



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 2 September 2026

Present:

Cllr Christine Colbert
Cllr Lee Denney (Substitute)
Cllr Mark Goldsack (Vice-Chair)
Cllr Martin Goodearl
Cllr Keith Horgan (Substitute)
Cllr Bill Hunt (Chair)
Cllr James Lay
Cllr Alan Sharp
Cllr Ross Trent
Cllr Mary Wade (Substitute)
Cllr Christine Whelan

Officers:

Patrick Adams – Senior Democratic Services Officer
Sophie Browne – Planning Team Leader
Victoria Crosby – Major Projects Officer
Shayleen Kirkland – Locum Planning Lawyer
David Morren – Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager
Gavin Taylor – Major Projects Officer

In attendance:

Catherine Chapman – ADL Traffic & Highways Engineering Limited
Mark Cross – Applicant
ECDC Comms
Philip Gilbey – Applicant's agent
Cllr Julia Huffer – Local Member
Justin Lloyd – Co-operative Group
Richard Radcliffe – Chair of Isleham Parish Council,

31. Apologies and substitutions

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Christine Ambrose Smith, Cllr Lavinia Edwards and Cllr John Trapp. Cllr Keith Horgan substituted for Cllr Ambrose Smith, Cllr Lee Denney substituted for Cllr Edwards and Cllr Mary Wade substituted for Cllr Trapp.

32. Declarations of interest

Cllr Mark Goldsack declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 7, as he had submitted comments on a previous application, which the applicant had been withdrawn.

33. Chair's announcements

The Chair introduced those present.

34. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 5 August 2026 were agreed as a correct record.

35. 25/00362/FUL – Old Salt Depot, 38 Brinkley Road, Dullingham

Gavin Taylor, Major Projects Officer, presented a report (AB57, previously circulated) on an application for the erection of five two-storey dwellings, associated outbuildings and highway access.

Philip Gilbey made the following statement, on behalf of the applicant.

“Good afternoon, Councillors. My name is Philip Gilbey and I am the Managing Director of Logan Homes. Firstly, may I thank your planning officers and consultees for their assistance during the preparation of this application, and for the comprehensive report before you recommending approval.

“At Logan Homes, we pride ourselves on producing carefully designed developments, which respond to their surroundings and provide homes that meet the needs of the local market. We were therefore very proud recently to receive a Gold Award from Hertfordshire Building Control for the best small housing development in their area.

“We believe we have brought that same attention to design and detail to the proposal before you today. I think the most important starting point when considering this application is the existing, implemented planning permission for this site.

“That permission allows four large detached houses, each of approximately 3,000 square feet, of identical layout, positioned relatively closely together with limited rear gardens. It also provides four separate vehicular accesses onto Brinkley Road.

“When commenting on the application before you, your Conservation Officer perhaps summarised the comparison most clearly, stating that: ‘the five modest units work better than the four bloated detached villas permitted in 2022.’”

“When we first looked at the site, we reached a similar conclusion. We felt there was an opportunity to produce a significantly better development, both in terms of its relationship with Dullingham and the range of homes being provided.

“We have therefore designed five smaller homes: three individually designed four-bedroom detached houses of varying sizes and a pair of three-bedroom semi-detached houses. Importantly, although the number of homes increases from four to five, the overall amount of accommodation actually reduces by approximately 4,000 square feet – around 33% compared with the implemented scheme. That reduction allows substantially more space around and between the buildings, together with more generous gardens, and creates a development which we believe sits much more comfortably within the site.

“We have also addressed concerns regarding the number of accesses onto Brinkley Road. Rather than the four individual accesses already approved, this proposal has just two – only one more than currently exists on the site. That not only provides a simpler relationship with Brinkley Road, but also enables considerably more soft landscaping and screening along the frontage.

“The four built forms proposed are deliberately varied in their design and use a palette of sympathetic and locally appropriate materials. Our aim has been to create a development which feels appropriate to Dullingham rather than simply maximising the size of the houses that could be accommodated on the site.

“It is also important to note the consultation response. The proposal has the support of your planning officers and there are no objections from Conservation, Highways or Trees. Dullingham Parish Council has also raised no objection to this proposal. That is particularly relevant because, when considering the previously approved scheme, the Parish Council objected on the basis that: ‘the dwellings appear too large for the plots and would be overly dominant and out of keeping with existing development.’ We believe this application directly addresses those concerns. There are also no objections from local residents.

