

Delegation meeting 30th June 2026

Delegation Panel meeting - Minutes

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

Attendees: Cllr James Rixon (Vice Chair of Planning Committee), Rebecca Smith (Delivery Manager), Phoebe Carter (Senior Planning Officer), Karen Pell-Coggins (Senior Planning Officer).

Apologies: - Cllr Anna Bradnam (Chair of Planning Committee)

Minutes approved by date: Cllr James Rixon (Vice Chair of Planning Committee)
02.07.2026

26/01867/FUL – The Common House 9-20 Marmalade Lane Orchard Park

Installation of 12 new domestic heat pumps to replace an existing communal heating system with individual heat pumps for each apartment within the apartment block at Marmalade Lane, and to provide a separate heat pump for the common areas.

Reason for Inclusion

The application has received more than 5 comments

Discussion

1. Relevant material planning considerations raising significant planning concerns.

The application is full planning application for the installation of individual heat pumps serving each of the individual units within the co-housing apartment block along a further heat pump for the communal area. The apartment block forms part of a co-housing street in Orchard Park, comprising individual houses and cohousing apartment block, communal kitchen / dining room and guest rooms on ground floor.

The applicants have advised that the communal heating system is currently not working hence the request for individual heat pumps, reducing costs for residents and moving towards improved sustainability measures for the building.

No objections have been received from any of the technical consultees, although Environmental Health have requested conditions.

There are considered to be concerns relating to material planning considerations including potential for reduction in private amenity space given the proposed location of the units, and potential for noise from the units, however a noise assessment has been submitted and the Environmental Health Officer has not raised any objections; these 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.

None relevant.

5. Degree of public involvement.

8 comments have been received from third parties, all in support of the proposal. No comments have been received from the Parish Council.

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 the level of support for the proposal was acknowledged. As such it was not considered overall to warrant committee consideration.

Decision

Do not refer to planning committee.

26/01874/FUL – Land North East of High Drove Farm, Long Drove Cottenham

Change of use from agricultural land to residential and conversion of existing buildings to 1 No. self/custom build dwelling with annexe

Reason for Inclusion

Parish Council requested:

The application is well outside the development framework and is contrary to policy COH/2-1 of the Neighbourhood Plan. The location is not sustainable. CPC recommends refusal and should the Officer be minded to approve we would like the application to go to Committee

Discussion

The local ward member, Cllr Wilson, expressed her support for the referral by the Parish Council for a committee decision.

1. Relevant material planning considerations raising significant planning concerns.

The application is a full planning application for conversion of existing agricultural buildings to 1 self build property with an annexe. The site is an isolated site located outside of the development framework boundary, a significant distance from the village. The application represents a resubmission of a previously refused application, that was refused on 3 grounds – loss of agricultural land, archaeological potential and lack of marketing information and harm to the countryside. The resubmitted application proposes the conversion of the barn with the addition of windows, and conversion of another building to an annex, 12 months marketing information has been submitted.

A structural survey has been submitted to confirm the barn is structurally sound, it was acknowledged that the site is located outside the development framework and in an unsustainable location; however the proposal is for a self build dwelling.

No technical consultees have objected to the proposal, subject to the imposition of some conditions / informatives along with the submission of a revised preliminary ecology survey. 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, and would not be consistent with the cottenham neighbourhood plan in terms of location 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 previous refused application and subsequent appeal decision was noted.

5. Degree of public involvement.

No comments have been received from third parties; the objection from the parish was noted.

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.

26/01252/FUL - Dales Manor Business Park Unit P2 Grove Road Sawston

Change of Use from Class B8 (Warehousing) to Class E (indoor sport and recreational use)

Reason for Inclusion

The application has received more than 5 comments – 9 in support

Discussion

The local ward member, Cllr Milnes, expressed his support for the application and satisfied that the application can be determined under the scheme of delegation.

1. Relevant material planning considerations raising significant planning concerns.

The application is a full planning application for the change of use from B8 storage and distribution to a Class E trampoline park. The unit is located in the centre of a terrace of 3 x B1/B2/B8 units. To the north and east of the business park is open countryside with residential development to the south and west. Immediately outside of the unit are 7 parking spaces, 2 will dedicated spaces for sports coaches and 5 for visitors. There are around 30 other spaces on street / marked bays along East Way which visitors to the unit will be able to use. The application is accompanied by 2 years of marketing evidence of the unit being marketed for let.

No objections have been received from technical consultees, subject to the imposition of some conditions / informatives. There are considered to be concerns relating to material planning considerations including potential for parking stress on surrounding streets but no objections have been raised by the LHA and there are around 37 spaces available for use, and a cycle store is proposed along with a communal bike store is indicated in close proximity to the unit.

There are not considered to be any relevant material considerations raised that are 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.

None relevant.

5. Degree of public involvement.

9 comments have been received from third parties, all in support of the proposal. The Parish Council's concerns regarding the lack of dedicated parking spaces were noted, however the LHA have raised no objections. There are around 30 other spaces on street / marked bays along East Way which visitors to the unit will be able to use.

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