HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of the meeting of the DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE held in THE CIVIC SUITE (LANCASTER/STIRLING ROOMS), PATHFINDER HOUSE, ST MARY'S STREET, HUNTINGDON, PE29 3TN on Monday, 19 October 2026

PRESENT: Councillor W Smith – Chair.

Councillors L Davenport-Ray, P Gammons, P J Hodgson-Jones, J E Kerr, D McIlwain, D L Mickelburgh, J Neish, T D Sanderson, G Seeff and A Wood.

APOLOGIES: Apologies for absence from the meeting were submitted on behalf of Councillors S Hodgson-Jones, A Hunt, J Hunt, D N Keane and L M Simpson.

SUBSTITUTES: Councillors G Seeff and A Wood

22 MINUTES

Subject to the deletion of Minute No 20 (b), to be replaced with:

b) Outline planning permission (all matters reserved except for means of access) for the development of up to 70 dwellings, open space, play area, landscaped areas and associated infrastructure - Land south of Blenheim Grove, Offord Darcy - 25/01738/OUT

(Councillor S Young, Offord Cluny and Offord Darcy Parish Council, B Mickelburgh, Ward Member, and A Wright, Agent, addressed the Committee on the application).

A proposal to approve the application was moved by Councillor Sanderson and seconded by Councillor McIlwain. On being put to the vote the proposal was declared to be TIED

At 8.48 pm the meeting was adjourned.

At 8.58 pm the meeting resumed.

Upon the Chair's casting vote, the proposal was declared to be LOST.

Following further discussion, a proposal to approve the application was moved by Councillor Sanderson and seconded by Councillor McIlwain. On being put to the vote, it was

RESOLVED

that the application be approved subject to conditions and the completion of a Section 106 agreement, with delegated authority

being given to the Head of Planning, Infrastructure & Public Protection to approve any amendments to conditions as deemed necessary or refused in the event that the Section 106 agreement referred to above has not been completed and the Applicant is unwilling to agree to an extended period for determination, or on the grounds that the Applicant is unwilling to complete the obligation necessary to make the development acceptable,

the Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 21st September 2026 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

23 MEMBERS' INTERESTS

Councillor D McIlwain declared an Other Registrable Interest in Minute No 25 by virtue of the fact that that he knew the applicant and had previously been a Member of Ramsey Town Council and served in the capacity of Mayor, Deputy Mayor and Chair of the Planning Committee but he had not discussed the application.

Councillor McIlwain also declared a Non-Registrable Interest in Minute No 26 (a) by virtue of the fact that the application related to the Ward he represented.

Councillor P Gammons declared an Other Registrable Interest in Minute No 25 by virtue of the fact that the application related to the Ward in which he lived.

Councillor A Wood declared an Other Registrable Interest in Minute No 25 by virtue of the fact that he represented the Council on the Middle Level Commissioners.

Regarding Minute No 26 (b), Councillors L Davenport-Ray, P Gammons, S Hodgson-Jones, J Kerr, D McIlwain, D Mickelburgh, J Neish, T Sanderson and W Smith placed on record that they were present when the application was considered at the Development Management Committee meeting on 17th August 2026.

24 APPLICATION REQUIRING REFERENCE TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - CHANGE OF USE FROM DAY SCHOOL TO RESIDENTIAL, DEMOLITION OF ANCILLARY BUILDINGS TO THE REAR AND CONSTRUCTION OF NEW REAR EXTENSIONS AND INTERNAL ALTERATIONS - THE OLD DAY SCHOOL, HIGH STREET, BLUNTISHAM - 26/00903/FUL & 26/00904/LBC

This item was withdrawn from the Agenda.