“The proposal will replace a redundant brownfield site with an attractive and carefully considered development providing a better range and scale of homes. Compared with the permission which has already be implemented, it provides smaller buildings, substantially less overall building mass, greater spacing, larger gardens, fewer road accesses and improved opportunities for landscaping. In addition, because this is a new application, the development will deliver a 10% Biodiversity Net Gain – an environmental benefit which the existing permission is not required to provide. So, the choice before Members is not between this development and leaving the site undeveloped. There is already an implemented permission. We respectfully suggest that the proposal before you represents a clear improvement on that permission, while delivering five well-designed homes appropriate to this location. It has the support of your professional planning officers, no objections from the relevant consultees, no objection from the Parish Council and no objections from local residents. For those reasons, I respectfully ask Members to support your officers’ recommendation and approve the application.”

Councillors were invited to ask questions to Philip Gilbey.

In reply to Cllr Alan Sharp, Philip Gilbey explained that the developer planned to keep the existing mature hedge and supplement it with additional planting.

In reply to Cllr Bill Hunt, Philip Gilbey confirmed that the footpaths on the site would connect with the existing footpaths. He also confirmed that whilst the development was for five homes instead of four requested in the previous application, the actual footprint of buildings was 4,000 square feet less than that of the previous plans.

There were no additional comments from officers.

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

In reply to Cllr Keith Horgan, the Major Projects Officer stated that there had been no objections from Cambridge Highways. They had suggested the use of simple vehicle crossovers rather than bellmouth arrangements as proposed. The plans could be amended with input by Highways as part of the Section 278 agreement.

In reply to Cllr Alan Sharp, the Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager explained that a construction management plan could be agreed with the developer to ensure that the construction vehicles were parked sensibly.

The Committee moved into debate.

Cllr Alan Sharp explained that Dullingham needed more three bed properties and so he supported the proposal to build five medium sized homes, instead of four larger houses. He was concerned about traffic safety and approved of the plans which reduced four exits to two. He proposed that the Committee approve the application. Cllr James Lay seconded this proposal. He stated that more three bedroom homes were needed in the area.

Cllr Alan Sharp proposed and Cllr James Lay seconded that the Committee approve the application. A vote was taken and

the Committee unanimously **agreed**

to resolve

to **approve** the application, subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 1.

36. 25/00535/FUM – Meadow View Industrial Estate, Reach Road, Burwell

Victoria Crosby, Major Projects Officer, presented this report (AB58, previously circulated), on an application for the regularisation of the development for a lorry storage park, self-storage container, 15 industrial units, including associated parking, drainage, hard landscaping, and a surface water attenuation pond.

Cllr Mary Wade joined the meeting at 2:42 pm. She did not participate in the debate on this item and did not vote.

The applicant Mark Cross was present, but did not make a statement under the Committee's public speaking scheme.

Councillors were invited to ask questions to Mark Cross.

In reply to Cllr Lee Denney, Mark Cross acknowledged that the application was retrospective. He explained that an application had been submitted May last year. When the units were built the containers and lorries had to be moved over to allow the construction of the units. The number of lorries had been reduced.

In reply to Cllr Keith Horgan, Mark Cross stated that every day two vehicles left the compound and then returned.

In reply to Cllr Martin Goodearl, Mark Cross explained that the blue containers in the yard were full of soil and acted as an anti-theft device. He confirmed that the lorries would not be replaced by bigger vehicles and he had no plans to purchase any additional lorries.

In reply to Cllr Christine Colbert, Mark Cross explained that users of the containers had key fobs to gain access to the site and whilst access was difficult to monitor he believed that very few containers were accessed after hours. Solar powered lighting was in place, which was barely visible from the road.

In reply to Cllr Mark Goldsack, Mark Cross stated that there were no plans to provide access for commercial vehicles to the site.

In reply to Cllr Keith Horgan, Mark Cross stated that as the applicant, he fully intended to meet the BREEAM Good standard or equivalent.

The Senior Democratic Services Officer read out the following statement from Cllr David Brown, local member for Burwell.

"I strongly support the officer's recommendation to approve this application for the reasons laid out in the officer's report. I hope that the Committee will agree. Thank you for your consideration."

Officers were invited to make comments. The Major Projects Officer stated that Appendix A included condition 3 that restricted the use of the lorry park to

vehicles ancillary to the operations of the Meadow View Industrial Estate and condition 7 that ensured suitable lighting on the site.

Members were invited to ask questions for officers.

In reply to Cllr Christine Colbert, the Major Projects Officer explained that condition 6 limited the hours of use of the site, which could lead to enforcement if breached.

