



East Cambridgeshire District Council

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee

Held at The Grange, Nutholt Lane, Ely, CB7 4EE at 2:00pm on
Wednesday 5 August 2026

Present:

Cllr Christine Ambrose Smith
Cllr Christine Colbert
Cllr Lavinia Edwards
Cllr Mark Goldsack (Vice-Chair)
Cllr Martin Goodearl
Cllr Bill Hunt (Chair)
Cllr James Lay
Cllr Alan Sharp
Cllr Ross Trent
Cllr John Trapp
Cllr Christine Whelan

Officers:

Patrick Adams – Senior Democratic Services Officer
Philip Baum – Planning Officer
Kevin Breslin – Locum Planning Lawyer
Sophie Browne – Planning Team Leader
Rachel Gordon – Planning Team Leader
Shayleen Kirkland – Locum Planning Lawyer
David Morren – Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager
Juleen Roman – Planning Enforcement Team Leader

In attendance:

ECDC Comms
Justin Bainton – Applicant's Agent
Cllr David Brown – Local Member
Lynda Warth – British Horse Society

21. Apologies and substitutions

No apologies for absence were received. All members of the Committee were present.

22. Declarations of interest

Cllr Mark Goldsack and Cllr Christine Whelan both declared non-pecuniary interests in agenda item 5 as County Councillors who were not responsible for the governance of the applicant This Land, which was a residential property company owned by the County Council.

Cllr Martin Goodearl declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 6, explaining that he had called this item in on behalf of Littleport Town Council but came to this matter with an open mind.

Cllr Christine Ambrose Smith declared an interest in agenda item 6, as she had publicly expressed her support for the application. She explained that she would speak as a local member on the agenda item and then leave the Chamber.

23. Chair's announcements

The Chair introduced those present.

24. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 3 June 2026 were agreed as a correct record, subject to

- the amendment of Whelen to Whelan; and
- the correction of minute 11 to reflect that it was hours a day that was discussed not hours a week.

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 June 2026 were agreed as a correct record.

25. 25/01073/FUM – Millstone Park, Newmarket Road, Burwell

Sophie Browne, Planning Team Leader, presented a report (AB52, previously circulated) on an application for a residential development of land at Millstone Park, Newmarket Road, Burwell to provide 60 dwellings with associated landscaping, access, drainage and related infrastructure.

Lynda Warth of the British Horse Society made the following statement.

"I am speaking on behalf of the British Horse Society in support of our objection to this application.

"This objection has been submitted at a late stage because, despite the site's immediate proximity to a large livery yard and the surrounding Public Rights of Way network, the BHS was not notified of the application and only became aware of it shortly before this meeting.

“Our objection is not to the development itself. It is to the missed opportunity to deliver the Burwell–Exning route as a safe and inclusive connection to the Public Rights of Way network for all lawful users.

“This development provides Active Travel infrastructure only for pedestrians and cyclists, but the Public Rights of Way network is different. It is the legally protected network of footpaths, bridleways, restricted byways and byways that provides access to the countryside for all lawful users, including equestrians. The Burwell–Exning route will be the strategic link between those two networks. Yet the Transport Assessment contains no assessment of equestrian movements, the nearby bridleway and byway network, or the impact that additional traffic from this development will have on horse riders.

“Immediately behind this site is a large livery yard with over 40 horses, with other yards in Burwell and Exning. This is therefore not a theoretical issue; it affects existing highway users every day.

“National planning policy is clear. Paragraphs 96, 110 and 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework require planning decisions to promote healthy and inclusive places, provide safe access for all users, and identify and pursue opportunities to promote walking, cycling and horse riding, while protecting, enhancing and improving Public Rights of Way.

“Having reviewed the planning history across this allocation, I have been unable to identify any meaningful assessment of the Public Rights of Way network or the opportunities that national policy expects planning decisions to pursue.

“Current national guidance reinforces that expectation. Active Travel England's Rural Design Guide states that ‘people riding horses should not be purposefully excluded from rural active travel routes through inattentive design.’ Evidence from Burwell Parish Council minutes shows that this route was intended to include a bridleway until around 2022, before that provision disappeared from the current design. Although subsequent development may have altered the alignment, current national policy places even greater emphasis on improving access to Public Rights of Way. The Exning Section 106 already recognises the need for equestrian access, so it is reasonable to ask why the Burwell section should now be delivered to a different standard when both form a single strategic route. Although the detailed design sits with the Highway Authority, national planning policy still requires planning decisions to identify and pursue opportunities to improve the Public Rights of Way network.