25 DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT - SECTION 106 AGREEMENT - OUTLINE APPLICATION WITH ALL MATTERS RESERVED SAVE FOR ACCESS FOR ERECTION OF UP TO 199 DWELLINGS INCLUDING OPEN SPACE, PLAY SPACE, CAR PARKING, DRAINAGE, UTILITIES CONNECTIONS, AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW ACCESS OFF STONEMAN WAY AND BIGGIN LANE - LAND SOUTH OF THE MALTING, RAMSEY - 25/01382/OUT

(Councillor S Corney, Ramsey Town Council, Councillor D Masterson, Bury Parish Council, Councillors H Tobias and K Maheshwari, Ward Members, S

Harrington, Objector, and D Bainbridge, Agent, addressed the Committee on the application).

See Minute No 23 for Members' interests.

Consideration was given to a report by the Planning Service Manager (Development Management) (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book) on an outline application with all matters reserved save for access for erection of up to 199 dwellings including open space, play space, car parking, drainage, utilities connections, and the construction of a new access off Stoneman Way and Biggin Lane on land south of The Malting, Ramsey. Members were advised of further representations, which had been received since the report had been prepared.

Following a detailed introduction by the Case Officer, Councillor Neish reported on the views expressed on the terms of proposed S106 obligations considered necessary to make the application acceptable at meeting of the Section 106 Advisory Group held the previous week. It was reported that:

- no specific projects had yet been identified for funding, but these would come forward at a later date based on the number of houses constructed. Given the scale of the proposal, available funding was unlikely to be sufficient to deliver entirely new facilities and would more likely be directed towards enhancing existing provision.
- Anglian Water had been consulted and had not requested any Section 106 contributions.
- Contributions towards allotments and community gardens would be offered first to Ramsey Town Council and, if declined, passed to Bury Parish Council.
- Consideration had been given to whether the development should be linked to a neighbouring development for contribution purposes, but Legal advice had confirmed that this was not possible owing to the elapsed time between submissions.
- The Advisory Group supported the terms of the proposed obligations in so far as they complied with the legal requirements on the Council

Councillor D Masterson, Bury Parish Council, addressed the Committee and stated that whilst the Parish Council was not opposed to housing development in principle, it objected to the application because of the impact it would have on the remaining separation between Ramsey and Bury and the long-term identity of the two settlements. He highlighted significant housing growth that had already occurred in the area and the conflict with the protected settlement break policy contained within the Bury Neighbourhood Plan. He also outlined the Council's concerns regarding the future highway connection shown on indicative plans.

Members questioned Councillor Masterson on the precise location of the separation gap and the implications of future highway links through adjacent land.

Councillor S Corney, Ramsey Town Council, addressed the Committee on the application. He stated that insufficient weight was being given to neighbourhood planning policies, particularly given the advanced stage reached by the Ramsey Neighbourhood Plan and that both Ramsey and Bury Neighbourhood Plans

opposed further coalescence between the settlements. He also referred to concerns regarding traffic levels on Biggin Lane, school place capacity, future access arrangements and flood risk and drainage pressures. Finally, Councillor Corney questioned the reduction of dwelling numbers from 220 to 199 and suggested this avoided additional contribution requirements.

Members asked questions of clarification about the southern access shown on plans, settlement gap distances and flooding concerns arising from the comments of the Middle Level Commissioners.

Councillor K Maheshwari, Ward Member, highlighted the significant housing growth in Ramsey and Bury since 2011, historical references to a proposed Ramsey-Bury relief road that had never materialised, the pressure on local school places, NHS capacity and healthcare provision, the Integrated Care Board's request for mitigation measures, the absence of dedicated contributions towards education and healthcare and conflict with the settlement gap policy.

Councillor Howard Tobias, Ward Member, argued that Ramsey carried a disproportionate burden in meeting housing targets, the distinction between Ramsey and Bury was being eroded, infrastructure had failed to keep pace with housing growth, there were insufficient schools, doctors, dentists and other community facilities, valuable farmland would be permanently lost and reliance on a single access point raised concerns regarding emergency access and public safety.

S Harrington, Objector, drew the Committee’s attention to the fact that residents had submitted additional legal and planning representations earlier that day. She then stated that she had concerns regarding infrastructure deficits, the proposal avoided approximately £6 million of site-specific infrastructure contributions, school and healthcare services were under pressure, access arrangements represented a single point of failure and delaying junction signalisation until occupation, rather than prior to construction, increased risks associated with construction traffic.