In reply to Cllr Lee Denney, the Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager stated that hours of operation were restricted by a standard condition. If this was breached the enforcement team would have to deal with it.

In reply to Cllr Alan Sharp, the Major Projects Officer assured the Committee that the three reasons given for the refusal of permission two years ago had been addressed. In addition, it was noted that under the new National Planning Policy Framework substantial weight should be given to applications that support economic development.

The Committee moved into debate.

Cllr Mark Goldsack stated that he did not approve of retrospective applications. However, he supported this application and was assured that the conditions would prevent other lorries from using the site. He proposed that the Committee approve the application. Cllr Christine Colbert seconded this proposal.

Cllr Alan Sharp stated that the application complied with the National Planning Policy Framework and he would support it. Cllr Christine Whelan approved of the use of solar powered lights and she supported the application.

Cllr Mark Goldsack proposed and Cllr Christine Colbert seconded that the Committee approve the application. A vote was taken and

the Committee unanimously **agreed**

to resolve:

to **approve** the application, subject to the conditions set out in Appendix A.

37. 26/00520/FUL – 11 Mill Street, Isleham

Gavin Taylor, Major Projects Officer, presented a report (AB59, previously circulated) on a hybrid application comprising full planning permission for the erection of a convenience store with associated external plant, access, parking and servicing areas, and landscaping; and Outline permission, (all matters reserved except access) for two single-storey dwellings.

Justin Lloyd of the Co-operative Group explained that his organisation had reviewed feedback from Council officers and residents on the original application and had made significant changes to the proposals. The resulting application would provide Isleham residents with a larger, more modern shop with improved parking, replacing an old store which was on a junction and had limited parking. The additional bungalows were necessary to make the development viable and they met the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework regarding sustainable development. The Mill Street site had been vacant for a number of years and had deteriorated into a derelict condition. The application would transform a neglected site into an attractive landscape development. Council officers recognised that the development would complement the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Traffic and parking arrangements had been comprehensively reviewed by ADL Traffic & Highways Engineering Limited and the Highways Agency had raised no objections. The impact of noise and deliveries had been assessed and mitigated through conditions. The outline application set maximum building and boundary heights but did not include matters such as the appearance, layout, scale and landscaping of the single-storey homes, which would be considered in a forthcoming, reserved matters application. Concerns relating to overlooking, loss of privacy and daylight had been addressed. He concluded that the development would offer an improved facility and employment opportunities for residents.

Members of the Committee were invited to ask questions to Justin Lloyd.

In reply to Cllr Keith Horgan, Justin Lloyd confirmed that the plan was to sell the site for the two bungalows to a developer who would then build the homes.

In reply to Cllr Lee Denney, Justin Lloyd acknowledged that the final details of the buildings were still to be agreed but these would be governed by the plans and the conditions in the report. He explained that there would be approximately 2-4 deliveries a day, between 8 am and 7 pm. The size of the vehicles would be restricted by planning conditions.

The Senior Democratic Services Officer read out the following statement on behalf of Chris Reed, resident of Isleham.

“As residents of Isleham, we are pleased to see this revised application for a class E convenience store be considered by this committee, with an officer recommendation for approval. There is strong support within the parish for this site to be brought back into use and this is a view we share. Whilst strongly supporting this application we would like to ask committee members to fully consider the possible highway safety impacts, namely, existing parking displacement, HGV servicing, and pedestrian connectivity. The latter being significant, noting the existing western footway opposite the proposed access being constrained in width and no existing pedestrian crossings in the close vicinity.

"We note the statutory consultee for the above matters raised 'no objection', for which on balance we can appreciate how this decision was reached, in line with the NPPF. In general, we agree with the supplementary response to public comments provided by the LHA dated 21 July 2026. We note that in the response they state specifically that the LPA should consider the impacts of existing and proposed parking (or displacement thereof) as part of the residential amenity and therefore we ask that this committee evaluate this as part of the decision-making process.

"We hope that all members of this committee would agree that to lose such an opportunity of an enhanced store, would be a significant cost to the parish of Isleham. Thank you all for your support of this application."

Richard Radcliffe, Chair of Isleham Parish Council, made the following statement:

"I am speaking on behalf of Isleham Parish Council regarding this application for the proposed Co-op relocation and two single-storey dwellings at the former Patterson's Stores site on Mill Street.

