

## PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING – 29 October 2025

### Amendment/De-brief Sheet

Circulation:	First	Item:	5																											
Reference Number:	24/04859/FUL																													
Address:	The Paddocks, 347 Cherry Hinton Road, Cambridge																													
Determination Date:	31 October 2025																													
To Note:	<p>Further information is set out below in relation to the technical details - potable water and foul water discharge.</p> <p>The table shows a summary of potable water demand and foul water discharge set out in paragraph 1.7 of the report.</p> <p><b>Table 1 – Technical Summary</b></p> <table><tr><th colspan="3">Potable Water Demand</th></tr><tr><th>Scheme</th><th>Phase 1 – Annual potable water consumption</th><th>Entire Site – Annual potable water consumption (l)</th></tr><tr><td>Existing Site</td><td>628,321</td><td>4,424,797</td></tr><tr><td>Redevelopment</td><td>255,320</td><td>1,791,920</td></tr><tr><td><b>Betterment</b></td><td><b>59%</b></td><td><b>60%</b></td></tr></table> <table><tr><th colspan="3">Foul Water Discharge</th></tr><tr><td>Existing Site</td><td>628,321</td><td>4,424,797</td></tr><tr><td>Redevelopment</td><td>561,704</td><td>3,942,224</td></tr><tr><td><b>Betterment</b></td><td><b>10.6%</b></td><td><b>10.9%</b></td></tr></table> <p><b>Existing water network</b></p> <p>Western boundary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 375mm diameter foul water sewer enlarging to 450mm midway through the site, falling in a northerly direction</li><li>• 1600mm diameter surface water sewer also falling in a northerly direction</li></ul> <p>Cherry Hinton Road (connect to the sewers running along the site's western boundary)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 225mm diameter and 300mm diameter foul water sewer falling in a westerly direction</li><li>• 675mm diameter surface water sewer also falling in a northerly direction both shown to connect to the sewers running along the site's western boundary</li></ul> <p>Northern boundary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• a 100mm diameter surface water sewer enlarging to 150mm midway through the site, falling in a westerly direction envisaged to discharge into the western foul water sewer</li></ul>			Potable Water Demand			Scheme	Phase 1 – Annual potable water consumption	Entire Site – Annual potable water consumption (l)	Existing Site	628,321	4,424,797	Redevelopment	255,320	1,791,920	<b>Betterment</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>60%</b>	Foul Water Discharge			Existing Site	628,321	4,424,797	Redevelopment	561,704	3,942,224	<b>Betterment</b>	<b>10.6%</b>	<b>10.9%</b>
Potable Water Demand																														
Scheme	Phase 1 – Annual potable water consumption	Entire Site – Annual potable water consumption (l)																												
Existing Site	628,321	4,424,797																												
Redevelopment	255,320	1,791,920																												
<b>Betterment</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>60%</b>																												
Foul Water Discharge																														
Existing Site	628,321	4,424,797																												
Redevelopment	561,704	3,942,224																												
<b>Betterment</b>	<b>10.6%</b>	<b>10.9%</b>																												



### **Existing potable water consumption**

Potable water use per annum based upon water meter readings on the site and 92% occupation of the area of the buildings at the time and then calculated to predict 100% occupation. No existing water recycling facilities.

### **Proposed potable water demand**

Potable water demand per annum based upon the occupation of the area of the building with 75% mezzanine area and number of staff with 70% working on site on a typical day.

### **Proposed surface water drainage**

- Blue and blue green roofs
- Rainwater harvesting
- High efficiency water fittings

### **Proposed foul drainage**

- A network of 100mm and 150mm diameter pipes below the building slab to discharge via gravity to the existing Anglian Water foul sewer to the west of the site