Members asked questions about her highway safety concerns associated with construction traffic, proposed traffic signal timings and the calculation of infrastructure funding requirements.

D Bainbridge, Agent, stated that over two years had been spent on engagement with council officers and consultees and there had been multiple revisions to the scheme in response to technical and environmental issues. He also referred to the absence of technical objections from consultees, with the exception of the Middle Level Commissioners, the extensive conditions proposed and the landscape buffers incorporated along sensitive boundaries.

Members questioned Mr Bainbridge regarding the reduction in dwelling numbers from 220 to 199. He advised that the reduced unit count reflected design-led changes and the need to provide wider landscape buffers. Questions also were asked about highway access arrangements, potential future access through RAF Upwood land, the timing of the junction signalisation, ground contamination investigations and historic land uses.

At 8.40 pm the meeting was adjourned.

At 8.48 the meeting resumed.

Members then sought clarification from Officers on a range of issues. Regarding highways, Officers from the Highways Authority advised the application had been assessed solely on the basis of a single access point, no evidence existed to support refusal on highway safety grounds, there was insufficient justification for requiring the signalisation of the Biggin Lane/Bury Road junction before commencement, Fire and Rescue Services had no objection to the proposal and roads were considered to be capable of accommodating emergency vehicles.

On the subject of Section 106 contributions and the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), Members were advised that developments below 200 dwellings contributed through CIL and larger developments might also be subject to additional Section 106 requirements. Adoption of the Ramsey Neighbourhood Plan would increase the local proportion of CIL from 15% to 25%.

Following questions on flood risk, Officers advised that the Lead Local Flood Authority had no objection to the application, that surface water runoff would be lower than existing greenfield rates and that the Middle Level Commissioners' concerns related primarily to wider strategic drainage issues rather than site-specific failings.

Questions on the settlement gap established that the Ramsey Neighbourhood Plan carried material weight, settlement gaps were not formally defined within national policy and assessment of them involved professional judgement.

During the debate on the application, Members discussed the cumulative impact of development on Ramsey, transport infrastructure, pressures on schools and healthcare and the loss of agricultural land. Reference also was made to the strength of local opposition and concerns about infrastructure. The Committee acknowledged the presumption in favour of sustainable development, the lack of technical objections from statutory consultees and the provision of 40% affordable housing.

Detailed discussion focused on the settlement gap between Ramsey and Bury, the emerging Ramsey Neighbourhood Plan and the weight that should be attributed to the Middle Level Commissioners' objection. Members had particular concerns over reliance on a single access point, cumulative dwelling numbers resulting from development already accessed via Stoneman Way and future resilience of vehicle access in emergency situations.

Members also discussed the implications of an appeal if the application was refused and the possibility of Secretary of State intervention.

A proposal to approve the application was moved by Councillor Seeff and seconded by Councillor Mickelburgh. On being put to the vote the proposal was declared to be LOST.

While Members recognised the weight that should be given to the National Planning Policy Framework, they also acknowledged the need to review Officers' assessment of the harms that that had been identified. They also discussed the implications that approval of the proposal would have for the District Council's

emerging Local Plan, local landscape character and the Bury Neighbourhood Plan.

A proposal to refuse the application was then moved by Councillor Wood and seconded by Councillor Davenport-Ray.

At 10.21 pm the meeting was adjourned for reasons to be prepared in policy terms.

At 10.56 the meeting resumed.