"The Parish Council wishes to begin by reaffirming our strong and longstanding support for this application. The Co-op is a vital facility for Isleham, and the majority of residents attending our public meetings have expressed clear support for its relocation. Councillors are concerned that refusal of this proposal may jeopardise the future viability of the existing store, which is ageing and constrained by its location. We want the applicant to achieve the best possible scheme for the village, and our comments are aimed at strengthening the proposal rather than opposing it.

"We previously raised concerns about the Transport Statement in relation to Highways and Parking because of the existing parking difficulties and the bottleneck on Mill Street. We recognise that parking pressures exist on Mill Street already as they do in other parts of the village. These will continue irrespective of this development, and we are aware of the impact of this development for the residents living opposite and near to the site. We note that Highways Officers have confirmed no objection to the proposed scheme and therefore that Highways matters here should not be a concern for our Council in future years.

"We do welcome the applicant's confirmation that the outline element for the residential dwellings is now restricted to single-storey dwellings. We wish to be very clear that the Parish Council expects no rooflights, dormers or elevated openings, in line with the applicant's own statements about preventing overlooking when it comes to the final proposals. Councillors are fully aware of the amenity impacts that would arise if roof-level openings were permitted.

"We note the updated Parameters Plan secure 1.8-metre boundary treatments. These must be designed to protect privacy while avoiding overbearing impacts for neighbouring residents and be sympathetic to the site's context in the

village. This is an important balance, and we expect it to be secured at reserved matters stage.

“We also request that landscaping is implemented at the development stage, not left as an afterthought. Early landscaping will help integrate the development into the Conservation Area and soften visual impacts for neighbouring properties.

“We welcome confirmation that no piling is proposed, and that any future need for piling would require a management plan. This development is in the heart of our Conservation Area and protection of the clunch retaining walls is essential in reflecting the site’s history. We expect this to be reflected fully in the conditions to be applied.

“In summary, the Parish Council believes that meaningful improvements have been secured through the planning process. The applicant has addressed the concerns raised, and the scheme now represents a significant enhancement to local facilities. We therefore confirm our continued strong support for the application and respectfully ask the Committee to give due weight to the clear community support expressed at our meetings.”

Members were invited to ask questions to Richard Radcliffe.

In reply to Cllr Martin Goodearl, Richard Radcliffe explained that he could only comment on the existing application, and he would not speculate on whether moving the car park to the front of the proposed shop would allay any road safety concerns.

In reply to Cllr James Lay, Richard Radcliffe explained that residents wanted to secure the future of the Co-op shop in the village and this was more important than concerns regarding the street scene.

Cllr Julia Huffer spoke to the Committee as a Local Member for the village of Isleham. She explained that she had called-in this application due to the concerns that residents had about the application. She reported that everybody in the village wanted to see a new store built, as residents relied on the service it provided. However, there were concerns regarding properties being overlooked and road safety. She explained that similar concerns had been ignored in the village of Fordham, resulting in a fatality. She asserted that lorries would not have sufficient space to enter and leave the site safely. She concluded that the store was needed but safety should not be compromised.

Members were invited to ask questions to Cllr Julia Huffer.

In reply to Cllr James Lay, Cllr Huffer assumed that the reason for the location of the car park on the current plans was to allow for space for the bungalows to be built. Cllr Bill Hunt suggested that the bungalows were needed to ensure that the project was viable. Cllr Huffer replied that the safety of residents was more important.

Officers were invited to make comments. The Major Projects Officer clarified that this was a hybrid application for both the store and access for the residential development. The design, scale and layout of the homes were reserved for a future application. The dwellings were restricted to 5 metres in height. He suggested that an additional condition could be agreed to restrict permitted development rights for roof alterations to include things such as dormer windows and rooflights. The design of the store was a consideration of this application, made more challenging by the fact that it was in a Conservation Area. It was noted that the Highways Officer, James Stringer, was present to answer concerns about traffic safety.

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

In reply to Cllr Keith Horgan, James Stringer stated that Highways had assessed the plans as being safe for delivery vehicles of up to 10.3 metres in length to carry out deliveries to the store. The vehicles would be able to arrive and depart in forward gear. The provision of 13 parking spaces for customers complied with the Local Plan. The average time a customer parked their vehicle was nine minutes, so less parking was required than for a larger store. It was noted that this was more spaces than were provided at the current store. In reply to Cllr Lee Denney, James Stringer explained that national standards had been applied to the application's car parking proposals.