### **Conclusion**

	<p>The sustainable drainage strategy and water efficiency measures would reduce potable water and foul discharge to the network.</p> <p>Phase 1 will have a predicted potable water use betterment of c59% and foul water discharge betterment of c10.6%.</p> <p>The development of the whole site is predicted deliver a potable water use betterment of c60%, and foul water discharge betterment of c10.9%.</p>
Amendments to Text:	Paragraphs 1.7 and 1.8 should read potable water
Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:	<p>Approval subject to the new updated condition set out below and deletion of condition 38 of the full and outline applications in the 23 July 2025 report, with minor amendments to the conditions as drafted delegated to officers</p> <p>Condition updated as follows: -</p> <p>38. Prior to the commencement of the development of each relevant phase, excluding works for demolition, full details of a scheme for the provision of foul drainage for each relevant phase shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include: the design of all on-site foul sewerage infrastructure; the diameters of proposed pipes and the capacity of any on-site storage; and a timetable and programme for the provision of the foul sewerage infrastructure. The scheme shall demonstrate that, where connection to a public sewer is proposed, the foul sewerage discharge is consistent with the Water Consumption Study Technical Note (October 2025) or the foul water sewerage discharge can be accommodated within the piped public sewer system without significantly increasing the risk of flooding or backing up of the existing system on the site or elsewhere. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and the approved timetable and programme.</p> <p>Reason: To reduce the risk of pollution to the water environment and to ensure a satisfactory method of foul water drainage (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policies 31 and 32)."</p>
<b>Decision:</b>	

Circulation:	First	Item:	6
Reference Number:	25/02161/FUL		
Address:	Christ's College, St Andrews Street		
Determination Date:	07.11.2025		
To Note:	<p>Further representations have been received, including new representations from 3 addresses.</p> <p>Those in objection raise the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of sufficient consultation of residents</li> <li>• Failure to explore alternative designs</li> <li>• Lack of comprehensive sustainability consideration</li> <li>• Lack of provided Transport management plans</li> <li>• Violation of local validation requirements</li> </ul> <p>Officer response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The level of consultation undertaken is compliant with the statement of community involvement.</li> <li>• The current proposal follows an extensive pre-application process and has been developed to meet the needs of the College and its students. The current proposal must therefore be assessed on its merits.</li> <li>• The level of information provided with regards to the overall sustainability of the proposal is sufficient.</li> <li>• In line with the advice received from the Local Highways Authority this impact is considered acceptable subject to conditions requiring mitigation measures.</li> <li>• Whilst acknowledged this information was not provided at validation stage, given it has been provided the application can be assessed against this information.</li> </ul> <p>Five total further representations have been received by or on behalf of the Christs Lane Action Group (CLAG). These individual representations are:</p> <p><u>Independent Heritage appraisal by Alec Forshaw.</u> This was received prior to the publication of the officer report and has therefore been reflected within it.</p> <p><u>Daylight, sunlight and Overshadowing appraisal by eb7</u></p>		