“This application presents one of those opportunities and these opportunities do not come along very often. There is also an important highway safety question. Rule 63 of the Highway Code states cyclists should not pass horses on their left. Yet the proposed design places a two-way cycle track alongside horses who remain on the carriageway. Has the Highway Authority assessed how that interaction is intended to operate in practice, and has it been considered through a Road Safety Audit?

"This is not infrastructure for one user group. The equestrian industry contributes over £100 million per annum to Cambridgeshire's economy and supports rural businesses, employment and tourism. Safe access to the Public Rights of Way network is part of the transport infrastructure that supports the equestrian industry.

"I recognise that this Committee is not determining the detailed design of the route, and I am not asking you to refuse this application on that basis alone. However, if you are minded to approve the application, I respectfully ask that you request Cambridgeshire County Council to:

- review the Burwell–Exning route before construction,
- explain why the original bridleway provision was removed, and
- confirm that the final design has been assessed against current planning policy, modern highway safety guidance and the needs of all lawful users.

"If it is lawful to secure an enhanced multi-user route through a planning obligation or condition, or by working with Cambridgeshire County Council as neighbouring landowner and partner in This Land, the BHS would strongly support that approach.

"Councillors, this application will be decided today, but the Burwell–Exning route will serve the community for generations. I simply ask one question: Has the current design been reviewed against?

- today's planning policy,
- today's highway safety guidance and
- the original objective of providing safe connectivity for all lawful users?

If it has, the community can have confidence in the scheme. If it has not, this is the opportunity to put it right."

Councillors were invited to ask questions to Lynda Warth.

In reply to Cllr Mark Goldsack, Lynda Warth explained that horses should never be overtaken on the nearside, as this could startle them out into traffic. For this reason, cycle lanes should not be located between a horse track and the road.

In reply to Cllr John Trapp, Lynda Warth asserted that a safe route for horses should be provided between Burwell and Exning. Those who will live in the new development will increase the amount of traffic and would benefit from this.

In reply to Cllr Christine Colbert, Lynda Warth explained that a route for horses had been funded by previous planning applications but not had been delivered. The route would not go through the development area for this planning application.

In reply to Cllr James Lay, Lynda Warth suggested that the byway would link to other paths in Burwell and Exning.

In reply to Cllr Alan Sharp, Lynda Warth explained that a route for horses had been promised, but was then dropped from the plans around 2022.

Cllr Mark Goldsack questioned whether the Council could determine this matter. David Morren, the Development Manager Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager, explained that funding had been provided in a Section 106 agreement in 2022 for a footpath, but not for a bridleway. This matter could now only be determined by the County Council.

Justin Bainton made the following statement on behalf of the applicant.

"This application seeks consent for 60 new homes at Phase 6 of Millstone Park, Burwell, representing the final residential parcel within the wider BUR1 allocation.

"The wider allocation, including access arrangements, transport improvements, open space provision, drainage infrastructure and off-site highway mitigation, was established through the outline planning permission granted under reference 15/01175/OUM granted in 2019 and subsequent six reserved matters approvals. This final phase sits within that approved and substantially implemented framework and utilises infrastructure that has already been delivered.

"The proposal before you delivers a high-quality residential scheme which accords with the Local Plan and makes an important contribution to housing delivery. It will provide 60 homes, including 24 affordable homes, representing 40% affordable housing, fully in accordance with Policy HOU3.

"The scheme also delivers public open space, extensive landscaping, biodiversity enhancements and sustainable drainage features, alongside a strong sustainability package that includes air source heat pumps, water efficiency measures.

"The application has been comprehensively assessed by technical consultees. The Local Highway Authority, County Transport Team, Lead Local Flood Authority, Natural England and the Council's Ecologist all raise no objection. The officer report concludes that the proposal accords with the Development Plan and recommends approval.

"It is also worth highlighting the wider benefits associated with Millstone Park. The development will provide a significant amount of open space and green infrastructure, exceeding policy requirements and creating an extensive network of spaces that support recreation, biodiversity and wellbeing for both existing and future residents.

"Turning briefly to the British Horse Society representation, the matters raised relate to the Burwell to Exning route secured through the outline planning permission and Section 106 Agreement, rather than the application before you today.

"The required contribution towards that route was paid in 2023 and forms part of a shared funding arrangement linked to development in both Burwell and Exning. Delivery of the scheme is being progressed by Suffolk County Council,

and the applicant has no involvement in its detailed design or implementation. This Phase 6 application neither affects nor controls those arrangements. Importantly, neither the Local Highway Authority nor the County Transport Team has raised any objection in relation to equestrian access. Nor is there any evidence before Members that the proposal would adversely affect an existing bridleway, byway or equestrian route.