Cllr Mark Goldsack expressed concern about the visibility for customers driving out of the store car park, due to cars parked on Mill Street. James Stringer acknowledged that drivers of delivery vehicles would have better visibility than the drivers of private vehicles, as they will be higher up. Cllr Goldsack suggested that some shoppers will park on the street, compounding the problem.

In reply to Cllr Goldsack, the Major Projects Officer stated that bollards would be placed in front of the ATM machine to prevent theft. In reply to Cllr Goodearl, he expected that further security issues, such as adequate lighting, would be part of the business's security strategy.

In reply to Cllr Christine Colbert, James Stringer stated that disabled and family parking spaces would be nearest the store. He believed that deliveries were likely to take place early in the morning, when fewer people and other vehicles were about. The Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager added that under condition 11 delivery vehicles were restricted to arriving within the operational hours of the company.

In reply to Cllr Mary Wade, the Major Projects Officer explained that it was not unusual for stores to have car parks at the rear of the building and in this regard, the layout of the shop reflected the historic pattern of development in the area. The Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager added that the application met the criteria for development in a Conservation Area. It was noted that whilst some regard had to be given to the current environment, issues such as aesthetics were a matter of judgement.

In reply to Cllr Lee Denney's concerns regarding the effect of the historic quarry on the site, the Major Projects Officer explained that an environmental survey had been carried out, and the site was seen as stable and appropriate for development. There would have to be an agreement between the developer and the owner of the relevant land if shared boundaries would be affected through the development.

The Committee moved into debate.

Cllr James Lay understood both the local support in Isleham for the new store and residents' concerns about traffic safety. He felt that he could not support the application due to the risk caused by the planned layout.

Cllr Bill Hunt recognised the importance of a local store for the residents of Isleham. Cllr Lee Denney agreed but suggested that the Committee should not approve an application that would compromise residents' safety. He also expressed concern regarding the design for store building and the lack of windows. He concluded that he could not support the application.

Cllr Alan Sharp recognised the local need for the store, but he had the following concerns. Firstly, the location of the car park behind the store made parking on the street more likely. Secondly, delivery lorries coming in and out of the car park would hold up traffic. Thirdly, vehicles exiting the car park would have their visibility obscured by parked cars. Fourthly, the new homes could overlook exiting properties and fifthly, he was concerned that if the store was built first, construction traffic for the bungalows would be via the car park.

Cllr Mark Goldsack asked if the Committee could agree a condition for a transport review regarding access to and from the car park and the impact on the traffic on Mill Street. The Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager agreed that conditions could be added for this and for Cllr Sharp's concern regarding the height of the new homes.

Cllr Martin Goodearl supported the application but recognised that having the car park at the back of the building was not ideal. He shared concerns about traffic safety and supported a suitably worded condition. Cllr Mark Goldsack proposed approving the application with the following additional conditions:

"To give delegated authority (in conjunction with the County's Highways Officer) to the Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager to formulate a pre-commencement condition (subject to agreement by the applicant) on an updated transport assessment, to include a line of sight assessment, taking into account parked cars. The assessment will consider the possibility of parking restrictions and the installation of road traffic speed restrictions on Mill Street to make the road safe.

"To give delegated authority to the Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager to restrict the permitted development rights to roof alterations and expansion."

Cllr Martin Goodearl seconded this proposal. Cllr Mary Wade stated that the Council needed to balance the demand for the store with concerns regarding road safety. She supported the additional condition ensuring a transport assessment.

Cllr Christine Colbert suggested that the proposed bollards could impede pedestrians with trolleys and wheelchair users.

Cllr Mark Goldsack proposed and Cllr Martin Goodearl seconded that the Committee approve the application, with the additional two conditions. A vote was taken and with 9 votes in favour, 2 against and no abstentions,

the Committee agreed

To **approve** the application, subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 1 and give delegated authority (in conjunction with the County's Highways Officer) to the Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager to formulate a pre-commencement condition (subject to agreement by the applicant) on an updated transport assessment, to include a line of sight assessment, taking into account parked cars. The assessment will consider the possibility of parking restrictions and the installation of road traffic speed restrictions on Mill Street to make the road safe.

To give delegated authority to the Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager to restrict the permitted development rights to roof alterations and expansion.

38. Planning Performance Report – July 2026

David Morren, Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager, presented a report summarising the performance of the Planning Department in July 2026. Cllr James Lay asked how many of the ten applications that had been refused had been incomplete. The Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager agreed to find out this information and report back to the Committee.

The Committee agreed

to resolve to **note** the report.

The meeting concluded at 5:04 pm.

Chair.....

Date.....