

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING – 25 June 2025

Amendment/De-brief Sheet

Circulation:	First	Item:	1
Reference Number:	25/0432/TTPO		
Address:	193 Sturton Trees		
Determination Date:	26.06.2025		
To Note:	Additional applicant and objector representations		
Amendments to Text:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Saturday 21st June a letter was received from Richard Buxton Solicitors who were instructed by Friends of St Matthew's Piece. 2. The objection has been uploaded to public access and can be viewed there in full. A summary is provided below, where appropriate officer comments are provided in italics. 3. Relevant to 25/0432/TTPO the letter highlights that Friends of St Matthew's Piece has commissioned a structural engineer report that considers it likely that any recent measurements may well be inaccurate and that the degree of damage to the house does not justify underpinning. 4. The increased costs associated with underpinning has increased to frighten the council. However, it would be absurd for the Council acting rationally not to take independent advice on what the insurers say. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>Following a request for an explanation of the increased cost, the Council was informed that the increase cost is a result of working restrictions caused by party wall and facing on to footpath resulting in the need for a piled raft approach.</i> b. <i>A breakdown of costs was also requested but when received was found to be inaccurately calculated. A further request for clarity resulted in the below breakdown.</i> 		

Prelims	£15,000
Site establishment and break out works	£30,000
Piling works	£85,000
Needle beam works	£90,000
Foundation isolation works	£35,000
Level formation and void filling	£25,000
Slab works	£26,500
Total budget costs	£306,500.00

5. It is extraordinary that the Council's engineer has only assessed documents submitted by the applicant, rather than being asked to advise independently on the extent of alleged damage.
 - a. *The legislation is clear in that it is the applicant's responsibility to provide the necessary evidence to support any application. If the Council doubts the evidence this could be a reason for refusal.*
6. The CAVAT assessments are listed by the Council on the portal as having been provided by the applicants, and also are redacted, further raising queries about the process adopted.
 - a. *The assessments were carried out by SCDC and CCC tree officers and are therefore independent. The public access description has been updated.*
7. Noting the limitations of CAVAT it is a helpful tool in balancing the justification for removal against the benefits of retention. The Council's responsible course is to refuse the application and pay a claim if it arises – but scrutinising it very carefully including, obviously, as to whether underpinning is necessary at all.
 - a. *It is agreed that the question of liability and payment of any costs should be considered and thoroughly scrutinised following the submission of any claim.*
8. We believe the position is so obvious that the Council would be acting irrationally and opening itself to judicial review if it were to make any decision to fell without fully investigating the matter from an arboricultural and engineering perspective and indeed dealing with amenity values in a rational way.
 - a. *See point 5a.*

	<p>9. The above referenced engineers report, commissioned by Friends of St Matthew's Piece to support their objections, was submitted Friday 20th June and can be viewed in full via public access. The report questions the severity and cause of cracking, the accuracy of the findings and the subsequent conclusions.</p> <p><i>Officers remain satisfied that evidence submitted with the application and verified by an independent structural engineer on behalf of the Council indicates on the balance of probabilities a causal link between tree root activity and foundation movement and therefore damage to the building.</i></p>
Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:	None
Decision:	

Circulation:	First	Item:	7
Reference Number:	24/04582/FUL		
Address:	Innisfree 1B South Green Road, Newnham		
Determination Date:	25.06.2025		
To Note:	<p>Additional representations in objection from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - South Newnham Neighbourhood Forum - Visual presentation from third-party - Letter from Richard Buxton Solicitors on behalf of third-party representatives <p>Additional representations in support from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Visual presentation from applicants <p><i>Officer Note: Both sets of visual representations are artist's interpretations and do not represent verified views and are not put forward for approval, they are merely indicative. Given that both the applicants and the objectors provide different visualisations which indicate different impacts, they should not be relied upon by members.</i></p> <p>Comments from South Newnham Neighbourhood Forum received 23 June 2025 do not raise any additional material planning considerations that have not already been addressed in the officer's report.</p>		

	<p>All points raised within the Richard Buxton solicitor letter on behalf of third-party representatives, received 23 June 2025, have been addressed in the officer's report.</p> <p>Apart from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Compliance with policy 3 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) - Self-build benefits are disputed <p><i>Officer note: Policy 3 refers to new development and is relevant to the application. Accepting that there is no net gain in residential development from site, nevertheless the scheme would result in more modern, inclusive and sustainable living accommodation replacing an outdated existing home.</i></p> <p><i>On self-build, again accepting that there would be no net increase in dwellings arising from the proposal, nonetheless given that this is a specific self-build proposal, in granting and conditioning the scheme as such, the LPA would be securing and the site would be contributing to the identified deficit in self and custom build properties within the City. This is a material consideration which weighs in favour of the proposal.</i></p>
Amendments to Text:	NONE
Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:	NONE
Decision:	