“Accordingly, while we recognise the aspirations being promoted by the British Horse Society, those matters do not affect the planning merits of Phase 6 and do not provide a basis to delay or amend the application before you today.

“Members are being asked to determine a well-designed final phase of an established allocation, delivering much-needed housing, including a significant proportion of affordable homes, within a development framework that has already been approved and substantially implemented.

“For those reasons, and in accordance with your officers' recommendation, we respectfully ask Members to support the application and grant planning permission.”

Councillors were invited to ask questions to Justin Bainton.

Cllr Mark Goldsack expressed concern that the application sought to add 60 more homes to the overall development. This will also add approximately 120 cars to the Isaacson Road/Newmarket Road junction. Justin Bainton explained that the overall housing density of 23 homes per hectare was within the parameters of the application and the Highways Authority had raised no objection to this planning application.

In reply to Cllr Bill Hunt, Justin Bainton stated that the application proposed a variety of parking, including garages, shared parking and tandem parking, which was normal in comparison to other applications.

In reply to Cllr James Lay, Justin Bainton stated that the statutory consultees considered the Isaacson Road and Newmarket Road junction to be acceptable, without a roundabout. The additional traffic was low in comparison with the rest of the scheme.

In reply to Cllr Martin Goodearl, Justin Bainton explained that the two previous phases of the overall development referred to by Cllr Goodearl were the responsibility of a different applicant and so he was not able to comment on it.

In reply to Cllr Alan Sharp, Justin Bainton explained that with regards to open space, the application was over-delivering at site BUR1. The scheme had been favourably assessed in terms of water provision, drainage and sewage. It would deliver more affordable homes to Burwell.

In reply to Cllr John Trapp, Justin Bainton explained that he was not able to provide the exact location of all the 24 proposed affordable housing units in the proposed development.

In reply to Cllr Christine Whelan, Justin Bainton explained that the site was in walking distance to a playground to the northeast but he could not remember the exact equipment on this playground. The site would be in walking distance to other open spaces and recreation areas. More details were in the design access statement.

Cllr David Brown made the following statement as Local Member.

"I am here to support Burwell Parish Council in objecting to application 25/01073/FUM. When I refer to items in the officer report I am using the paragraph numbers in the report.

"Members will be aware that the 'so called' Millstone Park development already has planning approval for around 350 dwellings from earlier applications. That figure of 350 has not come about by accident. The 350 figure was a result of comprehensive consultation with residents of Burwell, including household surveys and 9 public meetings.

"The application before you is an attempt to increase that 350 figure, that was agreed by the village, by a further 60. I leave it to you to decide whether the description as 'phase 6' is accurate.

"Paragraph 3 in the report states that the 'majority' of this application site lies within BUR1 housing application. So not only does this seek to increase the numbers, it also seeks to extend the allocated site. Contrary to policy in my view.

"Paragraph 23 states there have been no concerns about density and layout in earlier applications. I am not sure that I agree. Members may recall deferring one reserved matters application to address such concerns.

"Turning to paragraph 76 and highways. Members may recall that Burwell was adamant that we needed a roundabout at the junction with Newmarket Road to address road safety. Highways said, at the time, it was not necessary for 350 dwellings. I disagreed then, and I disagree even more when vehicle movements associated with a further 60 dwellings are added.

"Finally, if members are minded to approve this application, can I please ask for a much stronger Construction Environmental Management plan in condition 4? With the number of complaints that officers in Planning Enforcement and Environmental Health have had to deal with due to dust from the existing development it is clear to me that the existing CEMP is inadequate."

Members of the Committee were invited to ask questions to Cllr David Brown.

In reply to Cllr Christine Whelan, Cllr David Brown confirmed that there had been complaints about the amount of dust generated by development in Burwell.

In reply to Cllr James Lay, Cllr David Brown stated that in his view Burwell Parish Council would still oppose the development if a higher proportion of affordable homes were delivered.

In reply to Cllr Alan Sharp, Cllr David Brown stated that the additional shops predicated by the developer had not been forthcoming and in his view never would be.

In reply to Cllr John Trapp, Cllr David Brown noted that in the past the Council had rejected applications for additional houses, in excess of the original development.

Cllr Bill Hunt suggested that more children play areas and less tandem parking could have been included in the plans, in place of the proposed additional 60 homes.