	<p>This was received prior to the publication of the officer report and has therefore been reflected within it.</p> <p><u>Planning appraisal by HGH</u></p> <p>This document primarily sets out CLAG's heritage based concerns with the scheme, specifically;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater levels of heritage harm to other relevant heritage assets, including the Historic Core Conservation Area.</li> <li>• Lack of meaningful public benefits to outweigh such heritage harm as required by the NPPF.</li> <li>• Failure to fully explore alternative arrangements, including aspects of the previous consents.</li> </ul> <p>Concerns are also raised, as set out in the eb7 report regarding loss of light. This aspect is covered in the officer report.</p> <p>Officer response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As set out in the officer report, the proposed development is only considered to result in heritage harm to the setting of the Bodley Library. With all further impacts either neutral or positive.</li> <li>• Nevertheless, as per the officer report, given heritage harm is identified, as per Paragraph 215 of the NPPF "<i>this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use</i>".</li> <li>• Whilst not all the public benefits are considered relevant or applicable. As per the officer report, those proposed, in addition to securing the optimum viable use of the buildings are considered to be sufficient to outweigh the harm.</li> </ul> <p><u>Critical review and design proposal by Create Streets</u></p> <p>This was sent on the final day of consultation but not received by the LPA because of the file size of the representation being over 20 Mb. The document provides an alternative frontage design for the site with a survey then carried out to compare public opinion in comparison to the scheme proposed within this application. The alternative scheme has been provided to highlight the perceived issues with the proposed scheme relating to its:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Height and massing</li> <li>• Lack of active public frontage</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>Results from a public survey have been provided concluding that 71% of people asked preferred the alternative design produced by Create Streets.</p> <p>Officer response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The survey results are acknowledged however the current proposal must be assessed on its own merits.</li> <li>• Whilst the alternative design is noted, the applicant's proposal follows extensive pre-application engagement, with technical officer support and is a fully detailed scheme which meets the needs of the College and its students. The proposed scheme is considered acceptable and is what is being put forward for consideration.</li> </ul> <p><u>CLAG formal objection</u></p> <p>This document expands upon CLAG's objections to the proposed scheme. This letter covers 9 main areas of objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failures within the Planning Performance Agreement process. Including policy conflict &amp; evasion, failing validation requirements and transparency.</li> <li>• An unacceptable impact upon Christ's Lane, including failure to assess policy 60 (tall buildings)</li> <li>• Unacceptable heritage harm, as set out in the appraisal undertaken by Alec Forshaw.</li> <li>• Inflated public benefits to outweigh any heritage harm.</li> <li>• Significant impact upon Christ's Lane from loss of light/ shading</li> <li>• Economic harm to retailers along Christ's Lane from loss of light and construction of the development.</li> <li>• Insufficient sustainability rationale</li> <li>• Insufficient traffic management and pedestrian safety measures.</li> <li>• Failure to consider how previous schemes and alternative designs to provide preferable options for development of the site.</li> </ul> <p>Officer response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst the Council cannot comment on behalf of responses from the College to requests, it is</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>considered sufficient consultation has been undertaken, including the statutory requirements of the Local Planning Authority. Whilst not provided at validation stage, a daylight/ sunlight assessment was provided. It is not possible to invalidate an application once it has been validated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The officer report sets out why it is considered Policy 60 is not applicable in this instance. Including the overall impact assessment upon Christ's Lane.</li> <li>• As previously noted, Alec Forshaw's report and the heritage objections are covered within the officer report.</li> <li>• As above, the public benefits are covered within the officer report, including their necessity.</li> <li>• As covered in the officer report, the impact upon Christ's Lane is considered to be acceptable.</li> <li>• As set out in the officer report, the loss of light and construction impacts are not considered to be unacceptable.</li> <li>• As per the officer report, the proposal is considered to be acceptable with regards to all aspects of sustainability.</li> <li>• Subject to conditions as recommended, the proposal would not result in any significant impact upon traffic management or pedestrian safety.</li> <li>• As per the response to the Create Streets representation, the alternative design is noted, however the current scheme is considered to be acceptable.</li> </ul>
Amendments to Text:	<p>Addition of a further paragraph after 12.13 to state:</p> <p>As highlighted in the report produced by Create Streets, the proposed development would result in an increased enclosure ratio along Christ's Lane. It is considered however, that, despite this increase, its height to width ratio would be comparable with that expected of an urban thoroughfare. The overall enclosure ratio resulting from the development is not considered, within the context of Cambridge to be unduly harmful with other examples such as Rose Crescent noted with similar levels whilst retaining elements of public realm.</p>

	<p>Amend the text in Paragraph 12.15 to the following:</p> <p>The proposed library building's two primary elevations are those facing onto Christ's Lane and also facing internally into Bath Court. <b>Whilst the lack of an active frontage within the development facing onto Christ's Lane has been raised by a number of third-party representations.</b> Owing to the nature of the College and the use of the library, the public facing elevation onto Christ's Lane is required to provide a certain level of privacy from public views. As opposed to the existing blank façade, the proposed elevation fronting Christ's Lane has a greater level of articulation creating an interest that is not found in the current site. A 'base' level is established up to the second floor where the façade steps back revealing the depth of the chimneys. A combination of the chimneys and windows within this elevation attempt to take note of other historic college streets and provides to a rhythm along the lane.</p> <p>Amend the text in Paragraph 12.16 to the following:</p> <p>Included within the façade facing Christ's Lane, a bench measuring approximately 13.8 metres in length is proposed along Christ's Lane to replace the existing, far smaller bench that would be lost with the demolition of the existing building. This combined with the other positive features of this public façade is such that the combined contribution to the public realm is considered to be positive <b>and a notable improvement upon the existing blank facade of the library building, whilst considering the privacy requirements for a College library building.</b></p> <p>Addition of a further paragraph after 12.16 to state:</p> <p>The results of a survey undertaken by Create Streets are acknowledged, highlining a preference amongst those asked for an alternative design of reduced scale. Whilst acknowledging the results of the survey, it cannot reasonably be concluded that the needs of the College and its students could be met within an alternative design such as this without the College being able to fully review. Officers must consider the proposal submitted including assessing its scale, design and impact upon the Public Realm.</p>
--	--



