirmed with the agent. There is additional car parking on the site adjacent to the bridleway.

The drawings from the Parish council shows the details of the site and how close the proposal is going to be to the two villages.

### Relevant material planning considerations raising significant planning concerns

Green belt, design, highways and the impact on the public right of way. Are they able to get the lorries around the site and not use the Public Right Of Way. Amenity of the neighbouring residents in the villages (lighting) in view of the night time photo from the Parish Council. All of these issues have been raised and don't appear to be overcome or can be conditioned as part of the determination of the application.

### Significant implications for adopted policy

Green belt and intensification of the site through the additional building and how they are being relocated.

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

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

Green belt and intensification of the site through the additional building and how they are being relocated.

### Planning history

The application has not been built in accordance with the original plans. Before there was space between the building and the public right of way. Is this an agricultural building or commercial and, has this been changed by this application? it is not clear on the use of the site and the buildings.

### Degree of public involvement

19 objections have been received as well as detailed comments from the Parish council and Cllr Richard Williams letter on the application. All which raise concerns that have not been overcome and do raise concerns that should be considered at Planning committee.

## Decision

Refer to Planning Committee

## Development

### **25/05010/FUL – 40 Topper Street Orchard Park**

Change of use from 6bed HMO to large 8bed 8person HMO with a single storey rear extension.

## Reason for Inclusion

Parish requested

Orchard Park Community Council have objected on the following basis: Parking, safety and disability access; Layout, density and public health as the communal areas are too dense, the kitchen facilities are inadequate. Should the officer be minded to approve the application, the Parish Council would request the application be considered by the Planning Committee.

## Discussion

Change of use from 6 bed to 8 bed 8 person HMO, with an extension. The main concerns that have been raised are parking, disabled access, density of HMO

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

applications, public health and amenity concerns. An email from a Cllr has been sent to the case officer prior to the meeting.

The garage will be converted and cannot park a car in the left over space, the house is being reconfigured to provide 2 additional bedrooms. There are only a few external changes to the building with the extension of the dwelling, which will provide additional amenity space to the HMO.

Objection to the bike store to the front and the overhang onto the public highway, this could be a condition.

*Relevant material planning considerations raising significant planning concerns*

Principle of development there are no policies that stop HMO's in South Cambs. The design of the extension is acceptable.

There is the level of internal space that meets the licencing requirements for the bedrooms and the amenity area, there are no objections to the application from Environmental Health.

The amount of parking that is to be retained is two spaces and this is considered to be acceptable.

As it is a conversion it does not need to conform to M4(2) under the building regulations.

*Significant implications for adopted policy*

The size of the properties meets the communal space and floor space requirements

*The nature, scale and complexity of the proposed development*

Small scale of internal and external development which is considered to be acceptable in regards of the design.

*Planning history*

This is already an HMO and the site has been licensed for an HMO.

*Degree of public involvement*

The parish council and Cllr comments and concern on the application. However, all of the concerns raised can be overcome with the proposed conditions.

## Decision

Do not refer to Planning Committee

## Development

### **24/04119/OUT – Land at Avon fields Haden Way Willingham**

Outline application for up to 65-bed care home including detailed access and associated infrastructure from Haden Way with all other matters reserved.

## Reason for Inclusion

Officer referral

Parish Council have objected on the grounds the proposal is outside the development framework, would introduce precedent, the site suffers with water issues, size of development would create sewage issues, overdevelopment of the site. There are complex planning issues which relate to Anglian Water.

## Discussion

There are complex planning issues on the site and AW objections to the application because of foul water on the site and waste water recycling centre not having the capacity for this development at this time. The application site is adjacent to the development framework, but not inside it.

Concerns that this might set a precedent of development in the area and impact on the water in the area – PC comments.

Neighbour two objections to the application – traffic and use of the road and the use of the access.

The application is for a specialist care home dementia and could be for other conditions that need a care home. There is a need for this facility, this is the first proposed in the area.

The built form would be on the edges of the areas that are at a risk of flood. LLFA do not have an objection to the application and have recommended conditions in regards of surface water and drainage.

Anglian Water has an objection to the application, but we have a condition for the review of headroom in the infrastructure and when the application comes forward then the infrastructure can be provided and it is up to the developer to check it.

Local Highways Authority have no objection to the application.

### *Relevant material planning considerations raising significant planning concerns*

This is outside of the development framework, however it is considered that there is a need for this development. This is an outline application with all matters reserved and the detail would be required in any future planning application, including the areas that have raised more concern:

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

- Access
- The number of residents at the site and the staff to look after them
- Design
- Built form and how this is to be impacted on by drainage (surface water and foul)
- Landscaping.

*Significant implications for adopted policy*

This is outside of the development framework, however, it is not considered to be a significant concern as there is a demonstrated need for the proposal. The numbers of beds and the type of care is to be considered as part of future reserved matters applications.

*The nature, scale and complexity of the proposed development*

This is an outline application with all matters reserved. Only the principle of the development can be considered in this application.

*Planning history*

None on this site.

*Degree of public involvement*

Minimal on the application and the concerns that have been raised would be considered at the Reserved matters applications.

## Decision

Do not refer to Planning Committee

## Development

**25/03926/FUL – Waterbeach barracks proposed development Denny End Road**

## Reason for Inclusion

Parish objection

Waterbeach parish council did not explicitly request the item to be determined by planning committee, and no comments have been received on the more recent amendment package despite re-consultation.

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

## Discussion

Cllr Bradnam is the ward Cllr of the area and a County Councillor.

Originally there were objections from Local Highways Authority, landscape and others, there is a Planning Performance Agreement on the site. The applicant has amended the scheme and the application, which has removed all of the objections to the application subject to conditions in some cases.

However, the PC did not comment again on the application, their comments are considered to have been overcome with the new information and the conditions that are being recommended.

### Relevant material planning considerations raising significant planning concerns

The principle was part of an outline application and this full application is providing the detail of the proposal.

### Significant implications for adopted policy

This is an allocated site and the roundabout is needed.

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

LHA are ok with the site and the proposed roundabout.

### Planning history

Not applicable on this site

### Degree of public involvement

Only the parish council, there are three public comments on the application, all of which have been overcome with the amended information to the application and the recommended conditions from the consultees.

## Decision

Do not refer to Planning Committee

## Development

### **25/03927/LBC – Waterbeach Barracks proposed development Denny End Road**

## Reason for Inclusion

Parish objection

Waterbeach parish council did not explicitly request the item to be determined by planning committee, and no comments have been received on the more recent amendment package despite re-consultation.

## Discussion

Cllr Bradnam is the ward Cllr of the area and a County Councillor.

There is only half the mile stone there and the rest of it missing, they don't know where it is and it is too dangerous to investigate, because it is a busy road and the area is covered in wild flowers. The mile stone would be relocated 17 meters (approx.) away from and west of the current highway. If the milestone cannot be found. Then it could potentially be delisted, but it would be conditioned depending on what they do or do not find when starting the works.

Relevant material planning considerations raising significant planning concerns  
NA

Significant implications for adopted policy  
NA

The nature, scale and complexity of the proposed development  
The condition that has been recommended and agreed with Conservation will cover the different scenarios if the stone is found or not and in what location.

Planning history  
NA

Degree of public involvement  
The comments from the PC have been overcome with the recommended condition and the details provided in amendments to the application.

## Decision

Do not refer to Planning Committee