Officers were invited to make comments.

The Development Manager Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager explained that all the previous reserved matters relating to the wider development had been approved by the Planning Committee. The housing density had been agreed. The Committee were only being asked to consider whether to approve 60 additional homes for the site.

The Planning Team Leader reported that the County Council had assessed the impact of additional traffic on the Isaacson Road and Newmarket Road junction and determined that the current road layout was acceptable. She understood Members concerns regarding tandem parking but it was not contrary to the policies that the Council had to abide by. Play equipment was provided on site, it was located on the edge of green separation. Additional play provision would be provided in other phases to the north and west of the site. In terms of housing density and garden size, the application was within the parameters set by the design guide. The Committee was being asked to consider this specific application and was unable to determine aspects of the wider development, which had already been agreed.

Members of the Committee were invited to ask questions to officers.

In reply to Cllr Martin Goodearl, the Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager explained that the provision of play areas had already been agreed in the previous reserved matters applications.

In reply to Cllr Christine Whelan, the Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager explained that the condition regarding dust mitigation will be carefully monitored. He added that dust from building works was a particular problem at the moment, due to the dry weather.

In reply to Cllr Alan Sharp, the Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager explained that the master plan showed where housing was expected and the layout had been agreed years ago. The impact of the

extra housing had been assessed by the statutory consultees who had not objected to the application.

In reply to Cllr James Lay, the Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager explained that the number of affordable homes promised in the application met the number required in the Council's policies.

In reply to Cllr Lavinia Edwards, the Planning Team Leader explained that a site notice for the application was displayed on Newmarket Road on 23 October 2025. It was advertised in the Cambridge News on 30 October, and 19 neighbouring properties were contacted directly. This was in accordance with legislation. There had been some additional correspondence regarding the ecological impact of the application.

In reply to Cllr John Trapp, the Planning Team Leader explained that the diagram on page 77 of the agenda was accurate, whilst the maps on pages 51 and 52 were not. The Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager explained that the play areas outside the site were not part of the application and so were not included in the report. Justin Bainton explained that one road would not be adopted and bin lorries would be unable to go the entire length of this road. In reply to Cllr Christine Colbert, the Strategic Planning Development Management Manager explained that there would be public access to the private road.

In reply to Cllr Mark Goldsack, the Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager explained that the Council would review the Section 106 agreement for the earlier outline permission to ensure that the terms were applied with. The Council could not amend the terms of the agreement.

The Committee moved into debate.

Cllr Mark Goldsack sympathised with Burwell Parish Council due to the impact of the extra homes and the lack of consultation. However, the report showed no objections from the statutory consultees and he could see no legitimate planning reasons for refusing the application. He reluctantly expressed his support for the application.

Cllr James Lay expressed concern regarding any application that asked for planning permission for additional homes in excess of what had already been agreed. He hoped that steps could be taken to avoid this happening in the future. However, he reluctantly accepted that the Committee should approve this application.

Cllr Martin Goodearl expressed concerns regarding the lack of parking for users of the sports field and the increase in the density of housing. However, he could not see any planning reasons to refuse the application and so would be voting to approve the application. The Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager explained that the masterplan showed that parking for the sports field was to the south and was never proposed to be on this application site.

Cllr Alan Sharp expressed concerns regarding the safety of the Isaacson Road and Newmarket Road junction. He accepted that the Committee could not alter the previous Section 106 Agreement. He reluctantly supported the application in relation to the whole site but objected to the piecemeal nature of an additional application.

Cllr John Trapp stated that in the past, the Committee had refused to approve applications for additional homes, in excess of the original application. If the application was purely for social housing then he would vote in favour of it. Cllr Lavinia Edwards agreed and stated that 350 homes had been included in the Burwell masterplan. She shared the Parish Council's concerns regarding overdevelopment of the site and the impact of additional traffic. Cllr John Trapp stated that the under policy BR1, 350 dwellings had been agreed for the site, as a result of consultation process with the residents of Burwell. The additional homes in the application would mean additional traffic, that would be harmful for the area.

Cllr John Trapp proposed and Cllr Lavinia Edwards seconded that the Committee refuse the application. A vote was taken and with 3 votes in favour, six votes against and two abstentions the Committee **rejected** the recommendation to refuse the application.