	<p>Amended the wording of Paragraph 14.7 to state:</p> <p>Christ's College forms part of the larger Registered Park and Garden designation of the area, however, it is considered that Bath Court, <del>which did not exist at the time of the designation</del> is not itself considered to make a significant contribution to the landscape of the College. Indeed, Bath Court is not visible from First, Second or Third Court, or from the Fellow's or Master's Gardens. Consequently, it is considered that it does not have any impact on the main historic components of the historic park and garden. Given the insignificant contribution of Bath Court to the Registered Park and Gardens, in addition to the lack of impact upon the more formal landscaped areas of the College. The development is acceptable with regards to its impact upon the Grade II listed Historic Park and Gardens.</p> <p>Amended wording of Condition 11 to state:</p> <p>No development shall commence (including demolition) <b>to the existing Kitchen/ Dining facilities</b> until details of the proposed temporary kitchen/ dining facilities have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details provided should include the timespan for which the facilities are required and how the land will be restored to its original condition. The approved development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Reason: To ensure that the proposed development would be acceptable with regards to its impact on relevant heritage assets and protected trees within the site, in accordance with Policies 61, 62 and 71 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.</p> <p>Amended wording of Condition 12 to state:</p> <p>No development above ground level to the <b>new library building</b> shall take place until an ecological enhancement scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include details of bat and bird box installation, hedgehog provisions and other ecological enhancements. The approved scheme shall be fully implemented prior to first occupation or in accordance with a timescale agreed in writing by the local planning authority.</p>
--	---

	<p>Amended wording of condition 15 to state:</p> <p>No development above ground level <b>to the new library building, or to Bath Court</b>, other than demolition, shall commence until a hard and soft landscaping scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include the following:</p> <p>Amended wording of condition 16 to state:</p> <p>16. No development above base course <b>to the new library building</b> (other than demolition and enabling/utility diversion works) shall take place until a detailed scheme for the approved rainwater harvesting and recycling strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include relevant drawings showing the location of the necessary infrastructure required to facilitate the water reuse. The development shall be carried out and thereafter maintained strictly in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Approval subject to the deletion of Conditions 6, 28 and 32 and their replacement with the following condition:</p> <p>Prior to the commencement of development, a Demolition and Construction Environmental Management Plan (DCEMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>It shall include / adhere to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) A phasing programme.</li> <li>b) Contractor's parking and access arrangements for vehicles, plant and personnel including the location of construction traffic routes to and from the site, their signing, monitoring and enforcement measures.</li> <li>c) Control of dust, mud and debris on the highway.</li> <li>d) Construction and demolition (except for loading and unloading) shall be carried out only between 0800 hours to 1800 hours Monday to Friday, and 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays, unless in</li> </ul>
--	--

	<p>accordance with agreed emergency procedures for deviation.</p> <p>e) Delivery hours for muck away, demolition and construction purposes. The hours submitted for approval shall include an assessment of the daily number and type of vehicles required and an assessment as to how vehicles would safely access / exit the site include tracking / swept path analysis. The submission should include a highway safety and residential amenity audit / assessment to support the proposed times and include provision for banks person(s). The delivery times shall be carried out only within the agreed hours and shall at no time should any deliveries take place after 1300 hours on Saturdays and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority in advance.</p> <p>f) Prior notice and agreement procedures for works outside agreed limits and hours.</p> <p>a) Dust management and wheel washing measures in accordance with the provisions of IAQM, 2016 and 2018;</p> <p>b) Use of concrete crushers and mitigation measures;</p> <p>c) Site artificial lighting during construction and demolition including hours of operation, position and impact on neighbouring properties.</p> <p>d) Screening and hoarding details.</p> <p>e) Consideration of sensitive receptors.</p> <p>f) A Community Liaison Plan to inform the community in respect of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the construction required to facilitate the development</li> <li>- contractor point of contact, complaints procedures, including complaints response procedures.</li> </ul> <p>g) Membership of the Considerate Contractor's Scheme.</p> <p>The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed plan.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the safety, health and quality of life of existing residential occupiers and users of the City centre in accordance with policies 35, 36 and 56 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2020).</p>
Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:	As above