On resumption, it was proposed that the application be refused on the grounds that the development would result in an unsustainable pattern of development, contrary to NPPF 2026 S5 j (i) requirement to be of a scale which can be accommodated taking into account the existing or proposed availability of infrastructure, where adverse effects are not substantially outweighed by the benefits. Specifically, the material adverse effects of:

- Settlement coalescence, settlement identity and loss of settlement gap – LP11, LP12 and Ramsey Neighbourhood Plan (Developing) Policy 2
- Loss of BMV – LP10
- Surface level water drainage, system capacity and flood risks identified by the Middle Level Commissioners – LP5, LP6, LP15
- Lack of infrastructure (or contributions) to mitigate the effects of additional 199 homes – specifically in response to the ICB consultee – LP4f
- Developing local plan (Land Availability Assessment) – this evidence base found the site to be not suitable for development – NPPF 2026 DM4

On being put to the vote the proposal was declared to be CARRIED. Accordingly, it was

RESOLVED:

that, contrary to the recommendation, and subject to referral to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government, in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2026, the application be refused because the development would result in an unsustainable pattern of development, contrary to NPPF 2026 S5 j (i) requirement to be of a scale which can be accommodated taking into account the existing or proposed availability of infrastructure, where adverse effects are not substantially outweighed by the benefits. Specifically, the material adverse effects of:

- Settlement coalescence, settlement identity and loss of settlement gap – LP11, LP12 and Ramsey Neighbourhood Plan (Developing) Policy 2
- Loss of BMV – LP10
- Surface level water drainage, system capacity and flood risks identified by the Middle Level Commissioners – LP5, LP6, LP15
- Lack of infrastructure (or contributions) to mitigate the effects of additional 199 homes – specifically in response to the ICB consultee – LP4f

- Developing local plan (Land Availability Assessment) – this evidence base found the site to be not suitable for development – NPPF 2026 DM4.

26 APPLICATIONS REQUIRING REFERENCE TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

The Planning Service Manager (Development Management) submitted reports (copies of which are appended in the Minute Book) on applications for development to be determined by the Committee. Members were advised of further representations, which had been received since the reports had been prepared. Whereupon, it was

RESOLVED

a) Erection of 8 dwellings at Land North of 20 to 26 Heath Road and North of Heath Farm Heath Road, Warboys - 26/00344/FUL

(D Mead, Agent, addressed the Committee on the application).

See Minute No 23 for Members' interests.

that the application be approved subject to conditions to include those listed in Section 9 of the report now submitted with delegated authority being given to the Head of Planning, Infrastructure & Public Protection to approve any amendments to conditions as deemed necessary.

b) Demolition of the existing cattery and kennels buildings and the erection of 4 detached dwellings, together with associated works including access and infrastructure - Fields View, Fenstanton Road, Hilton - 6/01048/FUL

(Councillor P Balicki, Hilton Parish Council, and J Aldridge, Objector, addressed the Committee on the application).

See Minute No 23 for Members' interests.

that the application be refused because the development would result in the provision of isolated homes outside a settlement and group of dwellings, with no sustainable links to the nearby settlements, resulting in an unsustainable pattern of development, where adverse effects are not substantially outweighed by the benefits, contrary to the requirements of NPPF, in particular Polices S5(3) and HO11.

At 11.58 pm the meeting was adjourned.

At 12.01 am the meeting resumed.

c) Variation of condition 8 (deliveries and dispatches) of 25/02081/S73 to alter delivery/collection times on weekdays to 04:00 to 20:00 and 07:00 to 13:30 on Saturdays to reflect the operational requirements of the site at The Orchard - Garden Farm, The Town. Great Staughton, St Neots - 26/01169/S73

(Councillor N Yates, Great Staughton Parish Council, and A Newell and B Jewell, Objectors, addressed the Committee on the application).

that, contrary to the recommendation, the application be refused because it is considered that the variation in the hours of operation from 7 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. to 4:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. will create an unacceptable level of noise and disturbance to residential properties within the vicinity of the application site, which is contrary to policy LP14 of the Huntingdonshire District Council Local Plan which requires applications to maintain a high standard of amenity to neighbouring residential occupiers.

27 APPEAL DECISIONS

The Committee received and noted a report by the Planning Service Manager (Development Management), which contained details of eight recent decisions by the Planning Inspectorate. A copy of the report is appended in the Minute Book.

RESOLVED

that the contents of the report be noted.

Chair