Cllr Mark Goldsack proposed and Cllr Christine Ambrose Smith seconded that the Committee approve the application. A vote was taken and with 8 votes in favour, 3 votes against and no abstentions the Committee **agreed**

to resolve

to **approve** the application, subject to the conditions set out in Appendix A and grant delegated authority to the Strategic Planning Policy and Development Management Manager to finalise the terms and completion of the s106 legal agreement securing affordable housing, biodiversity net gain, public open space provision and maintenance, sustainable drainage delivery and maintenance, waste and recycling, and monitoring and legal costs.

26. 26/00636/FUL – Wisbech Road, Littleport

Cllr Bill Hunt left the meeting. Cllr Mark Goldsack assumed the Chair.

Philip Baum, Planning Officer, presented this report (AB53, previously circulated), on a retrospective application for siting an InPost parcel locker.

Cllr Christine Ambrose Smith made a statement as Local Member. She stated that she was both a district councillor for Littleport and a member of Littleport

Town Council. She did not sit on the Planning Sub Committee for Littleport Town Council. She had stated that although the parcel box did not greatly improve the street scene, on balance it was an asset for the number of people who use this to deal with their parcels and the shop provided an excellent and valuable service to the local community. Littleport Town Council Planning Committee had a contrary view, which she understood and accepted. It would have been better to have applied for planning permission before the installation of the boxes. She recognised the Town Council's concerns regarding lighting but believed that those can be overcome.

Cllr Ambrose Smith left the meeting. She did not participate in the debate and did not vote.

Cllr Martin Goodearl also made a statement as Local Member. He explained that he had called this application in after the Town Council had spoken to him. The biggest concern of the Town Council's Planning Sub Committee was safety at night and the possibility of somebody hiding behind the lockers and attacking a member of the public. He had spoken to officers and considered that a condition regarding the provision of lighting could address this concern.

Members had no questions for officers.

The Committee moved into debate.

Cllr Mark Goldsack expressed his general opposition to retrospective planning applications. However, he recognised that parcel lockers provided a valuable service to residents, and he declared his support for the application.

Cllr James Lay stated that having visited the site he did not consider that the application had enough of an impact on the street view to warrant refusal. He supported the application.

Cllr Martin Goodearl stated that he could support the application providing that a condition was added with regarding to improving the lighting by the unit. He explained that there were other parcel lockers in Littleport.

David Morren, the Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager, explained that whilst parcel lockers required planning permission there were many in the district that did not have this. He suggested that a new Local Plan policy should be agreed in the future.

Cllr Mark Goldsack recommended that a condition be added to the application that a rear automatic light be fitted to the locker. The Strategic Planning Development Management Manager suggested that condition 3 could be amended to ensure appropriate lighting.

Cllr Alan Sharp agreed that planning regulations should be updated to reflect the new technology. He supported the application with additional lighting.

Cllr Mark Goldsack proposed and Cllr Christine Colbert seconded that the application be agreed, as recommended by the officer, with an amendment to condition 3 to provide additional lighting. A vote was taken and the Committee unanimously

resolved:

to **approve** the application, subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 2 and grant delegated authority to Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager for amendment of condition 3, to require appropriate lighting to protect the safety of users.

27. Planning Performance Report – May 2026

David Morren, Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager, presented a report summarising the performance of the Planning Department in May 2026. He explained that there had been temporary dip in the number of applications validated within 5 working days to 52%. This was due to a backlog that had been cleared and performance had improved to 96% the following month.

The Committee agreed

to resolve to **note** the report.

28. Planning Performance Report – June 2026

David Morren, Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager, presented a report summarising the performance of the Planning Department in June 2026.

The Committee agreed

to resolve to **note** the report.

29. Exclusion of the Press and Public

The Chair proposed that the meeting should go into private session. It was resolved unanimously:

that the press and public be excluded during the consideration of the remaining item because it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the public were present during the items there would be disclosure to them of exempt

information of Categories 1, 2 and 7 of Part 1 Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).

30. Quarterly performance in resolving planning enforcement cases

The Committee considered a report (AB56, previously circulated) which considered the Quarterly Performance in Resolving Planning Enforcement Cases. The Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager requested that if Members had any concerns regarding a specific site they arrange a meeting with officers to discuss this. Cllr Mark Goldsack asked about enforcement notice effective dates and compliance periods and the Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager explained that when a notice was served it was not effective until at least 28 days from the date of service, to give the recipient time to appeal. The compliance period then starts from either the effective date of the notice if no appeal was submitted or the date of any appeal decision.

Members thanked officers for their work.

It was resolved that:

the Quarterly Performance in Resolving Planning Enforcement Cases be noted.

The meeting concluded at 4:39 pm.

Chair.....

Date.....