<b>Decision:</b>	
------------------	--

Circulation:	First	Item:	<b>7</b>
Reference Number:	25/02162/LBC		
Address:	Christ's College, St Andrews Street		
Determination Date:	07.11.2025		
To Note:	<p>Replaced S66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, with S16 as this applies to Listed Building Consent applications.</p> <p>Removed reference to Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as this relates to Conservation Areas.</p> <p>Clarification of spelling mistake within paragraph 11.30</p>		
Amendments to Text:	<p>Amend the text of Paragraph 11.20 to state:</p> <p>It is fundamental to recognise that there are two separate statutory duties when considering harm to listed buildings and harm to conservation areas, falling under sections <del>66</del> <b>16</b> and <del>72</del> of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990, respectively. Likewise, section 102 of the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 requires separate consideration of the effects on relevant heritage assets, including registered parks and gardens. Therefore, officers consider it important to clarify that the overall impact upon the listed buildings being neutral is identified separately from any impact upon the conservation area, and the Registered Park and Garden.</p> <p>Amend the text of Paragraph 11.39 to state:</p> <p>In conclusion, great weight should be given to the conservation of any designated heritage asset. Whilst there is a level of harm identified to the highly significant Grade I listed Bodley Library, this harm, at the lower end of the less than substantial scale, is considered to have been clearly and convincingly justified. Additionally, as concluded by the Council's Conservation Officer, the development of new increased library facilities would help to secure the listed building's optimum viable use. The overall impact upon the relevant listed buildings is</p>		

	<p>therefore considered to be neutral and would preserve their special historic and architectural interest in accordance with Section 66 16 of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990.</p> <p>Amend the text of Paragraph 11.41 to state:</p> <p>In accordance with local and national policies, as well as section 66 16 of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act, special regard must be given to the desirability of preserving listed buildings, including their settings. The statutory duties carry considerable importance and weight when weighing any harm against any benefits or countervailing factors. Overall, the development is considered to preserve the setting and significance of the listed buildings. It is therefore compliant with the provisions of the Planning (LBCA) Act 1990, the NPPF, the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023, and Policy 61 of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Amend the text of Paragraph 13.1 to state:</p> <p>Planning decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless there are material considerations that indicate otherwise (section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38[6] of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).</p> <p>Amend the text of Paragraph 11.30 to state:</p> <p>Level access is then proposed to be provided from the list <b>Lift</b> to the upper hall and the half-landing leading into the old combination room. Whilst this would obscure historic fabric, the process is considered to be fully reversible which is deemed to mitigate any harm from this aspect. A new staircase is also proposed adjacent to the new lift core leading into the upper hall, following opening up works, the brickwork that would require removal for this is modern and of no historic interest. A corresponding proposal is to remove the existing staircase into the upper hall to facilitate and reinstate the independent use of the old combination room whilst allowing for improved accessibility</p>
--	--

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:	-
<b>Decision:</b>	

Circulation:	First	Item:	<b>8</b>
Reference Number:	25/03201/FUL		
Address:	Crossways House, 176 Chesterton Road, Cambridge		
Determination Date:	31 October 2025		
To Note:	<p>A letter has been received from the Sandy Lane Residents' Association which represents the occupiers of Sandy Lane and Nos. 126 to 176 Chesterton Road.</p> <p>Please see the key points below: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The residents' association works to protect the character and wellbeing of the area</li> <li>• Recognises the importance of providing support to homeless individuals</li> <li>• The relevant authorities must ensure that the initiatives are properly conceived, responsibly managed, and appropriately located.</li> <li>• Planning permission should not be granted until a comprehensive business plan is provided.</li> <li>• Since Crossways House ceased to operate as a temporary shelter for homeless, anti-social behaviour has ceased.</li> <li>• Full explanation required for why the location has been identified as suitable for the development as it is in a predominantly residential area.</li> <li>• Economic impact upon tourism, independent businesses, cafes, bed and breakfasts.</li> <li>• A facility accommodating individuals with complex mental health issues, substance dependency, or other vulnerabilities would present a risk to the safety, security, and wellbeing of local residents particularly children and elderly.</li> <li>• Not an appropriate location and alternative sites should be considered – purpose built or more appropriate such as under used city centre buildings or Council land.</li> <li>• Area not designed for intensive supported accommodation for transient and vulnerable people as mainly family orientated residential.</li> <li>• The nearby facilities are quiet and not 24 intensive uses which result in noise and disturbance.</li> <li>• The use would be throughout the whole year.</li> <li>• The statement from the police in relation to the fatality on the premises confirms the presence of</li> </ul>		

	<p>serious risks which cannot be mitigated by management measures. Police callouts numerous.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fails a balanced approach between social need and community cohesion.</li> <li>• Photos submitted showing a rough sleeper on Sandy Lane and a resident of Crossways picking up alcohol behind bins at No. 168a Chesterton Road.</li> </ul> <p>2 further representations have also been received along with additional representations added to those already made. These mainly reflect comments already summarised in the main report and suggest conditions for the management plan.</p> <p>The applicant's agent has submitted further information in the form of a letter from Cambridge City Council Homeless Prevention and Solutions Manager. This sets out that the Council lost the opportunity for government funding through the Single Homeless Accommodation Programme (SHAP) due to not being able to identify suitable accommodation. There are not options for accommodation similar to Crossways House in alternative locations.</p>
Amendments to Text:	<p>Paragraph 14.4 additional text</p> <p>Cycle Parking</p> <p>The cycle parking for student accommodation is considered more appropriate with a standard of 2 spaces per 3 bedspaces, 1 space for every 3 members of staff, and 1 visitor space per 5 bed spaces. This would result in a total requirement of at least 22 spaces. Cycle parking should be sited to the front if possible or to the side if not. It should be covered and secure.</p>
Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:	None
<b>Decision:</b>	

Circulation:	First	Item:	<b>9</b>
Reference Number:	25/02147/FUL		
Address:	Cambridge Rugby Union Club Grantchester Road Newnham Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB3 9ED		
Determination Date:	28.07.2025		
To Note:	<p>The applicant has put forward very special circumstances (VSC's) these are listed in paragraphs 9.21-9.29 of the officer report.</p> <p>The applicants submitted planning statement has drawn attention to the Greater Cambridge Wellbeing and Social Inclusion Topic Paper (2021). Whereby which identifies significant health inequalities across Cambridge City and growing childhood obesity particularly in the most deprived wards.</p>		



	<p>The applicants submitted planning statement has also drawn attention to the Cambridge Health Strategy which identifies encouraging residents to participate in sport as being a key priority.</p> <p>Other benefits listed include access to sport, social benefits, health benefits, protection from adverse weather, economic benefits and spatial benefits.</p> <p>Clearly the provision of the padel tennis courts would provide economic benefits to the area with construction related jobs and then creating 3 full time and 3-4 part time positions and as well as 4-5 freelance coaches. However, there is no compelling evidence to suggest the future of the Rugby Club's financial status is dependent on the grant of permission for Padel courts on the site.</p> <p>Whilst it is not disputed the health and wellbeing benefits from the proposal. The VSC's put forward are largely generic benefits of Padel sport's development in general and could arise from almost any location in or around Cambridge. They do not constitute very special circumstances.</p>
Amendments to Text:	<p>Paragraph 7.4 of the report can be removed.</p> <p><i>Those raising neutral comments have given the following reasons:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Welcome the plan to build on what is currently an empty, unused and visually unappealing plot.</i></li> <li>• <i>The new design is better than what was previously proposed.</i></li> <li>• <i>The new proposal to retain the majority of the Leylandii cypress border is welcomed.</i></li> <li>• <i>The current proposal for a 6 monthly maintenance of the proposed reduction to 10m seems potentially unsustainable.</i></li> <li>• <i>The plan to fell the ash tree on the back of the site (numbered T003) is unjustified on the explanation given in the tree survey. This tree too acts as a natural</i></li> </ul>

	<p><i>visual barrier between the depot and Ditton Meadows.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The plans include the planting of new trees and on balance may increase the protective coverage both for the new houses and towards the meadows.</i></li> <li>• <i>Encourage the council to ensure that the overall landscaping proposal would increase rather than decrease the tree coverage in this sensitive location.</i></li> </ul>
Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:	None
<b>Decision:</b>	